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This study is an investigation of primary social networks of people in Canberra - that is, their collections of kin, neighbors, workmates, and other friends. The study sets out with certain expectations about the nature of primary social networks in a modern urban society, and the way in which networks vary between different social strata, age-groups, areas, etc., within such a society. The study delves deeply into a particular situation - Canberra - but it is looking ultimately to adding to our understanding of an aspect of societies generally. The study does have a subsidiary aim which is more immediately practical, however. Some variations in primary social networks may be the result of differences in neighborhood social composition, and this is a matter over which the planners of Canberra have had a very large measure of control; an attempt is made to evaluate their policies of mixing social classes in each neighborhood.

Primary Relations in the City

Classical sociological theories of the city suggested that primary relations were eroded in the city, and replaced by contacts that were impersonal, transitory, superficial, segmentalized, and often predatory.

"Sociologists" were not the first to adopt this point of view: a common reaction against the industrial revolution was to yearn for the old rural order. Thus Disraeli wrote: "Modern society acknowledges no neighbor", and Balzac said: "There is no kin but the thousand-franc note". Within the sociological tradition it is sufficient to mention Durkheim, concerned about solidarity and anomie in modern society, and
Simmel, analysing the anonymity and calculation of relationships in
the city. More recently, in America, Wirth (1938) presented a
stereotyped summary of urban life, explaining it in terms of three key
variables: size, density and heterogeneity. In another influential
article Parsons (1943) maintained that the isolation of the nuclear
family was functional for industrialized, urbanized society.

Lately, however, a number of sociologists have discovered,
somewhat to their astonishment, that personal ties do survive in the
urban situation, that city people do have links with extended kin,
friends, neighbors, and workmates.

Several American surveys carried out in the mid-1950's - e.g.
Greer (1956), Bell and Boat (1957) - provided some initial evidence of
informal contacts existing in major cities; they suggested that
usually relatives were most important in providing informal contacts,
followed by friends, then neighbors, and finally co-workers; and that
relatives and neighbors tended to be more important in familial areas,
while friends and workmates were more important in high socio-economic
status areas. There have been a number of more anthropological works,
starting with W.F. Whyte's (1943) study of an Italian slum in Boston.
Gans (1962) coined the term "urban villagers" for ethnic inner-city
dwellers who were shielded from the supposedly depersonalising effects
of the urban environment. Supporting evidence come from studies of
urbanization in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Meanwhile W.H. Whyte
(1956) described social life in a middle-class suburb on the edge of
Chicago as "a hotbed of Participation" (p.276) - though such
commentators on suburbia did seem rather loth to accept that this sort
of socializing might have possessed a genuinely primary quality. Young
and Willmott (1957) "were surprised to discover that the wider family,
far from having disappeared, was still very much alive in the middle of London" (p.120). Martin's (1967) study in Adelaide is a recent Australian demonstration of the significant part which extended kinship ties retain in modern urban life.

Nevertheless, although there may indeed still be some kind of community in cities, it is not necessarily the traditional, localized one - where kin, workmates and other friends were all neighbors. In the case of an ethnic enclave or a working-class slum, most of a person's primary relations may be concentrated in the neighborhood, but this is not normally so.

Often neighbors seem to be kept at a distance by people who prefer to choose who they will have relations with. For instance, Martin (1970) found in her middle-class suburb of Adelaide that kin, neighbors and friends were deliberately kept in distinct categories; this compartmentalization reinforced the autonomy of individual families. Neighboring relations have lost many of their old functions, and thus their obligatory character. Neighbors now don't have to help build each other's house, harvest each other's crops, fight each other's wars, provide each other with entertainment, or even carry each other's coffin. As Gans (1963, p.301) notes: "... there is no other necessary tie between homeowners beyond the maintenance of house and lawn upkeep."

Economic development has transferred dependence onto specialized, large, non-local organizations.¹ This is why planners' attempts to create neighborhoods in the traditional sense have ended in disappointment; and if housing-estate authorities set up "community councils"

¹ Stein (1960) in the case of American community studies and Frankenberg (1966) in the case of British ones show the importance of decline in local autonomy.
then "discussions revolve endlessly and impotently around such topics as children's playgrounds and amenity spaces" (Dennis, 1958, p. 82). As Keller (1968, p. 119) puts it:

Neighboring in dynamic urban areas is no longer part of a tight network of interdependent activities and obligations concentrated within a small physical and social space; it is simply one more segmentalized activity.

It cannot be assumed, therefore, that urban neighboring is necessarily a primary relation at all. Measured against Cooley's (1909) defining characteristics, we find that contact between contemporary neighbors is always face-to-face, but often only moderately non-instrumental, doubtfully affective, segmentalized rather than diffused, and not at all permanent. Gans (1962) describes neighboring relations as "quasi-primary", or, perhaps even more accurately, as "pseudo-primary": it is nice to be friendly with the people next door, and people can be apparent friends after only the most scanty acquaintanceship.

Similarly, we must be careful with other sorts of "primary" relations not to think of them in too black and white terms. Thus Babchuk and Bates (1963) introduce the phrase "suspended" primary relations for those ties which are latent but could be resumed, say if friends move back to the same city again. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) suggest that each primary group - kin, neighbors, and friends - operates under different handicaps and with different techniques; each group fulfills different functions. Kin, for instance, can maintain contact over long distances by means of the telephone and the aeroplane, and can send each other help in the form of money. The important point is that there is a continuum rather than a strict division between
primary and secondary relations, and, moreover, variation can occur along several dimensions.\(^2\)

Neighboring and kinship have been comparatively well studied, but there has been very little research on other forms of primary relations, notably friendship. As the next chapter makes clear, the present study asks a person about his whole collection of primary relations, and only afterwards are these relations categorized as being neighbors, friends, or whatever. This method makes no prior assumptions about, for instance, how many of a person's primary relations will be within the neighborhood, and whether kinship and occupational ties will coincide. The discussion so far, however, leads us to expect, firstly, that people in a modern city like Canberra will be involved in a considerable number of primary ties outside their own household/nuclear family; secondly, that not many of these ties will be with neighbors, and, conversely, many of them will be dispersed over a wide geographical area, and indeed some of them will reach right outside Canberra, particularly kinship ties; and thirdly, that a person's neighbors will be distinct from his kin, who will be distinct from his workmates, etc. - i.e. his relations with each will be segmentalized - and associated with this the precise content of the relationship in each case will be different. These are the basic ideas which guide what is reported in chapter 3. These ideas, however, receive further illumination from a theoretical framework provided in

\(^2\) The very concept of "primary relation" possibly needs some revamping. Because rural/primitive societies have a higher proportion of primary relations, people with the anti-urban bias tend to equate primary relations with rich, personal relations. This ignores the rigidly obligatory nature of village relations. Oscar Lewis (1965, p.127) has written: "... there may be more give and take about one's private, intimate life at a single 'sophisticated' cocktail party than would occur in years in a peasant village ... ."
Social Networks, and a Typological Continuum

Each person has his own unique collection of primary relations, though parts of this collection are shared with other people; moreover, particularly where the collection is dispersed and compartmentalized, some of the people in the collection may know each other but many may not. The concept of "social network" is peculiarly useful to describe such a collection of social ties - something less than an exclusive, mutually interacting group, but something more than a social category, such as "people with an income over $10,000". Frankenburg (1966, p.242) believes that "network" is the "first major advance in the language of sociology since role".

Words like "network" have long been used in a loose, pictorial way (as in "old-boy network"); Barnes (1954) introduced it as a precise, analytical concept. He was influenced by anthropologists' interest in the "kindred", a feature of bilateral descent systems, where descent ties are counted from ego rather than from an ancestor. He saw that "my relatives" have their counterpart in "the neighbors", "my friends", etc. In a crucial aside Barnes wrote (p.44):

One of the principal formal differences between simple, primitive, rural or small-scale societies as against modern, civilized,

---

3 The concept helps to bridge the chasm between macro-sociological structural-functionalism - attempting to explain action in terms of group membership or position in an institution - and micro-sociological interactionism (Katz, 1966, p.199).

4 He was also influenced by the sociometry of Moreno (1934), and helped by contemplating a fishing net in the Norwegian fishing village he was studying.
urban or mass societies is that in the former the mesh of the social network is small, in the latter it is large. By mesh I mean simply the distance round a hole in the network. In modern society, I think we may say that in general people do not have as many friends in common as they do in small-scale societies ... suppose that A interacts with B, and B interacts with C, then in a primitive society the chances are high that C interacts with A, in a modern society the chances are small ... In a modern society, each individual tends to have a different audience for each of the roles he plays.

This paragraph makes a fundamental point about the pattern of social relations in a modern city. In the first section of this chapter we noted how classical urban sociology suggested that relations become impersonal, superficial, and segmentalized in a city, and how this view has had to be modified: primary relations of sorts still exist, even though most of them are non-local, and even though it is indeed true that they are segmentalized - neighbors and kin, for instance being in distinct compartments. Barnes relates the segmentalization of role relationships - the fact that an individual A is brother to B, who is neighbor to someone else C - to the large mesh of the social network.

There is thus a constellation of related characteristics which typifies social relations in a modern urban society. Barnes' perception can be used to formulate a "typological continuum", describing the range of societies from small-scale ones to mass ones. A basic factor underlying the continuum is technological and economic development, but it is not to be thought of simply as describing the evolution of societies through time, or the spatial differences between rural and urban societies: it also suggests characteristics of national as opposed to local societies, and more importantly for the present study it elucidates variations within cities - for example between a localized, working-class area such as Young and Willmott's
East London, and the rest of the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple, Small-Scale Societies</th>
<th>Modern, Mass Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small mesh, or close-knit networks</td>
<td>Large mesh, or loose-knit networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple role relationships (several different roles between the same people)</td>
<td>Non-overlapping role relationships (different audience for each role)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blurred roles</td>
<td>Narrow defined roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations localized</td>
<td>Separation between residence, work, leisure: relations dispersed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little division of labour</td>
<td>Economic differentiation and specialization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This typological continuum owes something to Frankenburg's (1966) extension of Barnes' ideas, though not all of Frankenburg's 25 dichotomies are relevant here, and anyway they seem something of a hotchpotch. Frankenburg's idea of decreasing "redundancy" is useful in depicting the main changes from one sort of society to another: in modern, mass societies, there are fewer alternative channels between any two individuals (at least short channels - say two-step ones) and each link involves perhaps only one rather than several role relationships; on the other hand this reduction in redundancy is to some extent compensated for by the precision with which roles are defined.

The structural aspects of primary social networks in Canberra - the extent to which they are large mesh/loose-knit, and so on - are looked at in chapter 4. It can now be understood that these structural aspects should be closely tied up with the dispersion and differentiation of networks to be covered in chapter 3. A study which
throws more light on the connection between networks and roles is discussed in the next section.

The Influence of Networks: Bott's Hypothesis

It can readily be appreciated that variability in networks may have far-reaching implications - a network of primary relations can be thought of as a set of "significant others" from which one gets a sense of identity, and close-knit networks in particular can provide "consensual validation" for one's values and outlook, social support but also pressure to conform to a certain way of life.

One illustration of this, which also shows how the concept of network can enliven conventional concepts such as social class, comes from Epstein (1961), who studied the network of a single African. Epstein called the more intense and close-knit part of his network the effective network, and he found it was more likely to be between status equals. Epstein suggested (p.59):

that new norms and standards of behaviour will tend to arise more frequently within the effective network of those who rank high on the prestige continuum and that through the extended network they gradually filter down and percolate throughout society.

The most striking possibility with regard to the influence of networks was proposed by Bott (1957) who studied 20 families in London and found that their networks varied from close-knit to loose-knit. She was trying to explain the varying extent to which conjugal roles were segregated (husband and wife had separate jobs and recreation) or joint (husband and wife did things together or interchangeably). She suggested that "the degree of segregation in role-relationship of husband and wife varies directly with the connectedness of the family's
social network" (p.60). She explained this by saying that when a person's network is close-knit, its members tend to reach consensus on norms and exert pressure to conform to the norms, to keep in touch with one another and to help one another. If both husband and wife come to marriage with such close-knit networks and these remain unbroken, the marriage will be superimposed on the pre-existing relationships: each spouse will get emotional satisfaction and help from these external relationships and will demand less from each other. Without close-knit networks, on the other hand, husband and wife must rely more on each other, they take decisions themselves, they share activities, and they develop joint friends.

Ten years after Bott's work a spate of tests of her hypothesis began to be published. Nelson (1966), Turner (1967) and Blood (1969) found support for the hypothesis, but Udry and Hall (1965), Aldous and Straus (1966), Harrell-Bond (1969) and Toomey (1971) got negative results. Since different samples were involved, and different operational definitions - both of network connectedness or density and of conjugal role segregation - were used, it is difficult to form a conclusion. In the postscript to the second edition of her book Bott writes that Turner's study is the only one (she doesn't discuss Toomey's) about which she is really happy - particularly with regard to assessing network density. The main outcome of all this work, and also of commentaries by Fallding (1961) and Harris (1969), has been a realization that the hypothesis as originally formulated was far too simple.

Bott now believes (2nd Edn., 1971, p.287):

that it is not just network density per se that is crucial, but that where conjugal segregation is found to be marked inside the family, one will also find that the husband belongs
to a close-knit network of men outside the family and that the wife similarly belongs to a close-knit network of women outside the family.

This reformulation introduces two new characteristics of networks. One is the extent to which an individual's network is the same sex as he/she is; and the other is whether an individual's network is separate from or overlaps with his spouse's. Presumably networks which are "same sex" tend also to be "unshared"; and presumably, too, both these characteristics are associated with networks being dense (i.e. close-knit). If this were the case then they could be added on to our typology. However, the situation is likely to be considerably more complicated than this. Bott herself (p.290) raises the possibility of a close-knit network leading to a consensus on joint instead of segregated conjugal roles. A network composed largely of friends may have consequences different from a network composed mainly of kin.

As well as investigating the density of networks in Canberra, chapter 4 will reconnoitre this more unknown territory, and conduct a test of Bott's modified hypothesis. It is worth noting that insofar as loose-knit networks do indeed give rise to joint conjugal roles, these blurred roles are an important exception to the narrow, defined roles - e.g. neighbors versus relatives - expected to characterize modern societies. Frankenburg (1966, p.253) explains that marital roles can become blurred partly because of the development of specialized and defined occupational roles, which take over some of the housewife's traditional tasks. 5

5 Economic development thus has a direct influence on marital roles, apart from through the medium of networks.
Variables Affecting Networks

It is expected that the characteristics of primary social networks in a city like Canberra will tend on the whole to be clustered at the modern, mass end of our continuum, but that these characteristics will vary considerably between people within the city. Sometimes some of the network characteristics may vary fairly independently of the others, but often the characteristics for certain parts of the population will still be clustered, but not right at the modern end of the continuum. It is not expected that anything quite approaching an "urban village" will be found in Canberra, but that some people will have "less modern" or "less urban" networks; presumably such variations will be associated with the same basic factors which underlie our continuum. This section introduces a group of "independent" variables which will be used throughout chapters 3 and 4 to explicate any differences in networks.

One variable which on the basis of previous studies must be kept in mind is social class. For instance, Gans (1962) and Dobriner (1963) claim that most of the alleged peculiarities of the social life of American suburbs - such as W.H. Whyte's - which were originally put down to the mere fact of suburban residence, can be explained largely in terms of class.

Bott (1957; 2nd Edn., 1971) decided that "families with close-knit networks are likely to be working class" (p.112) - though simply because it is only in the working class that there are ever the homogeneous, locally employed, stable populations necessary for the growth of close-knit networks. Supporting this analysis, Young and Willmott's (1957) study discovered a traditional, localized community, with close-knit networks of kin, amongst working-class people in East
London - but when these people moved to a new housing estate, old extended ties were weakened and people centred themselves more on the home.

Patterns of networks related to class, it appears, may not be entirely explicable in terms of class by itself. Bott mentions homogeneity, and this will be discussed in the final section; in addition it is clear that mobility is heavily involved. Overall, it is middle-class people who tend to be most mobile (see, for example, Friedlander and Roshier, 1966, pp.50-51). Mobility alone, however, may not account for variations in networks - the people who moved out of East London were forcibly relocated, and many of them missed the old way of life and sought to re-establish it. Willmott's (1963) study of another, older rehousing area shows that with the second generation for most families the traditional community had re-emerged. Class values, no doubt in turn reinforced through networks, can carry some weight. Perhaps what is crucial is the willingness to be mobile - the section of the working class with this attitude, the people Mogey (1956) called "status-dissenters", may experience permanent loosening of their networks. Accordingly, several aspects of mobility/stability need to be looked at: the time a person has spent in Canberra, the time he has been living in his present house, whether he owns or rents his house (perhaps an indicator of class as much as of mobility), and whether he is likely to move in the near future.

Other variables besides class and mobility tend to be tangled up with one another. One of the reasons why mobility affects networks is that it tends to separate people from their kin. Not many people in Canberra have any relatives available outside their own households;
obviously, this must have an immense impact on their networks. People who were born overseas are obviously mobile in some sense and are much more likely to be living away from kin; the studies of Italian slums are sufficient to alert us to ethnicity as a sub-cultural factor. It was also felt important to distinguish between people who had moved into Canberra from the surrounding countryside (or villages in Europe), from those who moved from major cities - and talking to the people who had come from communities not so close to the modern end of our continuum confirmed that many had a vastly different experience of Canberra social life.

The significance of life-cycle stage to social networks has been highlighted by several studies - for example Bott's work suggested that with the arrival of children a wife might fall back on her old close-knit kin ties, and a husband might revert to his "male bonding" (conjugal role segregation would tend to increase somewhat in all families). As is explained below the present study has confined itself to studying married couples with children, but the age of the children can be expected to make a difference: younger children tying women particularly to the neighborhood. Of course this is associated with mothers of younger children being less likely to be employed - which effectively rules out workmates. Conversely, men who work a lot of overtime or on second jobs can presumably have more workmates, but fewer other primary ties. One other variable connected with children is whether they attended local government schools, or whether they went to the usually more distant private schools catering mainly for a particular religious denomination - or social class. Martin's (1970) middle class suburb had a network (the total one rather than personal ones) which ranged widely over one whole side of the city, but which
had clusters and was not exceptionally loose-knit: she drew attention to the fact that many of the children in this suburb attended a select group of private schools.

Two "technological" variables were used in the study: whether people had telephones, and whether women had the use of cars. Obviously these two variables are linked with social class, but they were included on the assumption that they would help to tease out those differences in network patterns due to class itself, and those due to its concomitants. Both these devices facilitate contact over a distance - day-to-day mobility, if you like - and many people besides Litwak have hinted at their importance: Bryson and Thompson (1972) say one action necessary to keep traditional, localized communities would be to "bar the motor car" (p.301). The only aspect of the physical environment which was included was whether a residential street was a through road or a cul-de-sac; it suffices to mention at this stage that Patterson and Helmer (1975) have recently found in Melbourne a strong negative correlation between the traffic along a road and the extent to which residents along the road know each other. A further variable which was expected to affect the neighborhood portion of networks was whether people had been amongst the first to live in their area. The National Capital Development Commission's 1971 Survey of the Residential Environment found that neighborly calling in was strongest in the outer, newest suburbs; this could easily have been because people there were "pioneers".

The only way properly to untangle the effects of all these variables is by some form of multivariate analysis. A high-powered multivariate analysis has been used once in studying networks - although just for neighborhood networks. Carey and Mapes (1970) found
only five personal characteristics that made for high intra-estate participation: young age, high geographical mobility expectation, not being a working wife, having a relative on the estate, being helpful to newcomers. Social class was not significant at all. Aspects of the physical environment, such as site-plan, size, price level of houses, were quite uninfluential too. The only other important factors were proximity and demographic similarity - there was more visiting where people of the same age, or having children of the same age, lived close by.

This leads us to a consideration, in the final section, of the effects of the social environment - so far the discussion has been mainly in terms of the characteristics of individuals rather than of the population which surrounds each individual.

The Effects of the Social Environment

The social environment which is to be considered here is the local area. It should be borne in mind, though, that an individual's local area may be only a portion of his social environment - for example, if he works and belongs to organizations somewhere else, and goes to another city each Christmas. Insofar as an individual's network is not particularly localized anyway, then the compatibility or otherwise of the population in his local area can only have a marginal influence on his overall network.

The importance of measures of the whole local area is shown by considering an immobile person - his immobility will not make him keen and able to make local friends if everyone else in the area is highly mobile. Rossi (1955) made three interesting findings related to this: the more mobile the neighborhood, the less likely were its residents to
form personal ties with their neighbors; the more mobile the area, the more unfriendly was the neighborhood perceived to be; and the more mobile the area, the greater was the difference perceived to be (with respect to social class) between the residents themselves and their neighbors.

Other characteristics of a local population which are liable to be important are its general stage in the life-cycle (which Carey and Mapes' results above illustrate) and its class composition. Gans (1961) contends that it is homogeneity with respect to both these characteristics that is crucial in having friendly neighborhoods. Proximity may initiate relations, but they will soon lapse if people are too dissimilar.

It is the influence of neighborhood homogeneity or heterogeneity with respect to class which is singled out for special attention in the present study - it forms the subject of chapter 5. Chapters 3 and 4 having described the chief characteristics of primary social networks in Canberra and explored some of the variations in these network characteristics, chapter 5 will focus on this one particular factor which might affect network characteristics. The question of mixing or segregating classes residentially is important because it has to be decided on by planners and administrators. As will be described in the next chapter, government authorities in Canberra have an unusually strong ability to determine the class composition of neighborhoods, and for the last two decades there has been a (largely unwritten) policy of cautious "social mix". It would be useful to have some evaluation of this policy.
Mixing is usually advocated on egalitarian grounds, e.g. by Stretton (1970). But several sociologists, like Gans (1961), have put the opposite point of view. Thus Gutman (1963) found that working-class wives had considerable difficulty in adjusting to a mixed class suburb. Willmott (1963) argued that one-class residential areas are preferable, though different classes should share services - obviously the level at which classes are mixed makes a difference. Michelson (1970) sums up his review thus (p.130):

Completely random placement of working class residents among middle class neighbors results in the isolation of the former rather than in any intended, positive result.

Results from the Canberra Mental Health Survey gave rise to the tentative suggestion that working-class people may be more prone to mental illness as a result of being mixed in with middle-class people in the way that they have been under the present policy in Canberra (Hennessy, lecture at A.N.U., 1972).

Clearly mixing or segregating classes can have ramifications well beyond any effects that may be produced on primary social networks. The present study does not cover all of these - for example, the practicalities and benefits of services being shared by different classes have not been investigated - and so in no way does it represent a complete evaluation of social mix. The study concentrates on the issues related to networks. Do working-class people mixed into middle-class suburbs thereby miss out on a traditional, close-knit community? Do they suffer attenuated neighborhood networks? Do they actually manage to have middle-class people in their neighborhood networks? Do they feel isolated? Do they remain divorced from their middle-class neighbors in terms of norms and outlooks (to some extent transmitted through networks)?
All these questions have previously been studied, and can usefully be interpreted, within the framework of the 'embourgeoisement' thesis. This thesis arose out of the apparent failure of Marx's prediction that the working-class would overthrow capitalism. By the 1950's it seemed that not only had the working class been integrated into capitalism, but that it was decomposing and becoming 'bourgeois'. There appeared to be several aspects to this: the working class was apparently becoming as affluent as the middle-class, and this seemed to have a direct effect on life-styles; technological and managerial developments looked as though they were obliterating class distinctions; and, finally, ecological changes - e.g. suburbanization, urban renewal - were evidently causing "the decline of the traditional type of working-class community, the decline of the 'urban village', founded upon the residential stability and social homogeneity of its inhabitants" (Goldthorpe et al., 1969, p.13), and at the same time the decline of working-class culture which had been transmitted through those old close-knit networks.

If the working class is undergoing 'embourgeoisement', then it should be manifest in Canberra. As we shall see in a moment, Canberra fulfills many of Goldthorpe and his colleagues' (1969) criteria for choosing the town of Luton as a critical case for testing the 'embourgeoisement' thesis: Canberra is new and suburban, with a relatively mobile and affluent population of which a large proportion is middle-class, and working-class people are not involved in outdated, dirty industries. The social environment of the city as a whole should make it difficult for working-class people to maintain their old networks and norms. But Goldthorpe et al.'s work - and other studies such as Berger's (1960) - would suggest that working class people will not necessarily copy middle-class patterns of sociability:
"... remarkably few 'social' relationships with white-collar workers may in fact be formed...", and rather than an outgoing, socializing, association-joining life-style they may tend "... to follow a family-centred and relatively privatized pattern of social life..." (p.159). It can therefore be expected on the basis of these studies that in any homogeneously working-class areas of Canberra there may be vestiges of traditional working-class networks and culture, but that, especially where they are mixed in with middle-class people, working-class people in Canberra will tend to have neither their traditional networks and outlooks, nor middle-class ones: i.e. social mix will not result in social integration. Whether that situation would bother the working-class people remains to be seen.
Class and Planning in Canberra

Canberra has been planned from the outset as Australia's national capital. The site for the city was chosen in 1911, but there were only about 3,000 people, mainly workmen, living there up until the new Parliament House was completed in 1927. Since the Second World War the population has grown at a rate of some 10% a year, largely from net migration. By mid-1973 the population was about 168,000.

The present population is not representative of that of Australia at large, as the following table shows:

Table 2.1. Socio-Economic Characteristics of Canberra and Australia
(the statistics apply to 1971 unless otherwise indicated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canberra</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Born</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 Years Old</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Years and Older</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never to Secondary School</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Tertiary Qualifications</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Workers in Workforce</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Private Dwellings with 7+ Rooms</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Private Dwellings Rented from Government</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual Residents in Same Residence 1966</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women 15+ Years Old in Workforce</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekly Earnings for Males, last quarter 1973</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These figures come from the 1971 Census, except the last one which is quoted in N.C.D.C., Canberra: Demographic and Social Background, 1975.
In sum, when compared with Australia's population, Canberra's population is more ethnic in composition, younger, more educated, more white collar, more affluent and more mobile.

Land in Canberra is all owned, developed and leased out by the Australian Government, and much of the housing has been provided by the Government too. In the early years the Government built larger houses for the better off as well as cottages for the poor, though recently it has catered predominantly for the poor (many transferred public servants have accepted government houses, but often they only use them as staging houses; a means test for government houses was introduced in 1973). The government has thus largely determined the distribution of land and houses between different classes, and the degree to which different classes are mixed or segregated.

A few older suburbs in Canberra bear witness to early heavily segregationist policies - Red Hill and Forrest continue to be the most exclusive areas of the city, the Causeway (supposed to be temporary) and Narrabundah are the city's slums. Stretton (1970, p.99) explains how the system operated so that "the workers paid more per foot for the worst land than the rich paid for the best". In the early 1950's an outcry over Narrabundah began a change in these policies.

The National Capital Development Commission (set up in 1958) has for the most part been against wholesale segregation and in favour of a degree of heterogeneity. N.C.D.C.'s social mix policies are largely brought about "by ensuring a range of block sizes within each neighborhood. They are also brought about by attempting to distribute government housing over as wide an area as is economically possible" (brief for review of social mix, 1973). The pattern of private housing
is affected not only by block size and positioning, but also by building covenants, land allocation techniques, reserve prices for leases, and land rent or rates, all of which are decided on by the Department of the Capital Territory. The best land is still usually cut up into the largest blocks, and the covenants for these blocks still tend to specify very high minimum values for the houses to be built there - though the overall range in blocks and houses is not as great as it was. The net result has been in most suburbs a gradient, from the larger, more expensive blocks and houses higher up the hills, to the government houses on the lower, flatter land and along the major roads. There is mixing within each suburb, but with patches of homogeneity at the level of the street.

Canberra is thus different from the older, bigger cities of Australia in that a person's suburb does not, except in the case of some of the earliest suburbs, immediately and reliably identify him as coming from a particular social class. On the other hand, just as the lack of such an obvious working class in Canberra means that "gradations within the middle class itself are more refined than usual" (Encel, 1970, p.289), so the lack of any marked differences between suburbs probably makes distinctions within suburbs seem the more precious. Real estate agents persuade people with their own labels, such as "Hackett Heights". A particularly special quality seems in many suburbs to be attached to the "top street". It was said at the time when Canberra was being divided into two electorates that the only way to create a non-Labor seat would be to draw a boundary following the altitude contours.

This mild degree of social mix is in line with the dominant ideology of the planners and administrators, as paraphrased by Stretton
(p.122): "A sort of contiguous mixing is probably best, where there are plenty of unlike neighbors but each is only a little richer or poorer, not a lot". There is almost nothing so far written in the files of the authorities on the rationale for their policy - indeed the policy is barely acknowledged to exist there. Official publications tend to be even more vague and non-directive about social objectives: "The philosophy in Canberra is that planning should be directed towards the convenience of the user; that provision should be made for different age, income, and social class groups ..." (N.C.D.C., 1970, p.xviii).

Stretton noted the lack of public commitment to social mix, and voiced his fears that what he called "the snobbish party" could quietly overturn the policy (pp.102, 121-123). There is no doubt the policy is far from settled; in fact it has already reverted somewhat. Recently four suburbs have been planned with no government houses at all - Weetangera, Hawker, Chapman, and the extremely prestigious O'Malley. The first houses in O'Malley ranged in size from 40 to 120 squares, and it was only when the new Labor Minister for Urban and Regional Development, Tom Uren, expressed his wish for "government houses to break up this silvertail suburb" that N.C.D.C. had to produce a revised plan, trebling the number of blocks (Canberra Times, 3/1/75).

Social mix has recently become an exceedingly popular topic of research with planning and housing authorities. It is not a question, however, that can easily be decided simply by research. The present study covers some of the most important aspects of social mix.

**Design of the Study**

A sample survey was carried out of married couples, with
children living at home, in three areas of Canberra. The survey was restricted to couples having children because they make up perhaps half the adult population of Canberra; it was felt that limited resources should not be dissipated in what would have been a rather inadequate attempt to find out also about smaller categories, such as old people.

Interviews were conducted with 87 couples, husbands and wives being interviewed separately, so there were altogether 174 people in the sample. Given that hour-long face-to-face interviews were carried out, the sample size was determined mainly by available interviewing resources. The quite small sample has meant that the extent of the analysis, and the generalizability of results, have been limited, but nevertheless the sample has been sufficient to provide some valuable preliminary insights and indications.

As well as describing networks generally, the study aimed at testing some effects of social mix, so the couples were selected from particular neighborhoods of Canberra. One was a fairly working-class area, another was a typically mixed area, and the third was a middle-class area.

Two aspects of this design need further comment and explanation. Several studies have rather glossed over sex differences in patterns of sociability - for example, Bryson and Thompson (1972) apparently interviewed whichever member of a couple happened to be available, and then said some families had local friends etc., without distinguishing between husbands and wives. In the present research it was felt important to interview husbands and wives in more or less equal numbers, and moreover to interview each person separately from his/her spouse.
A possible approach would have been to take separate sub-samples of married men and of married women. However, it would then have been rather uncommon for both a husband and his wife to be selected. This would have made it impossible to compare a husband's network with his wife's - and thus impossible, for instance, to establish the degree of overlap between the two networks. Consequently, the unit of sampling was made the couple - or, more precisely, the principal householder and his spouse in each dwelling - and separate interviews were conducted with each member of a sampled couple.

The unit of analysis was generally the individual person rather than the couple. Since the spouse of a selected person had more than equal probability of selection than the spouse of an unselected person - one selection actually collected two people - the 174 people interviewed do not strictly speaking form a random sample. For analysis purposes they were regularly treated as though they did, but as will be seen (chapter 3, footnote 8), due care was taken in doing this.

The other aspect of the design needing additional comment is the focus on three particular areas. This of course, is another reason why the 174 people do not precisely constitute a single random sample, say of all married people with children in Canberra. In Canberra as a whole, however, relatively working-class areas (and indeed working-class people) are quite rare, so it was necessary in order to test the effect of neighborhood social composition, to boost their representation in the sample. One possibility would have been to sample throughout Canberra (for instance using the electoral roll), and, once enough people from mixed and middle-class areas had been selected, not use any extra people from these areas who were selected but keep selecting until there were enough people from working-class areas. It was much simpler, though,
just to pick one working-class, one mixed and one middle-class area. (It was decided, also for simplicity's sake, not to boost the representation of the minority classes within these areas, but just to sample randomly within them).

The main defect of this design is that choosing three areas out of over 150 in Canberra may involve a large clustering effect, or intra-class correlation. In other words, the three areas are likely to differ on other variables as well as class composition, so that it is hard to tell how much any effects are associated with class composition as such.

This is an extremely common limitation of this sort of research. Martin's (1970) study showed that different types of networks might be associated with mixed as against homogeneous suburbs, but the differences could equally be explained by age of the suburbs, or amount of local employment. Etherington (1975) made some comparisons between a mixed and a council housing area in Birmingham, but the mixed area was Bourneville, which has been trumpeted for decades as a model of mixture, and this reputation for mixture probably had an effect on the residents' perceptions as strong as any mixture as such.

In the present study the three areas were deliberately chosen taking care that they were as similar as possible in respects other than class composition. This was not easy, particularly in the case of working-class areas, where there was little choice anyway. The only properly working-class areas in Canberra are the Causeway and Lower Narrabundah, but the Causeway is a tiny, overattended anomaly (e.g. much of the housing is used for welfare purposes), and Lower Narrabundah has an extremely high proportion of migrants. Because of the early-1950's
policy change referred to in the previous section, it proved to be impossible to find an area even faintly working-class which was not also rather on the old side. To sum up: Social mix is difficult to evaluate short of using an experiment.

Selecting Areas - A Social Map of Canberra

It was felt that Canberra suburbs were too large to be used as the areal units studied - neighborly relations are likely to develop at a more local level, and it is the social composition of these smaller areas that is important. The collector's districts for census purposes are nearer the right size - each C.D. has a population of about 800.¹

Several possible "ecological" indicators of neighborhood social composition were investigated - from proportion of government houses, and average rent of government houses, to average auction prices of block leases, mean unimproved values, and average prices of houses sold on the open market. These statistics could be obtained from various government agencies but were not usually available below the suburb level. Some of them were not comparable because of suburbs being in different stages of development or because of market fluctuations. All of them assumed, more or less dubiously, a close correlation between the indicator and actual social composition.²

¹ Even this could be too large: Gans (in Michelson, 1970, p.123) says about a dozen houses is right, and Carey and Mapes (1972) took no more than 50 houses. On the other hand Goldthorpe et al. (1969) are not unusual in defining neighbors as people living within ten minutes' walk, which would probably take in all those in a typical Canberra suburb, about 3,000 people.

² To illustrate these last problems it can be pointed out that in Carey and Mapes' (1970) work one estate which was defined as heterogeneous according to house price had the smallest range of occupations.
Since occupation is taken by sociologists to be at least the most important single component of "social class", it was desirable to have information directly on this. Unpublished data by C.D. from the 1971 Census was available on tape, and a program was written to derive various statistics from this source. The percentage of "manual" workers out of the total "non-manual" plus "manual" workers was found for each C.D., and was used as a rough index of the C.D.'s class composition.

Map 2.1 illustrates the results of this exercise. It shows that the more extreme C.D.s are in inner Canberra, where planning mostly took place before the mid-1950's. All the C.D.s in the new towns of Woden and Belconnen are in the middle range of the index. Segregation there is less severe, though there is still a pattern of the more elevated C.D.s in each suburb having a lower proportion of manual workers. Weetangera, the first of the new suburbs without any government houses, stands out as having a low proportion of manual workers. In general the picture is much as expected, and confirms the description of Canberra given earlier. This piece of work also fits in with the factorial ecology of Canberra done by Jones (1965) and Dent (1970) based on the

3 Occupations on the tape are given grouped into 73 "minor groups". Broom, Jones and Zubrzycki (1965) built up their categorization of occupations by social rank from the original 850 odd individual occupations used in the Census; but it was found that all the "minor groups" were wholly "non-manual" or "manual", according to Broom and Jones' (1969) definition, except for four "minor groups", which were ignored. Non-manual groups: 1-20, 22, 31, 33, 38, 39, 72. Manual groups: 23-30, 32, 34-36, 40-61, 63-71. It is assumed that "non-manual" or "white-collar" occupations characterize the "middle class", and "manual" or "blue-collar" occupations characterize the "working class".
MAP 2.1. Class Composition of Canberra by Collector's District
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1961 and 1966 censuses respectively.  

It is worth noting the contrast between Canberra and the associated township just across the A.C.T. border, Queanbeyan. Whereas most of Canberra's C.D.'s have less than 50% manual workers, all of Queanbeyan's C.D.'s have over 50% manual workers. Canberra people may think of Queanbeyan as rather low class, but in fact it is almost exactly the same as the Australian average of 53%. Rather than Queanbeyan being especially working-class, it is Canberra which is extremely middle-class (partly, it must be admitted in retrospect, because there is much more white-collar employment than manual employment available to women in Canberra - they were included in this analysis).

This poses a problem in deciding what is a "socially mixed" area - by Australian standards it would be an area with about 50% manual workers, but for Canberra such an area would be comparatively working-class. It was decided to use the Canberra frame of reference, partly because there were practically no truly working-class areas in Canberra (or Queanbeyan) which could have been studied. So of the three areas chosen for study, one was in the 50-60% manual workers category (it was used as the "working-class"area); one was in the 30-40% manual workers category (i.e. for Canberra it was "socially mixed", and very typical); and one was in the 10-20% manual workers category ("middle-class" by any standards!) In evaluating social mix the present piece of work is thus

---

4 The pattern of Jones' Component I, which he calls Ethnicity, though it is associated with occupational characteristics as well, and of Dent's Factor I (on his two factor solution), which he calls Social Rank, though no occupational characteristics were put in, bear a resemblance to the present results.
comparing how manual workers fare when they are at least not outnumbered, and when they are mixed in with twice as many white-collar workers; and how white-collar workers fare when they are in a slight minority, and when they are in a substantial, and finally in an overwhelming, majority.

One other problem in identifying socially mixed areas is that the single index, percentage manual workers, hides the range of social class in any area. There is no way of knowing from a figure such as "35% manual workers" whether there is a cluster of highly skilled manual workers and lowly white-collar people, or a mixture of a much wider range of people. To counteract this problem statistics on lack of secondary education and on achievement of tertiary education were used as an adjunct in selecting areas. Nevertheless, as a matter of fact, an area with 35% manual workers is more likely to contain mostly manual workers who are skilled than an area of 55% manual workers. Manual workers in the first area may be different from those in the second area because of their skill rather than because of their more numerous white-collar neighbors. This point is raised again in reporting the results.

Table 2.2. gives profiles of the three C.D.'s chosen - one (actually one and a half) in the suburb of Ainslie, one in Lyons, and one in Pearce. The areas differed in social composition, but were as similar as possible in other ways. The Ainslie area actually had a lot more old people than the other two areas. The houses in Ainslie were built over a much longer period - partly because house-building stopped for most of the 1940's as a result of the Second World War. The serious difference between Ainslie's age structure and those of the other two areas - which had homogeneously young populations - was not fully realized until after interviewing had begun. Anyway, as has been
Table 2.2. Characteristics of the Three Areas Studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb in which C.D. is Located</th>
<th>Totals for Canberra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ainslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>(843)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Private Dwellings</td>
<td>(241)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Manual Workers in Workforce</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 15+ with Tertiary Quals.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 15+ Never to Sec. School</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Occ. Pve. Dwellings Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Occ. Pve. Dwellings Rented from Gov't.</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>73 *</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Dwellings Built by Gov't.</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Occ. Pve. Dwellings with 7+ Rooms</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% 65+ Years Old</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Less than 15 Years Old</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Born Overseas</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Born in A.C.T.</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Usual Residents with Same Dwelling 1966</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of First Settlement</td>
<td>1940/59</td>
<td>1965/70</td>
<td>1966/70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The census figure is 55%, but in addition there were 29 houses leased from the Air Force.

Note:  

a. All these figures come from the 1971 Census, and apply to 1971, except the eighth and the last line of figures, which came from N.C.D.C. statistics.

b. Because the Ainslie C.D. was small and the eligibility rate low, three blocks (less than half) of an adjoining Ainslie C.D. were added on to the original one. Figures for the second C.D. are given in brackets.
explained, it was well nigh impossible to find a relatively working-class area which was not old.

All the dwellings in the three areas consisted of detached bungalows, except for a few dwellings in Ainslie which were semi-detached, some of them two-storied. This is very typical of Canberra, where medium density accommodation is uncommon. Houses in Ainslie, predominantly built by the government, were made of weatherboard, asbestos, monocrete, aluminium, or brick, with many of the roofs corrugated iron rather than tile. In Lyons they tended to be middle-of-the-road brick veneer; the practised eye could identify the rather smaller, plainer and more uniform government houses. In Pearce some of the houses, particularly on the large blocks in the top street, were triple-fronted, double-garaged, Greek-pillared (or Spanish-arched) mansions. The relationship between the proportion of government housing in an area and the area's social composition is very clear.

The Sample

The sampling procedure within each area was as follows. Maps showing each residential lot were used as the sampling frame, except that, after a field inspection, vacant lots were eliminated, and any additional dwellings on a lot (e.g. converted garages) were included. Dwellings were sorted into significant categories, such as government-built houses now privately owned (up-to-date information from the N.C.D.C. was used for this). Within each of these "strata" the dwellings were numbered and a systematic sample taken (every nth dwelling) using the same sampling fraction for all the strata in an area. (The reason for both the stratification and the systematic sampling was to make sure that
houses of different sorts/locations were accurately represented in the sample). The target for interviewed couples in each area was 30, but an overestimate of dwellings (say 75) was selected to allow for ineligibility and refusal. This stock of selected dwellings was used in random order (they were renumbered and a table of random numbers applied) until the target had been achieved.

Table 2.3. shows the outcome of approaches to dwellings in each of the three areas. It will be noticed that not only was the survey restricted to couples with children - in addition people had to be resident in their house for at least 3 months - so that it was meaningful for them to talk about their neighborhood - and people had to speak adequate English - basically a practical requirement. It is worth repeating that a number of minority groups simply could not be accommodated in the present study.

What really stands out from the table is the very large number of dwellings which had to be approached in Ainslie - primarily because so many of them were inhabited by widows, people with grown-up children, and so on. The target for interviewed couples was never reached in Ainslie. It is obviously of potential significance that the eligible households in Ainslie were outnumbered two-to-one by ineligible households, but again there was really no working-class area in Canberra which could have served better.

Supposing most of the refusals were by eligible couples - in the case of abrupt refusals it was hard to tell - then there were approximately 125 eligible couples in all the dwellings approached, of whom 87, or 70%, agreed to be interviewed. This represents a reasonably good response rate in view of the fact that each person had to be prepared to give up a whole hour, for what was a fairly personal interview.
and it only took one member of the couple to refuse for the couple to be counted as a refusal.

Table 2.3. Reasons for Non-Interviews in Dwellings Approached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling Frame: All Dwellings</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings Approached</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contact (usually a vacant house)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible: Resident less than 3 Months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible: Language Problems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible: No Couple with Children</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples Interviewed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4. presents some salient characteristics of the sample, by area. These characteristics compare satisfactorily with the corresponding characteristics for the whole of each area which were shown in Table 2.2. It is notable, though that for Pearce there were almost no manual workers in the sample whereas there were 19% manual workers in the area - it is hard to believe that mobility between the census in mid-1971 and the interviews in late 1973 could explain this, it may be that the Pearce manual workers tended to be say very young couples with no children. For Ainslie, on the other hand, there seem to be considerably more manual workers in the sample than in the area, 70%
compared with 55%; this is because the sample figure classifies couples by husband's occupation, whereas the area figure takes account of women's jobs, which in Canberra are usually white-collar.

Table 2.4. Characteristics of the Sample, by Suburb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Manual Couples *</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Reached Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Houses Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Houses Rented from the Gov't.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Houses Built by the Gov't.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Couples are classified on the basis of the husband's occupation. Appendix C shows the scheme used in the study for classifying occupations.

The figures on occupancy show how government houses tend to be bought fairly rapidly in a new suburb like Lyons, whereas this process is far slower in an old suburb like Ainslie. In each case there are more people born overseas in the sample than in the area, but this is simply because the sample excluded children. It is interesting to note that Lyons families tend to be slightly younger than Pearce ones, even though the suburb is a couple of years older - Lyons seems to be a place
for first home-owners. Also interesting is that in Ainslie there were many teenage families, but also quite a few pre-school families - Ainslie is a transition zone. On the whole there is reason to believe that the interviewed couples accurately reflect the target population of each area from which they were drawn.

Interviewing

Much reading, discussion, thinking, drafting and trying out on long-suffering friends went into the development of the interview schedule. A version of the schedule similar to the final one was used in a pilot survey of a range of dwellings in the suburb of O'Connor. Ten interviews were completed. As well as helping to refine the questions, this pilot survey was used to test and improve the letter left in people's mail-boxes before their door was knocked on, the instructions provided to interviewers, and the coding of pre-coded answers. The interview schedule as finalized appears in Appendix A.

The most innovatory and important part of the schedule was the networks chart, which was given to respondents to fill in first, and which took on average half an hour to complete. By means of this chart a wealth of information about people's networks was collected. A feature of this instrument was that it required a respondent to list all the people in his primary social network, without making any prior assumptions about how many people this would involve. Only after the respondent had listed people were the people identified as living within five minutes' walk, i.e. neighbors, etc.; the relative importance of neighbors, kin, etc., could thus be established. Moreover, because a series of questions were asked about all the names listed, it was
possible to see when a name represented both a neighbor and a relative, or both a person seen at least once a week and a female, or both a manual worker and an ordinary friend.

In making initial contact with respondents the survey was presented simplistically as "...a study of friendship patterns in Canberra ...". When it came to administering the networks chart respondents were told: "We are interested in some of the people you know well, personally - they can be friends, relatives, neighbors, workmates/colleagues, anyone". In order to jog respondents' memories, four different stimuli were used in getting them to list names of people in Canberra (and Queanbeyan). Respondents were asked to write down the names (just first names and initials of surnames) of any people "you spend a lot of spare time with", any other people "who come into your house, or whose house you go to, once a fortnight or more", any people who "if you needed to borrow something, or if you wanted any other kind of help, ... you could go see", and anyone else in Canberra "who is very important to you (in a personal way)". Respondents were then asked to write down any people outside Canberra "you have specially strong ties with, and who mean a lot to you (you would definitely visit them if you went to the city or area where they live)."

These stimuli were occasionally problematic for respondents: "What do you mean by 'a lot of' spare time? and borrow 'something'?'"

Perhaps they could have been made more specific, though rather than have utterly mechanical criteria it was thought better to stir respondents to some extent into using their own judgement of who was primary. There are a few other problems with the listing procedure which might be thought to make the results an artifact of the interviewing situation. The chart provided space for about 30 names, and although people were
assured that they could go on to another form there was obviously some tendency to think that the first form indicated the expected maximum. Now and again respondents would make comments such as "that will do you" - as if to say, they could put down more names, but the list they had made was near enough. A few people seemed to have been concerned that putting down more names would take up more of their time, especially in answering the subsequent questions. On the other hand, one or two people were apparently loathe to admit they didn't have many friends, and tried rather desperately to expand their list.

Nevertheless, there is reason to be quite confident in these lists as valid indications of people's actual social networks. Most respondents fairly readily understood what was required. Indeed many were very interested in the exercise, and having taken the time to survey their networks some expressed surprise at the outcome - for example, "I didn't realize how many of the people I see are friends made through my husband". One woman even used her address book to help her remember the people she wanted to list, and it was quite common for people to exclaim, half way through the subsequent questions, "Oh, I should have put him down ... can I add his name?" and they would be allowed to. Moreover, there was more often than not some supporting evidence for the picture given by the networks chart. Two respondents listed no-one in Canberra, but they did indeed seem to have most of their social contacts within the extended family, including a daughter and grandchild in the same house and other kin in a nearby country town; it turned out that these people stayed at home a lot because they were against parties and alcohol; the wife was the neighborhood representative of a cosmetic firm, and consequently knew most of the people in the area, but she explained that she could not be too close to her customers. One man
listed 44 people in his Canberra network, and he did so with some pride, but during what was admittedly a three-hour interview (the longest) several of these people actually called on him.

Once the respondent had made a list of names, the rest of the networks chart was fairly straightforward. Some of the subsequent items of information were not required for relatives, nor for people outside Canberra. Apart from obvious items like occupation and place of residence, there were on page 4 of the questionnaire three items intended to rate each relation on three dimensions - confiding, emotional attachment, and helping. These items were originally inspired by Sutcliffe and Crabbe's (1963) questions, extensively modified during pre-testing. The matrix on the last page of the chart was used to measure the density of respondents' networks.

The rest of the interview schedule consisted of more conventional questions; it was fairly structured, but there was also an opportunity for probing questions and general conversation. There were some questions following on from the networks chart about preferences for and feelings of social involvement; there were some questions specifically about the neighborhood and attitudes to social mix; and there were half a dozen questions on social perspectives and life-styles, mostly based on, sometimes copied from, Goldthorpe et al.'s (1969) study of 'embourgeoisement'. Finally Part III of the schedule, which only required answers from the husband or the wife, provided background data on the couple - it was the source of most of the "independent" variables.

The author conducted nearly half of the interviews himself, but there were seven other people, nearly all of them sociology students, involved in the interviewing. Each of these people was given some
training, and care was taken to distribute all the interviewers evenly between suburbs. There turned out to be no discernible differences between the interviews conducted by the author and those of the rest of the interviewers. Several people showed a great deal of initial resistance to being interviewed, but, once an interview had actually got underway, most people were extraordinarily co-operative.
Urban sociologists in the last couple of decades have found, as noted in the first chapter, that primary relations do survive in cities. However, people's networks of primary ties, rather than being localized, are liable to be distributed over a wide geographical area, with neighbors being relatively unimportant. Associated with this, relations with neighbors, kin, workmates and regular friends probably do not overlap; indeed the precise content of the relationship is likely to be distinct in each case. These are the aspects of primary social networks which are investigated in this chapter. It is thought that these aspects are linked with a tendency for networks to be loose-knit - covered in the following chapter. The present chapter begins by looking at the relative size of networks in and outside Canberra; it goes on to study the distribution of networks inside Canberra; it attempts to establish how important neighbors are; it looks at the extent to which neighbors and other primary ties overlap; and it finishes up by considering whether the various categories of primary ties have separate functions.

Networks In and Outside Canberra

Respondents listed on average the names of 12.1 people in Canberra, and 10.0 people outside Canberra. Their overall networks thus consisted of an average of 22.1 people. These numbers do not mean much in themselves - a different instrument for getting at people's
primary relations would have come up with fewer, or more names.  

Nevertheless, using the line drawn by the present instrument for a "primary relation", it is clear that the average Canberra person has a collection of primary relations which is quite considerable. Primary relations have survived in Canberra - which is fortunate if only because this thesis has them as its topic.

Yet the range in number of names listed was very great - for Canberra networks from 0 to 44, and for networks outside Canberra from 0 to 36. The fewest number of names listed altogether was 3, while the greatest number was 67. This indicates that for some people a city like Canberra can indeed be quite an impersonal place - not only in the sense that the vast majority of people caught sight of each day are strangers, but also in the sense that there is a very small absolute number of people outside the individual's own household with whom he has primary ties.

Some check that respondents did have reasonably close ties with the people they listed in their Canberra networks was provided by the three content/intensity items on page 4 of the networks chart. These items were combined into a rough scale, and those people who scored 3 or more were called "extra primary" - they still may not have completely  

---

1 Bott (1957) does not say how large were the networks which she classified as close-knit or loose-knit. Goldthorpe et al. (1969) worked with 2.8 "regular spare-time companions" per couple and 2.4 "couples entertained at home" per couple, without saying whether these categories overlapped. Martin (1970) found between 2.9 and 5.0 (depending on the suburb) parents and siblings in Adelaide and out "contacted" per couple; and 0.8 neighbors visited or visiting in the last week per wife; she does not say how many friends people had.
satisfied Cooley's ideal type (e.g. many of them were not even seen once a week), but they were more definitely primary than the other people listed. Respondents had an average of 7.1 "extra primary" contacts in Canberra; these contacts made up well over half on average of a respondent's Canberra network.

Notice the relatively large number of outside-Canberra names which were listed. On average, 45% of respondents' overall networks consisted of people living outside Canberra. This indicates that a very big proportion of Canberra people's primary contacts are dispersed enough to be beyond everyday reach. This conclusion has added force because the interviewer's stimulus for listing people outside Canberra was, if anything, more stringent than the stimuli for listing people inside Canberra (see previous chapter). Moreover, while respondents were not required to rate names outside Canberra on the three content/intensity items, judging from the few occasions where respondents accidentally did, nearly all the people listed outside Canberra would

---

2 On the other hand respondents had only, on average, 1.0 Canberra person, outside their household, who scored 6 on this scale, and could thus be called "super primary" — in these terms primary relations are rare.

3 There was a very strong correlation between the total number of Canberra people listed and the number who were classified as "extra primary" — Yule's Q for these two variables dichotomized was .87. This suggests that these two measures are tapping, at different points, the same general dimension. It also suggests that people who have more ties are not therefore likely to have less intense ties, and vice versa.

4 It is interesting to note that there was a moderate positive correlation between the number in Canberra and the number outside — Yule's Q for the dichotomized variables was .46. This may be further evidence against there being a finite amount of sociability — more people known inside Canberra implying fewer outside (see previous footnote). Or it may indicate that while outside Canberra ties become gradually "suspended" people very quickly build up their usual number of local ties, though at first they are quite superficial, many of them being neighbors (see below).
have been classified as "extra primary".\textsuperscript{5}

It is clear that many Canberra people remain very dependent for personal ties on people living elsewhere. Only 8 respondents in the sample of 174 had spent most of their childhood, up to the age of fifteen, in Canberra; all the others had moved to Canberra from somewhere else. Yet Canberra was not regarded by all these immigrants as a place of temporary exile. Nearly half thought of their present house as a permanent home, and only a few expressly said they intended to leave Canberra. It seems that most people have accepted geographical separation from a large slice of their social contacts, but have taken steps to maintain the contacts, by letter, telephone, weekend visits to nearby country towns and Sydney and Melbourne, and longer holidays further afield.

Perhaps to an even greater extent than might have been expected on the basis of Litwak and Szelenyi's (1969) analysis, kinship ties dominated outside-Canberra networks. 61\% of all contacts outside Canberra were with kin. This certainly backs up Litwak and Szelenyi's thesis that kin can continue to provide emotional and financial support even though separated by great distances, for instance by telephoning and sending cheques. We will come back to the functions of kin in the last section. For now it is sufficient to note that kinship ties seem to have a reliability and a resilience which other primary relations do not; they can survive over distance and time better than all but the

\textsuperscript{5} The large proportion of kin in outside-Canberra networks - see below - is also significant here, because, as the last section of the chapter shows, ties with kin inside Canberra tended to be closer than ties with other categories of contact.
close friendships. 6

For most respondents Canberra was not their "kin home" -
55% did not have a single relative, outside their own household, who
lived in Canberra. This turns out to be of immense importance in
understanding the pattern of networks in Canberra: if the networks were
to be divided into two "ideal types" then the availability of relatives
would be the main basis of typification. Clearly in most other cities
there would not be quite the same separation from kin, nor indeed from
long-standing friends. Thus networks would probably not be quite as
dispersed beyond city limits.

Granted that Canberra is exceptional because of its newness,
and Canberra people's networks may become more localized as time goes
by, nevertheless we have here an impressive example of just how
dispersed primary social networks can be in a modern, mass society.

Some of the factors underlying the size of people's networks
in and outside Canberra have already been alluded to, and we will now
look at these factors systematically. It was felt that often the
safest and most fruitful way of analyzing variations in network
measures, at least initially, was to dichotomize the measures, and
treat them as ordinal; then to cross-tabulate them and measure

6 On the other hand a non-kin tie between two people may be quite
important where both of them move to Canberra. On average, 23%
of non-kin networks in Canberra were met outside Canberra (compared
with 6% of non-kin networks outside Canberra which were met inside
Canberra). Many people are flocking to Canberra to live, and old
networks are to some extent re-established in the new surroundings.
correlations between them using the statistic Yule's $Q$. Table 3.1 shows the relationships between the size of networks in and outside Canberra, and the main independent variables. (Notice that some variables only expected to affect, say, neighborhood networks are included - the rather brief analysis here is partly intended to serve as a framework for later investigations into several network measures which are proportions of Canberra network size, such as the percentage who are neighbors).

A whole heap of zero-order correlations does not mean much by itself, but it does provide an overall idea of the correlations occurring (including negligible ones, which otherwise tend not to be reported). A little more sense was made of the heap by taking the two network measures in turn and searching for their correlates. Those independent variables which had "significant" zero-order correlations with the network measure were picked out, and the correlations tested by introducing likely third variables (i.e. variables that had both a significant correlation with the network measure and a correlation of at least say .20 with the other independent variable - see Appendix D for correlations among independent variables). For each collection of three variables, causal models which more or less fitted the data could usually be worked out, using expectations from other studies especially

---

This is the approach recommended by Davis (1971). These and other measures of network characteristics are arguably ratio scales. This is what justifies reporting means, such as the mean size of Canberra networks. It would have been possible to have looked at the difference between means under various conditions to have analyzed the different sources of variance in the measures, and to have gone on and used the associated correlation and regression techniques to explicate relationships between the variables. However, this sort of analysis depends on several assumptions, for example normality and constant variances.
Table 3.1. Correlations Between Networks In and Outside Canberra and Independent Variables
(Yule's $Q$ - except for 3-category variables where the same statistic is called gamma)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Number in Canberra (hi=&gt;10)</th>
<th>Number Outside Canberra (hi=&gt;8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (hi = wives)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.31 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb (lo = Ainslie, med = Lyons hi = Pearce)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Median Age (lo = 0-4, med = 5-11, hi = &gt; 11)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time (hi = &gt; 8 years)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.53 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Time (hi = &gt; 4 years)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneers in the Area (hi = yes)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of House (hi = yes)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility (hi = possible, likely or definite)</td>
<td>-.36 *</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community (hi = not in cities)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.29 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant (hi = yes)</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.35 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (hi = white-collar)</td>
<td>.41 *</td>
<td>.48 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Available (hi = yes, in Canberra)</td>
<td>.44 *</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's School (hi = not gov't. local ones) (N = 126)</td>
<td>.38 *</td>
<td>.37 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Works Extra (hi = yes) (N = 87)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Works (hi = yes) (N = 87)</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Use of Car (hi = yes) (N = 87)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Phone (hi = yes)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road (lo = cul-de-sac, med = small hi = through)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the .025 level. Significance tests are used here only as rough guides: it will be noticed that it takes quite a high Q to register significance.

(Table 3.1 Contd.)
Table 3.1 (Contd.)

Notes:  
a. N = 174 for each variable unless otherwise indicated. Appendix B gives questions based on, categories, marginal frequencies and extent of missing data for all variables.

b. Suburb is the only trichotomous variable which is nominal; it is treated here as ordinal because of the coincidental gradation in age and percentage manual workers, and because nearly always any relationship it has with another variable is linear: nominal correlation measures show it having lower correlations.
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While these measures generated from the data represent best estimates of actual correlations, the confidence intervals for the measures are very wide - for instance the Yule's Q for the relationship between sex and size of network outside Canberra, in the population from which the sample was drawn, has a 95% probability of falling between .04 and .59 (using the formula in Davis, 1971, p.57). It has less than .025 probability of being below the lower limit, and so the sample value .31 is statistically significant at this confidence level, but the point is that it takes a sample Q of about .30 to register such significance. The Q must be even higher when the measures are skewed, or when only part of the sample is used. This means that the reduction in cell sizes occurring when a third variable is controlled makes the results quite dubious, and that four-or-more-variable analysis is not really feasible. All this represents important limitations in the chosen approach to analysis, and also in the study as a whole. With such a small sample it is simply not possible to arrive at hard and fast conclusions about the whole population of couples with children in Canberra. This is particularly the case because the sample is not a perfectly random one anyway: as explained in Chapter 2, husbands and wives were not picked independently, and the three different suburbs do not accurately represent all of Canberra. Accordingly statistics such as Q are used to describe simple relationships found in the sample; significance tests (which strictly speaking should only be applied to say males in Ainslie, and so on) give some indication of how likely it is that these findings hold for couples with children in certain parts of Ainslie, Lyons and Pearce, and an even rougher suggestion as to whether they would hold for all couples with children in Canberra. The study is basically an exploratory one.
to decide on the direction of causal relations. Appendix E explains the procedure and gives the relevant statistics. The three-variable models so derived are stuck together in the diagram below mainly for summary illustrative purposes. It is fully realized that a five-variable model cannot be safely arrived at from smaller ones (because the smaller ones do not take account of higher-order effects), but at least we have an approximate model here which can be modified, if necessary tossed out completely, by applying more sophisticated multivariate techniques. (If all this appears rather crude, it is still rather less crude than many studies, which report zero-order correlations without any check for spuriousness at all).

Diagram 3.1. Possible Causal Links Explaining Variations in Size of Network in Canberra. (Dotted lines are negative links)

The story in words which goes with this model is as follows: The moderate positive correlation between social class and Canberra network size is evidently partly explained by the positive correlation of children's schools with both of them; similarly, the correlation between children's schools and Canberra network size is partly explained by class; these three variables reinforce the relationships
between each other. White-collar people tend to acquire larger Canberra networks, partly because of their greater involvement in a system of private schools having wide geographical catchments but catering for people who are much the same, e.g. Catholic. Indeed it may be that the greater involvement by white-collar people in private schools is a sign of greater involvement in voluntary organizations generally (as reported in chapter 5). White-collar people in Canberra are likely to be tied up with a large collection of "semi-workmates", especially in the Public Service (see below). Knowing people may be a factor in promotion, in which case size of Canberra network would have a reciprocal influence on class.

Evidence was found of a moderate negative correlation between expected geographical mobility and Canberra network size, and again this is probably a reciprocal relationship - if someone knows he may move from his present house, perhaps out of Canberra altogether, then, he is less likely to bother about getting to know people, and if he has not got to know many people in the area of Canberra generally then he has no incentive to stay. Those inclined to move from their present house tend to be white-collar people - perhaps because they can best afford to, and because it may be necessary to promotion. This means that class is suppressing the relationship between mobility and Canberra network size, and similarly mobility acts to reduce the relationship between class and Canberra network size - the relationships were found to be higher when the third variable was controlled.

People who have relatives in Canberra are likely to have larger networks of close ties - relatives are ready-made candidates for people's networks, and while sometimes one or two are very definitely excluded, most are included. If a person has relatives in Canberra then he is
less likely to move, so these two variables reinforce each other's relationship with Canberra network size.

A variable which, contrary to expectations, does not seem to be correlated with Canberra network size is time spent in Canberra. Given the wide confidence limits involved, there is no weighty evidence either for or against a correlation, but the most likely situation is that old timers in Canberra have scarcely any larger networks in Canberra than people who arrived only a few years back. It may be that people newly-arrived in Canberra quickly build up an average-sized network in Canberra, but that the ties are not very intense. There was a slightly higher correlation between the time spent in Canberra and size of "extra primary" Canberra network (.26), which provides a little support for this idea.

For size of people's networks outside Canberra, the roughly indicated model of determinants is shown in Diagram 3.2. Females tend to have larger networks outside Canberra, and this evidently cannot be explained by any of the other independent variables in the study - only childhood community was found to have considerable correlations with both sex and size of network outside Canberra, and this variable had a negligible effect on the original correlation. Since 61% of contacts

9 The Yule's Q was .16, with .025 confidence limits of -.13 and .46. In a small sample, with wide confidence limits, significant relationships are less likely; but failure to demonstrate relationships does not prove they do not exist.

10 Insofar as there is any relationship it appears to be because of the intervention of the two variables, availability of relatives and expected mobility: the zero-order Q was reduced even further when either of these were controlled, while the partial correlations for the paths through these third variables were much the same as the zero-orders.
in the average outside-Canberra network were found to be relatives, a factor which, it was thought, could be responsible for this relationship was the tendency for women, particularly in traditional working-class areas, to maintain closer ties with kin, as described for instance by Klein (1965) and supported by Martin (1967). However, there is apparently no association between being female, and proportion of outside Canberra network who are relatives (Yule's Q was an insignificant .15). It seems that these Canberra women tend to maintain ties with more people over a distance, non-kin as well as kin.

People whose childhood was mainly spent in the country rather than in cities tend to have smaller networks outside Canberra. It may be that city people are used to keeping up contacts over wide geographical areas; they have more experience of societies at the modern end of our typological continuum. The relationship cannot
be accounted for by the effects of any of the other variables; indeed, it was found to be greater when the migrant variable was controlled. Childhood community in turn is evidently to some extent suppressing the association which apparently exists between being born overseas and having a small outside-Canberra network. This association is counter-intuitive, but perhaps the drastic step of migration from say Europe tends to diminish or at least suspend old ties more than when the old ties are closer at hand.  

It has already been observed that length of time spent in Canberra has little if any effect on the size of people's Canberra networks; however, as is to be expected, it has a substantial negative influence on size of networks outside Canberra. In this particular study the relationship was reinforced by, and reinforces, the tendency for white-collar people to have larger outside-Canberra networks.  

It may be this tendency occurs because white-collar people have better access to technological devices such as the long-distance telephone and the aeroplane which Litwak notes are of assistance in sustaining ties over distance. Having children at schools other than local, government ones, is associated with larger networks outside Canberra, and again this is reinforced by and reinforces, the positive correlation between class and size of outside-Canberra networks.

---

11 The third association in this suppressing system, the tendency for migrants in Canberra to have spent most of their childhood in cities, cannot readily be understood in causal terms - it could be due to some selection mechanism, or fortuitous.

12 This connection was accentuated because in the present sample white-collar people tended to have not been so long in Canberra, a spurious association which only occurred because the more white-collar suburbs selected were also the more recently built.
To sum up this rather quick exploration into sources of variation in size of networks in and outside Canberra, it is worth noting that the crucial importance of mobility/stability factors comes across very clearly. Mobility expectations, and associated with it the availability of kin, are major correlates of size of Canberra network; time spent in Canberra, and also being a migrant, show up as determinants of size of network outside Canberra. It may be that mobility/stability is one of the basic factors underlying our continuum: that the economic differentiation and specialization which we have suggested lies at the root of modern societies is accompanied not only by a separation between residence, work and leisure, and increased day-to-day mobility, but also by a tendency to change residences - increased year-by-year mobility.

The Spread of Networks Around Canberra

The results reported so far indicate that Canberra people's overall networks are quite extensively dispersed, though this is likely to be diminished somewhat over time. When we look at networks within Canberra we find, on the contrary, that locality is quite surprisingly significant, though in this case, as we will see, the dispersion of networks is likely to increase over time.

30% of respondents' Canberra networks consisted of neighbors, and we shall come back to this in the next section. Leaving aside neighbors, it was expected that the remaining 70% of respondents' networks would be distributed randomly all over Canberra, and in particular would be divided between the four quarters of Canberra, Belconnen, North Canberra, South Canberra and Woden, roughly in accordance with their populations. Quite the contrary was found - there
was a marked concentration of a respondent's network in the respondent's own district. Including neighbors, an average of 63% of a respondent's network lived in the same district of Canberra. (This figure is only partly explained by the three areas studied being in the two largest districts: Woden and North Canberra).

A number of factors are doubtless at work in bringing this about. To some extent people in the same quarter of Canberra are simply slightly more distant neighbors. There are chance meetings between them at children's schools, churches, clubs and shopping centres whose catchments are somewhat larger than the neighborhood. At the same time driving, and more especially bussing, across sprawled Canberra could be just sufficiently discouraging to decrease the frequency of contact with people on the other side - it is certainly understandable that casual dropping in would be less common. There is probably in addition to these physical proximity factors some gravitation by would-be householders towards those areas where they already have most of their acquaintances, where they work or have interests, which are most familiar, which after a while they feel they belong to. At the local level it was interesting to find pockets, half a dozen houses in a cul-de-sac, occupied by Finns, say. Then there was the man living in Ainslie who said he had a preference for living in Watson (another suburb in North Canberra): he said a large proportion of the caravan club which he was involved in came from Watson and this quarter generally: "probably the same sort of people live on the Northside". There is thus likely to be an increasing similarity of people in any quarter of the city over time (not only because of selection mechanisms, but also perhaps because of a convergence in attitudes brought about through residents interacting).

We are here getting into considerations of people's social
environment which are going to be the subject of chapter 5. At any rate, having speculated a little about why people's Canberra networks might be so concentrated in their own quarter of the city, it is time to compare figures for each of the three suburbs. Table 3.2 gives the break-up of non-neighbor Canberra networks between quarters, by suburb, and Map 3.1 illustrates the geographical distribution of networks by presenting typical ones for each suburb.

Table 3.2. Mean Percentage of Non-Neighbor Canberra Networks in Each District, by Respondent's Suburb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent's Suburb</th>
<th>Belconnen</th>
<th>Nth Canberra (includes Ainslie)</th>
<th>Woden (includes Lyne and Pearce)</th>
<th>Queanbeyan (and Other)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ainslie (N = 52)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons (N = 60)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce (N = 60)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean percent of non-neighbors in same district.

It stands out that Lyons and Pearce people had a greater concentration of networks in their own district than did Ainslie people. These two suburbs are in the youngest district, Woden; which casts
doubt on the idea we have just been developing that it is older quarters which are more homogeneous, and that accordingly people there are likely to have networks more concentrated within them. After stopping to think about it, however, it is clear that Woden is the more homogeneous district, and this is largely because it is young. North Canberra, in which Ainslie is situated, has some of the poorest areas (and people) in Canberra as well as some of the richest (as Map 2.1 showed), and this is partly because it was largely planned in the time of the old segregationist policies, and partly no doubt because since then there has been, through gravitation, an accentuation of this segregation within the district. Moreover, North Canberra was settled over several decades, spanning the Second World War, so there is heterogeneity of life-cycle stage as well. Ainslie itself is typical of an inner city area, in undergoing a transition: the old population is quite literally dying out and being replaced by a far younger one. Woden, on the other hand, has been settled recently, and over a relatively short period of time: it is extraordinarily homogeneous in its age structure. We are left with the conviction that homogeneity does not always increase over time, 13 but that it is indeed very important in explaining the pattern of networks.

13 It may be that anyway there is a tendency which runs counter to the concentration of networks: having made friends in one area a person or his friends move, but the contact is maintained; thus locality becomes less important. This idea receives support in the section on neighbors.
MAP 3.1. Typical Geographical Distributions of Within-Canberra Networks for each Area Sampled. (Each line represents one primary contact, circles are neighbors).
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Some other features of the distribution of networks between districts shown in Table 3.2 can be interpreted in the light of the twin influences of proximity, and similarity. Lyons networks, for instance, were most underrepresented in the districts of North Canberra, which is distant and has an older population, and Queanbeyan, which is distant and has a more working-class population. Pearce respondents were somewhat older than those in Lyons (even though the suburb is newer - Pearce seems to be less a place for the young, first home-owner, than a higher rung for the more established family) and this might explain the underrepresentation of Pearce networks in the newest district, Belconnen. Ainslie networks were underrepresented only in Woden, which is distant, more white-collar and younger.

A finer analysis of the distribution of networks, breaking them down into suburbs rather than districts, confirms these sorts of interpretations (the figures are given in Appendix D; they helped in drawing Map 3.1). In some cases the numbers involved were too small to reveal anything with certainty, but a couple of salient points can be made. There were extremely few suburbs which harboured friends for only one of the three sampled areas exclusively. In Adelaide Martin (1970) found 102 exclusive suburbs and only 61 shared suburbs. The present results can partly be attributed to the much smaller size of Canberra (about one fifth that of Adelaide). Partly, however, they have arisen from the deliberate policy of social mix, which has ensured that most suburbs contain a variety of people rather than just one class. Nevertheless, there are still some interesting differences in emphasis between the networks of people in the three areas, which seem to be associated with what segregation does exist, particularly in inner Canberra but also in the new suburbs which have been built with no
government houses. Over half of Pearce respondents' contacts in
North Canberra lived in one suburb, Campbell. Similarly, over half
of these respondents' contacts in South Canberra were located in Red
Hill and Deakin. By contrast two fifths of Ainslie respondents'
contacts in South Canberra were concentrated in Narrabundah.
Particularly noticeable for Lyons respondents, there was a tendency
for non-neighbors to be living in close-by suburbs, such as Curtin.
In parallel fashion Ainslie networks in the closest district, Belconnen,
tended to be located in the closest suburbs, Aranda and Cook. It is
perhaps worth noting that the only suburb in Belconnen from which Ainslie
networks were practically excluded was Hawker, which is one of the new
suburbs with no government houses.

Neighbors

It has been mentioned that 30% of the average respondent's
network in Canberra consisted of neighbors. This compares with relatives
making up 12% of the average Canberra network, workmates 13%, and other
friends 49%.14

The figure for neighbors was certainly higher than expected -
it was not believed that locality would be significant within a modern
city like Canberra. (Perhaps such a figure should have been expected,
because the one or two studies in any way comparable did have similar
results.15)

14 But for rounding, these figures would add up to 102.5% - the
categories are not quite exclusive as is discussed in the next
section.

15 Thus Goldthorpe et al. (1969) found that between 27% and 47%,
depending on kin availability, of their manual couples' regular
spare-time companions were neighbors, though for white-collar couples
it was apparently less.
As we go along we shall see that neighbors in Canberra were actually not quite as important as appears at first sight. Thus they constituted a considerably lower proportion of people with whom there were extremely close ties, while making up 42% on average of network members contacted once a week or more; which suggests that they appeared in respondents' Canberra networks more because of frequency of contact than because of closeness of contact. Nevertheless, the fact that they appeared in primary social networks in such high proportion does seem to overturn the idea that all neighboring is just a polite and perfunctory activity in a city like Canberra.

It has to be immediately underlined that the sample was restricted to married couples with children at home, i.e. that portion of the population most likely to be involved in neighborhood relations. Still, these findings do relate to the typical person in Canberra. 16

Because it was originally thought that neighbors would not feature much in a person's primary social network, but that there might well be quite numerous links with neighbors of a less intense kind, several items in the second half of the interview sought to establish how many neighborly (not necessarily primary) links each respondent had. Again the numbers reported were far more than expected. On average respondents claimed to know the names of 21 adult neighbors. Fifteen out of the 174 respondents said they knew 50 or more neighbors by name. Any scepticism expressed by the interviewer on this score was

---

16 67% of people over 15 in Canberra are married (and not widowed, divorced or separated); and 16% of occupied private dwellings contain three or more residents, the vast majority of whom would be married couples with children (since 90% of occupied private dwellings contain single family units only).
met by careful enumeration of names. Usually there was some special
contact involved. Thus the cosmetics representative mentioned above,
who denied there was anyone who qualified for her Canberra network,
said she knew the names of 99 women and 14 men living within five
minutes' walk (this was the highest number). A policeman, a solicitor,
a Catholic housewife, a local butcher and a local garage proprietor
were others who knew more than 50 neighbors - the importance of working
locally came out very strongly. Obviously most respondents were not so
extreme as these, but even the median number of 15 neighbors' names
known is quite impressive.

Rather fewer neighbors were chatted with once a fortnight
or more (the mean number was 9), and when it came to closer relationships
such as visiting and helping the mean numbers involved were down to
about 4. These more closely-linked neighbors were clearly the same
ones who appeared in people's networks. There is thus some support for
the initial idea of quite numerous but rather more superficial and
perfunctory neighborly relations, over and above any primary ties with
neighbors, though the extent of both sorts of links was somewhat
surprising.

Is there then, perhaps, something like an "urban village" in
Canberra? What are the factors underlying this concentration of social
relations within the neighborhood? Table 3.3 presents the correlations
between the proportion of networks in Canberra consisting of neighbors,
and the main independent variables. (Correlations for proportions
consisting of relatives, workmates and other friends are in Appendix D).
Table 3.3. Correlations Between Percentage of Canberra Network Who are Neighbors and Independent Variables (Yule's Q or gamma)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Percent Neighbors (hi = &gt; 27%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (hi = wives)</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb (lo = Ainslie, med = Lyons, hi = Pearce)</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Median Age</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Time</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneers in the Area</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of House</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility</td>
<td>-.36 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community (hi = not in cities)</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Available</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Schools</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hi = not gov't. local ones) (N = 126)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Works Extra (N = 87)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Works (N = 87)</td>
<td>-.58 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Use of Car (N = 87)</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Phone</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road (lo = cul-de-sac, med = small, hi = through)</td>
<td>.40 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* statistically significant at the .025 level (by extrapolation in the case of road, since the test being used does not apply for 3-category variables).

Notes: a. N = 172 for the percent neighbors variable since one couple had no Canberra network. For other variables N = 174 unless otherwise indicated.

b. Suburb is treated as ordinal, as before.
Three of the independent variables were found to be significantly correlated with percent neighbors in Canberra networks: expected mobility, whether wife works, and size of residential street. Firstly, it appears that people who expect to move from their present house have a lower proportion of neighbors in their networks. No third variable was able to explain this relationship - the other variables which had significant correlations with proportion neighbors were unrelated to expected mobility. The relationship is probably reciprocal in that mobile people would not worry about getting to know neighbors - unless, as in Whyte's Park Forest, everyone is mobile - and isolation from neighbors makes people more likely to move. So here again we have evidence of the crucial importance of mobility/stability in determining the extent to which networks are geographically dispersed. This reinforces the notion that mobility/stability is a factor which is basic to the continuum between traditional, small-scale societies and modern, mass ones.

Next, it is evident that women who work have a substantially lower proportion of neighbors in their networks (and, naturally, a higher proportion of workmates). This highlights the situational aspect of both neighboring and workmating - a person gets to know those people that he happens to mix with in the course of his daily activities. It also suggests that women who work have very little opportunity to see their neighbors; though insofar as for them there is the possibility of becoming close to either neighbors or workmates it suggests that they opt for workmates: interaction between workmates has a more functional basis to it than interaction between present day neighbors. This relationship between working and how important neighbors are again fits in very nicely with our guiding theoretical interpretation of the
nature of differences in primary social networks. The modern, mass
end of the typological continuum arises from increasing economic
differentiation and specialization, which means that men travel away
from home to specialized jobs; some of women's traditional tasks at
home are performed by specialized bureaucracies, and they are
couraged to "work" too; the contrast between working and non-
working women in the present study is striking evidence of the effect
this factor has on networks.

Reinforcing and reinforced by this relationship, there was
found to be a tendency for people living in larger, through roads to
have a higher proportion of neighbors in their networks. 17 There have
been conflicting findings concerning the influence of dwelling
arrangement on neighboring: Festinger, Schacter and Back (1950) found
that people whose doors fronted on to residential courts tended to
have more contacts within these courts; Kuper (1953) similarly found
that cul-de-sacs made for more intensive interaction but also that
friction could be generated as much as friendliness; Whyte (1956) found
that people living in the middle of blocks were more involved with
neighbors than people on corners. Carey and Mapes (1972) found no effect

The substantial negative correlation occurring between wife working
and road is presumably fortuitous. The statistics showing this
reinforcing system are as follows (Appendix E indicates how models
are derived from such statistics):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Pair</th>
<th>Zero-Order Q</th>
<th>Partial^0 Controlling 3rd Variable</th>
<th>Differential minus Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife Works/Percent Neighbors</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road/Percent Neighbors</td>
<td>.37 +</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Works/Road</td>
<td>-.52 +</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.06 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ For the 86 cases of women with data on percent neighbors
* Does not quite fit the suggested model
o Calculated along lines proposed by Davis (1967) for three or
  more category variables
at all on overall social activity from estate layout as such, though estates which had demographically similar individuals situated close to each other showed more social activity. Physical and even functional distance do not seem to have a straightforward determining influence on social interaction independently of social and personal compatibility. Bearing in mind Patterson and Helmer's (1975) findings on the influence of traffic, in the present study it was expected that, other things being equal, cul-de-sacs would make neighbors more important elements in people's social networks. The fact that the opposite has been found in this very small study perhaps only points to the difficulty of defining exactly what it is about physical layout that does have an influence. For example, the Air Force houses in Ainslie are on a through road but half of them consist of battle-axe blocks, which detail was ignored. 18

It is the lack of significant correlations between several of the independent variables and percent of network who are neighbors which is most unexpected and interesting. For example, it is generally thought that women, and people who have young children, are more likely to have close contact with their neighbors - because they are more likely to stay around the house and need neighbors. However, for these two variables insignificant correlations with percent neighbors

18 Nearly three quarters of all the cul-de-sacs were in Lyons - suburb in this case had a non-linear relationship with road. This does not seem to help in explaining the correlation that was found between road and percent neighbors, but it does reinforce the conclusion that in this sample the effect of road itself was probably not adequately isolated.
were found, and controlling likely suppressor variables\textsuperscript{19} made no substantial difference. Note that nearly half of the women in the sample were working at least part-time. Working women may have less opportunity to see neighbors than working men because when they are at home they have their energies cut out inside the house, particularly in the kitchen, whereas men may spend more time in the garden.

Two other variables which did not correlate with proportion of neighbors in networks are worth pointing out: wife's use of a car, and having a telephone. As noted in the first chapter, it was thought that the lack of these devices would make people more involved with and dependent on neighbors. Certainly their lack is commonly cited as factors in suburban housewives' isolation. This latter notion was supported: wives who had cars had a higher number of "extra primary" contacts for example (\(Q = .46\)), and there was a not quite significant tendency the same way for wives who had telephones (\(Q = .42\); for wives and husbands \(Q = .32\)). However, there was no evidence in the present study that access to these means of transport/communication brings about a lesser involvement with neighbors.\textsuperscript{20}

The effects of the time a person has lived in his present house turned out to be extremely interesting. It was thought that this was essentially an aspect of mobility/stability; it was expected that people who had lived longer in a particular house would be more closely

\textsuperscript{19} Ones having correlations with the original pair which were opposite sign if the correlation was expected to be more positive, and which were the same sign if it was expected to be more negative — see Davis, 1971, p.96.

\textsuperscript{20} Having a telephone apparently is associated, however, with having fewer relatives and with having more ordinary friends in one's Canberra network (see Appendix D) — and this may indicate a higher degree of selectivity in social contacts.
involved with their neighbors. However, this proved not to be the case at all. Indeed it seems that people who have lived longer in Canberra, though not necessarily in the same house, tend if anything to be less closely tied to neighbors, or at least to their current set of neighbors. On the other hand people who are amongst the first to move into a neighborhood, i.e. the pioneers of a neighborhood, do tend to have a higher proportion of neighbors in their networks. The zero-order correlation between these two variables was .25 and not quite significant, but when house time was controlled it increased to .42 which suggests very strongly it is time of arrival relative to other residents, rather than time stayed, which is crucial.

Bryson and Thompson (1972) found that interaction with neighbors increased for the first two years a person lived in an Australian new town, then to some extent flattened out. This perhaps is the view suggested by commonsense. On the other hand Keller (1968) reckons that neighboring actually decreases after an initial flurry: "The first phase is characterized by eager interaction and mutual helpfulness, whereas the second is characterized by restricted interaction, selectivity, and withdrawal" (p.68); in the second phase middle-class residents turn outward to the larger community while the working-class residents withdraw to their own home and families. As Gans (1961) suggests, proximity is important for initiating contacts but not for their perpetuation. The present study supports Keller's conclusion rather than Bryson and Thompson's, and it elaborates it by highlighting the effects of a whole lot of people moving into a new suburb simultaneously. Length of time spent in a house is not really a factor, except that when most of the residents have been in their houses only a short time then they probably arrived there at the same
time. The very first residents have common aspirations in going to live in the new area, common needs for social support away from their old networks, common problems in establishing new homes and gardens and in reaching shops and other facilities.

In the first chapter mention was made of the National Capital Development Commission's 1971 Survey of the Residential Environment, which found that neighborly calling in was strongest in the outer, newest suburbs of Canberra; it is now clear that indeed this is because of the pioneering situation in these new suburbs. This fits in with our theoretical framework to the extent that it sees social relations within neighborhoods declining in modern societies because neighbors have lost their old functions, many having been taken over by specialized, large, non-local organizations. In a completely new housing area neighbors perform a few of the functions which they have in traditional societies. This is especially true where the organizations, the planners, have not completed their tasks efficiently: 21 "Commission omissions proved a wonderful social adhesive among the newcomers to the (Woden) Valley" (Lorna Ruddock, Canberra papers).

Nevertheless, insofar as our theoretical framework suggests that older, stable areas are likely to have the most localized networks, the situation being described here is slightly disconcerting. If anything, a tendency was found for neighbors to be less important for Ainslie people than for Lyons and Pearce people (Yule's Q = .19, see Table 3.3). The idea that Ainslie, which is not only older but more working-class, would have the vestiges of a traditional, localized

21 Which is why Durant (1939), who documents this sort of communality in a brand new housing estate, is probably wrong when she suggests that it would have continued if the residents' association had got a hall.
community, something approaching an "urban village", comes down with a crash.\footnote{22} It is now apparent that in the newest suburbs of Canberra, there is an important but temporary role for neighbors. Note that the life-cycle stage homogeneity of the newest suburbs, which was referred to above in explaining higher concentration there of non-neighbor networks in the same quarter, may also help to explain the higher concentration there of networks within the neighborhood. However, it now seems probable that this localization of networks both within Canberra and certainly within the neighborhood will decrease over time, to some extent irrespective of changing patterns of environmental social composition. This will happen not only as the physical difficulties of the pioneering era are overcome, but also as people grow less dependent on the local area as a source of new social ties.

To finish off this discussion on neighbors, it is interesting to report the responses to two attitudinal questions. Respondents were asked, "which one of these would you most prefer: to see more of your relatives, to see more of your neighbors, to have more or see more of friends, or none of the above – see enough people already." The results are in Table 3.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Category of Extra Contact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;To see more of your relatives&quot;</td>
<td>43% (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;To see more of your neighbors&quot;</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;To have more or see more of friends&quot;</td>
<td>29% (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;None of the above - see enough people already&quot;</td>
<td>26% (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Missing</td>
<td>100% (167)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{22} This idea was not peculiar to the present piece of research: one scholar of aboriginal communities actually moved into Ainslie because he felt it was about the only place in Canberra where there would be a localized community.
There is a very striking preference for relatives or other friends rather than for neighbors as a source of extra contact. Even when people were asked a little later the straight question, "Would you like to see more of your neighbors?", 67% said no, another 10% were ambivalent, and only 22% said yes. For most of those who said yes, lack of time presented the main difficulty - in other words, neighbors simply were not a priority when compared with other demands on time, from children, work, and other interests. A few people indicated it might have been different if they had a better lot of neighbors - but one of the characteristics of neighbors is that people do not have much choice about them. Perhaps this suggests that neighborhood planning is unlikely to be very significant for social interaction unless accompanied by measures to increase people's choice of neighbors. Even then our conclusion that much neighboring in Canberra is a somewhat temporary response to pioneering conditions suggests that there is little point in paying too much attention to neighboring. For Canberra it might be more worthwhile to facilitate contact with relatives. Neighbors are quite important to new arrivals or to full-time housewives, but it seems largely because for these groups there is no alternative.

Functions of Different Primary Ties

The fairly minor importance of neighbors in a modern city can be understood as resulting from their not being, also, relatives or workmates. (Their slightly greater importance for full-time housewives can perhaps be understood as neighbors being about the nearest approach to workmates housewives have). Often this segmentalization of primary social networks is simply taken for granted; in the case of the present study it can be readily demonstrated.
The mean percentages of Canberra networks who were neighbors (30%), relatives (12%), workmates (13%) and other friends (49%), when not rounded add up to 102.5%. The other friends category is a residual one; the extra 2.5% is the mean proportion of each Canberra network which is in two or more of the other categories. The 174 respondents listed altogether 2107 within-Canberra names, and of these 52 were names of people who were both relatives and neighbors (13), relatives and workmates (2), or neighbors and workmates (37) - not a single case was found of someone being both a relative, a neighbor and a workmate. 52 as a percentage of 2107 is again 2.5%. In other words, cases of overlap were quite rare. 95% of respondents had no relatives who were neighbors, 99% had no relatives who were workmates, 87% had no neighbors who were workmates. For the great majority of respondents, then, work, neighborhood, and family involved completely different personnel.

About one-third of the respondents who had neighbors-cum-workmates consisted of people living in some Air Force houses in Ainslie, or in some Army houses in Lyons. In these cases there is a very obvious selection mechanism which explains the overlap. Particularly with regard to the Air Force people, there was a whole life-style which went with the work - postings to different cities at perhaps two-year intervals, children attending a pre-school at Fairbairn air base, social life revolving around the canteen - and this very strongly reinforced the tendency for work to determine social contacts. The civilians who lived just across the road were felt by

---

23 So it is impossible by this method to tell to what extent "friends" overlapped with the other categories. See footnote 25 for some ideas.
the Air Force people to be part of another, alien world. This extremely close set of work/neighborhood ties was exceptional; in most other cases the overlap between workmates and neighbors was apparently coincidental, though having happened it had produced close personal ties; occasionally, being neighbors gave rise to finding each other jobs, or setting up a business partnership etc.; and seemingly even less commonly people who were workmates initially sought and managed to live close to each other. In the older suburb of Ainslie there were infrequent hints of a much more thorough interlocking of residence, work, and family - people who had gone to school in the area, living in their old family house or nearby, naturally were friendly with anyone else from the same school and area with whom they happened to find themselves working. But this sort of traditional, localized community, certainly did not prevail in Ainslie.

The general absence of overlapping ties helps to explain, not only the dispersion of networks, but also the quite low density of networks to be described in the next chapter. People see their workmates or their relatives mainly in a specific context, not over a wide range of situations, not continuously. The result is that a fully primary relation, at least as Cooley defined it, is very rare. The question that now concerns us is whether the separation of neighbors, kin and friends into different categories is accompanied by the development of a different type of relationship in each case. The waning importance of neighbors has already been described partly in terms of reduced functions; we will now consider to what extent the various categories of primary ties perform distinct functions.
There is no established way of measuring this sort of differentiation in a primary social network. Litwak and Szelenyi (1969) used expected performance of three tasks, ranging from help in a short-term emergency to help in a three-month illness, thus restricting their attention to the instrumental aspect of relations. The present study's approach was to pick out from a respondent's network in Canberra, those people with whom the respondent had a strong relation on each of four dimensions - i.e. those he contacted at least once a week, those he told most of his personal problems, those he would be very upset to lose contact with, and those he could always ask for any sort of help - and then to note the varying proportions of neighbors, kin etc. amongst each of these groups. Diagram 3.3. shows the breakdown into primary tie category for each of the four type-of-relationship indicators.

Some distinctions between relatives, neighbors and so on, stand out from these results. Relatives did not make up a very large proportion of those spoken to once a week or more (12% - they occurred in Canberra networks in the same proportion) but they made up a much larger proportion of those confided in, emotionally important and relied on for help. Relatives may not be seen all that frequently, but this belies their real significance to people.

It was almost the reverse with neighbors - they were spoken to frequently, to a greater extent even than they occurred in Canberra networks, but their importance apparently subsides when it comes to closer relationships. In particular, neighbors do not appear to be mourned much if they move or for some other reason contact is broken. They are not quite as insignificant for help - presumably people who are neighbors will help each other in little ways (lending saucepans or
tools) and this can lead to a feeling of being able to rely on each other in some larger crises. Nor are neighbors ignored as far as being confidants goes; presumably this is similarly an extension of their function as people readily available to chat to.

Diagram 3.3. Tendency of Contacts of a Certain Content to be Relatives, Neighbors, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean percent of these contacts who are Spoken to once a week or more</th>
<th>Told most personal problems</th>
<th>Very upset to lose</th>
<th>Could always go to for any help</th>
<th>Total in Canberra Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rel. 12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor 16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work mates 12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Friends 34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of resps with non-zero contacts 162 77 131 154 172

Mean total no. of contacts all resps. 6.9 1.3 4.3 5.3 12.1

Note: In the final column the total is 104% rather than 100%, partly because of rounding, and partly because on average 2.5% of a respondent's Canberra network consisted of people in two overlapping categories. In this last column the "mean % friends" figure is accurate. However, in the first four columns the "mean % other friends" figure is approximate, having for convenience been calculated as a remainder when the other categories are subtracted from 100, and is probably an underestimate by at least 2%.

The range of help exchanged by neighbors was enormous: it included panel beating, sharing a telephone, feeding pets during holidays, perming hair, cutting wood with a chain saw, plastering, supplying with paint, advice on filling in forms and on legal matters, passing down children's clothes, emotional support, bricklaying, teaching handicrafts, fixing stereos, and medical advice. Notice how people use their training to provide help. The same sort of thing happened with help from other primary contacts.
Interestingly, workmates were talked to about personal problems out of all proportion to their occurrence in networks. As with neighbors or at least housewife neighbors they are readily available — perhaps also some people would rather confide in a neighbor or a workmate because in a sense they are strangers;25 people land amongst them without knowing them beforehand and often the contact is defined as only temporary, moreover workmates particularly are in a different world from the domestic one, so people can pour out all their domestic worries to an outside ear. It should be noted that the figures do not indicate the complete extent to which workmates were spoken to, because the question required respondents to indicate whether they "see this person (outside work) or speak on the phone once a week or more". The assumption was that seeing people at work would probably only be within limited roles rather than in a primary relation and therefore was not relevant. In retrospect this was probably mistaken because it drew too hard and simple a line between secondary and primary relations.26 The point is that workmates may really make up a somewhat larger proportion of those spoken to once a week or more, and their profile would therefore be a little more in line with that of neighbors. There is no particular tendency for emotional ties or helping ties to involve workmates.


26 Particularly for white-collar people the distinction between workmates and other friends was very blurred. Very friendly relations existed with clients, business associates, etc. This is related to manual people's more instrumental attitude to work, covered in chapter 5. See Goldthorpe et al. (1969), p.66.
Ordinary friends evidently maintain the same paramount importance amongst those emotionally close and those looked to for help as they have in overall Canberra networks. This is true even though they are not seen/spoken to on the phone very often. Presumably many of these friends are not bumped into in the weekly course of activities in the same way that for instance workmates or neighbors are. Some of them would be seen regularly in associational activities, but meeting many of them would require a deliberate effort. Relations with these friends would be the most selective of all primary relations. Lack of frequent contact would, it seems, be made up for by intense contact when it did occur. Oddly enough, however, this intense contact does not seem to extend very much to talking about personal worries. It is surmised that there is something precious about ties with ordinary friends, which may involve idealizing the ties beyond what actually occurs - so that people feel close to their friends and would like to think they could go to them for help but do not actually talk about their inmost problems with them very much. Talking about problems may threaten the sweetness of the relationship. Ties between ordinary friends are less institutionalized, and it may take longer to get to the stage where confidences are swapped.

To see how far these distinctions between each sort of primary relation are inherent in them, or simply situational, two or three obvious independent variables can be introduced; this will also throw more light on how these independent variables operate. Diagram 3.4 shows the effect of two independent variables, sex and whether the wife has a job.
Diagram 3.4. The Effect of Sex and Wife Working on the Tendence of Contacts of a Certain Content to be Relatives, Neighbors, etc.

Mean percent of these contacts who are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spoken to once a week or more</th>
<th>Told most personal problems</th>
<th>Very upset to lose</th>
<th>Could always go for help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Friends</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No. of respondents with non-zero contacts | 81 | 43 | 38 |
| Mean total number of contacts - all respondents | 73 | 6.1 | 6.7 |

Note: It is possible to test the significance of the difference between pairs of means using an F ratio. E.g. for the difference between working and non-working wives with regard to mean percent relatives of those spoken to once a week or more, i.e. 11% versus 17%, the F ratio is 1.42. With 1 and 79 degrees of freedom it would require an F ratio of 3.95 for significance at the .05 level. Apart from the percent workmates differences none of the differences here are significant, so they must be treated with caution.
It can be seen from the diagram that workmates were consistently more important for husbands than for working wives (let along for non-working wives, who do not have any workmates). This is very markedly so amongst those emotionally close and those relied on for help. It is evident that the workplace does not provide much for women in the way of emotional or helping ties, and this fact should qualify the suggestion made earlier that working women opt for workmates instead of neighbors. It doubtless reflects the less intense and less long-term involvement of women in their jobs - over half of the working women were working part-time (i.e. less than 30 hours a week). Associated with this would be their situation and status at work - their main work experience was as teachers, nurses, laboratory technicians, clerks, typists/receptionists, or shop assistants; after having a family they might scrounge part-time work below what they were qualified for; some did home dressmaking, or bookkeeping for their husbands.

The diagram also indicates, on the other hand, that relatives were consistently somewhat more important for wives, especially for non-working wives, than they were for husbands. Neighbors tended to be rather more important for wives than for husbands as well. However, in line with the absence of a significant correlation between sex and percent neighbors in Canberra network which was remarked on previously, this tendency did not apply across the board - at least it did not extend to working wives with regard to their confidants. Working wives seem to talk about their problems with neighbors even less than their husbands do. Working wives certainly confide in neighbors much less than non-working wives do. For emotional ties and helping ties working wives look to their neighbors just as much as non-working wives do, but particularly for emotional ties this is not very much. Neighbors are used mainly as convenient companions with whom non-working housewives
can chat. As for ordinary friends, these were more important for wives than for husbands but only with respect to confidants and emotional ties. Whether wives are having to search out other friends because they lack workmates or are more selective about personal ties, or whether anyway these other friends are unofficial workmates in the form of "child-rearing mates", is difficult to tell.

Diagram 3.5 shows the effect of one further variable, the availability of relatives in Canberra, on the breakdown of particular kinds of intense ties into relatives, neighbors, workmates and other friends. There is obviously a very striking difference between the networks of those who had kin and those who did not. Where there were kin available they constituted nearly half of the more intense ties, even though they were only about a quarter of those spoken to at least once a week. Where there were no kin, the chief result was that the more intense networks were simply about half as big - e.g. the mean number of emotionally close contacts fell from 5.9 to 2.9. Neighbors are able to compensate for the absence of relatives as far as weekly chatting goes, but not in more intense contacts. For these contacts workmates become more important - nearly as important as neighbors. However it is other friends who come to play the preponderant part in people's intense contacts. It can be assumed that some of the people with no kin came to Canberra without minding the lack of kin, perhaps even in a deliberate attempt to move away from kin - these people would no doubt thrive on the greater freedom afforded by knowing mainly ordinary friends. On the other hand the fact that their intense networks are rather smaller may indicate - unless they are satisfied with a few extremely intense ties, perhaps consisting largely of the
nuclear family - that these people really feel deprived.

Diagram 3.5. The Effect of Availability of Relatives on the Tendency of Contacts of a Certain Content to be Relatives, Neighbors, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean percent of these contacts who are:</th>
<th>Spoken to once a week or more</th>
<th>Told most personal problems</th>
<th>Very upset to lose</th>
<th>Could always go to for help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>Rels. None</td>
<td>24/100</td>
<td>34/100</td>
<td>2/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Rels. None</td>
<td>15/100</td>
<td>22/100</td>
<td>8/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmates</td>
<td>Rels. None</td>
<td>16/100</td>
<td>45/100</td>
<td>3/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Friends</td>
<td>Rels. None</td>
<td>30/100</td>
<td>30/100</td>
<td>2/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of resp. with non-zero contacts: 77 85 38 39 70 61 75 79

Mean total no. of contacts - all resp.: 7.8 6.1 1.7 0.9 5.9 2.9 6.1 4.7

Note that the difference between these two patterns of networks is not a class one (the correlation between availability of relatives and class was an insignificant -.14 - see Appendix D) but it is closely tied up with length of time spent in Canberra. People who have not been in Canberra long have fewer intense ties on the spot and still look to their kin somewhere outside Canberra.
To sum up, these results show that there are different emphases in the frequency and intensity and content of each category of primary tie; within limits these differences are fairly fluid and situational, but sometimes one category of contact simply cannot fill in where another category is absent. The importance of kin, particularly for women, is confirmed; where kin are physically separated from people most of their functions are not compensated for on the spot. Neighbors are less important, though they can adequately perform the functions of providing help and a sympathetic ear, especially for full-time housewives. Workmates are good as confidants, and for husbands they also provide emotional contacts and help. In Canberra ordinary friends are very important for emotional contacts and for help, particularly in the absence of kin. There is thus support here for the fundamental idea of Litwak and Szelenyi (1969), that each primary tie category operates under different constraints, and offers different advantages.

As expected, then, albeit with some interesting variations, we have found in Canberra networks which are not only dispersed but also differentiated. It is time now to see whether these characteristics are linked with a tendency for them to be loose-knit.
The compartmentalization of social relations in modern society - the tendency for each individual to have a different audience for each of his roles, being neighbor to A, workmate to B, shopkeeper to C, etc. - was perceived by Barnes (1954) as stemming from social networks in modern society being large mesh. Frankenburg (1966) depicted modernization and urbanization as involving decreasing "redundancy": each link between individuals involves only say one rather than many role relationships - though these are more precisely defined - and there are fewer alternative links between individuals. This chapter begins by looking at the density of primary social networks in Canberra, at some of the factors underlying variations in density, and at the extent to which density is linked to the dispersion and differentiation of networks as predicted by Barnes and Frankenburg. The second section considers two further characteristics of networks: the extent to which a person's network is separate from his spouse's and the extent to which his network is made up of people the same sex as himself. This is preliminary to a test, in the third section, of Bott's (2nd edn., 1971) modified hypothesis that these two characteristics, combined with density, induce segregation of marital roles. The final section looks at the influence of networks on a matter of more practical significance: the extent to which people feel they belong or are lonely in Canberra.

Density of Networks

The density of someone's network is the extent to which the people known by him know and meet each other independently of him. The ideal measure of density is the actual relationships between people
in a network as a percentage of the possible relationships (see Mitchell, ed., 1969, and Barnes, 1969). Turner's (1967) study of a rural community appears to be the only research so far to have used this measure without networks being limited in size to, say, "the eight people you visit most often", and with the existence of independent relationships established independently of the focal respondent's beliefs. Asking the focal respondent who knows whom may, as Bott (2nd edn., 1971) thinks, be a poor substitute for direct checking, but, as she also notes, it is all that is reasonably practicable in an urban situation.

Even then the work involved in reporting on all the possible relationships can be quite arduous for the focal respondent. It was for this reason that respondents were only required to report on those people with whom they had "extra primary" ties. If they listed a lot of Canberra names, but only a few represented "extra primary" contacts on the basis of the questionnaire's page 4 items, then for the matrix on page 5 a new list was written out of just the "extra primary" contacts. Even so the respondent who had 38 people in his "extra primary" network had to report on 703 possible relationships. In such a case, three page 5's had to be joined together to form a big enough matrix. Generally a respondent would have only about seven "extra primary" contacts, and it would take him only five or ten minutes to say whether each pair did not know each other, knew each other "but only through you and .... continue to know each other just because of you" (which was noted as one out of two, i.e. it scored a half), or "know each other quite apart from you". After exercising a little thought in each case the respondent would normally come up with what seemed to be for him a satisfactory answer. Some checks were available and were encouraging - e.g. husbands and wives almost always rated a
common pair the same way. Obviously a respondent may have occasionally been mistaken, but in answer to Bott it can be suggested that anyway what is important (for control, support, etc.) is the respondent's perception of interrelationships.

The density of respondents' "extra primary" networks varied between 29% and 100%, with the mean being 70%. This may seem at first glance to be quite high, but it should be pointed out that included in these figures are all of the 165 respondents who had at least one "extra primary" contact. ¹ Nineteen out of these 165 respondents only had one "extra primary" contact, and these automatically registered 100% density (it was assumed that independent relationships always existed between the respondent and his "extra primary" contacts). Leaving out these cases the mean density was a little smaller: 68%. If the density was calculated, as was done by Turner (1967) but not as is generally recommended, in every case leaving out the focal person altogether, then the mean density (for the 156 cases with two or more "extra primary" contacts, i.e. one or more possible relationship between them) becomes only 55%. Although this method of calculation is not used subsequently in this thesis, it is interesting because it is more in line with what is suggested by commonsense: the extent to which a person's collection of friends etc., not including the person, know each other. According to this method of calculation five respondents had "extra primary" networks with densities of 0%, i.e. none of their "extra primary" contacts knew each other at all. One man said that his two main friends knew of each other quite extensively, but that he had not yet got around to arranging for them to meet. This lack of density seems fairly remarkable.

¹ Eight respondents had no "extra primary" contacts; in addition there was data missing for one respondent.
Although the density measure is supposedly independent of network size, it seems intuitively more likely that say four people out of a network of five would all know each other, the fifth one knowing only the respondent (this density would be 73%) than that eight people out of ten would all know each other, with the other two just knowing the respondent (this density would be 69%). This intuition that small networks are likely to be more dense may be based on experience which suggests that people get to know each other through sharing situations etc. and that sharing is more improbable if large numbers are involved. Perhaps a person has some sort of choice between being part of a small tight group with whom he spends most of his time and having a larger but more loose-knit network. For whatever reason, it is certainly the case that there was a very strong negative correlation between size of "extra primary" network and density of "extra primary" network (Yule's Q for the dichotomized variables was -.74).

A density of say 100% in a network of 15 is thus much less likely, and perhaps at least partly because of this would seem to be rather more significant, than the same density in a network of two. Presumably a person is more frequently in contact with a member of his network if there are 15 of them, and 15 people are capable of exerting a much stronger influence. Accordingly it seems important when looking at some of the variables associated with network density to use, not just zero-order correlations, but partial correlations controlling for network size. Table 4.1 presents these correlations for the main independent variables.
Table 4.1. Correlations Between "Extra Primary" Network Density and Independent Variables (Yule's Q or gamma)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>&quot;Extra Primary&quot; Network Density (hi = &gt;69%) (N = 165)</th>
<th>Zero-Order</th>
<th>Partial Controlling Number &quot;Extra Primary&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (hi = wives)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb (lo = Ainslie, med = Lyons, hi = Pearce)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Median Age</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.35 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Time</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneers in the area</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.36 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of House</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hi = not in cities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>.34 *</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Available</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Schools (hi = not gov't. local ones) (N = 126)</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Works Extra (N = 87)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Works (N = 87)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Use of a Car (N = 87)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Phone</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road (lo = cul-de-sac, med = small hi = through)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the .025 level (by extension in the case of partial correlations, where there is no test of significance: the asterisks are really just used to highlight those which seem large enough to warrant discussion.

Note: a. N = 174 for all variables except where otherwise indicated.

b. In general, if an independent variable has a positive correlation with "extra primary" network size (see Appendix D) then the partial is more positive or less negative than the zero-order; and vice versa.
Being a migrant was the variable with the strongest zero-order correlation with network density \( (Q = .34) \). It is understandable that migrants should have particularly close-knit networks, since much of their social activity would be with people from the same country. However, migrants also tend to have small "extra primary" networks \( (Q = .45, \text{ see Appendix D}) \), and this evidently to some extent explains their more dense networks: the original correlation was reduced considerably when network size was controlled. Being a migrant has sub-cultural implications which make for dense networks, but also mobility implications which make for smaller and not particularly dense networks.

By way of contrast, the time a person had spent living in Canberra does not seem at first to be associated with network density, but it did go with larger "extra primary" networks, and when this was controlled there was a very definite correlation between Canberra time and density. The longer time spent in Canberra the more chance there would be for a person's friends to get to know each other and a close-knit field of social relations to develop. It is particularly easy to appreciate the dense networks of people who have lived in Canberra since the early days, when it was relatively tiny. We have seen how stability factors underly the localization of networks — with the significant exception of localization within the neighborhood, which seems to become less marked as time goes on. The link here between stability and the density of networks appears promising in the light of our theorized typological continuum.
One more independent variable stands out as being related to network density: people who are pioneers in their area evidently have "extra primary" networks that are loose-knit or less dense, very obviously so with the size of their networks controlled. How is this to be understood? These people have not been any shorter (nor any longer) time in Canberra (they have been longer in their present house - see Appendix D). In the last chapter we saw that these pioneers have considerably more neighbors in their networks. Because of this we could expect their networks to be more close-knit - to the extent our continuum is correct in linking the localization and density of networks. Instead their networks are loose-knit - and it can be speculated that these people tend to have dealings with their neighbors individually rather than in a group. If this is true then it reveals something about the rather remarkable localization of networks we have found in the youngest neighborhoods of Canberra. This sort of concentration of networks could be quite different from the communal involvement with neighbors found in Young and Willmott's (1957) East London or in Gans' (1962) "urban village". It is quite understandable that it would be different, because it is not accompanied by overlapping of neighbors with kin and workmates - networks are still differentiated.

Two other variables are noteworthy for the fact that while they had no zero-order correlations with density there were marked moves in a positive direction when size was controlled: availability of relatives and wife's use of car. People with kin in Canberra have larger Canberra networks; when this size is allowed for they have more dense networks. Kinship ties are obviously distinguished from friendship ties partly because of their greater density. It is felt that fathoming the correlation for wife's use of a car would be to indulge too deeply in the game, "I can dream up a more ingenious ad hoc explanation than you can dream up" - see Roth (1973).
This may sound tenuous but it receives strong support when we look at the relationship between the dispersion and the density of networks. It was found, quite contrary to what would be predicted from our typology, that the people in Canberra with networks most concentrated in the neighborhood tend also to be those with the most loose-knit networks (Yule's Q between percent of Canberra network consisting of neighbors and density of "extra primary" network was -.27, and when size of "extra primary" network was controlled -.37). We can now perceive that the areas of extra neighboring in Canberra, far from being consistently at a less urban, less modern point on our typological continuum (assuming here that the continuum is still generally useful for describing different societies), are basically modern but with one less modern kink. This adds backing to the conclusion that this extra neighboring is a temporary adjustment to pioneering conditions, and rather than being a deeply embedded fixture.

Networks the Same Sex, and Separate from Spouse's

Barnes (1954) insightful paragraph quoted in the first chapter included the statement: "In modern society, I think we may say that in general people do not have as many friends in common as they do in small-scale societies." In this section we are concerned with the extent which a person's network is separate from or overlaps with his spouse's. It is apparent that this will be related, not only as Barnes

3 These characteristics cannot readily be related to the differentiation of networks, because overlap between neighbors, kin and workmates is so rare in Canberra - in this sense differentiation is complete - and there is no single measure of distinctions in content between each of these sorts of ties.
implies to the density of each person's network, but also to a further characteristic covered in this section, the extent to which a person's network is composed of contacts who are the same sex as he/she is. Bott (2nd edn. 1971) uses all three characteristics to predict variations in conjugal role segregation.

It turned out to be relatively easy to decide who were joint friends from the first names and initials which were listed by husband and wife. One might write down "John S", the other "Jack S", and these may or may not have been the same person, but this could usually be settled by seeing who the person was married to, where he lived, what his occupation was, etc. Obviously there would have been some inaccuracy, for instance due to different nicknames, but this seemed very minor. The degree of overlap was measured for each respondent by expressing the number of primary ties that were held jointly with this spouse, as a percentage of the total number of primary ties. (Note that here the respondent was omitted from the calculation).

For total networks (Canberra and outside Canberra) the mean overlap was 41%. For Canberra networks the mean overlap was 43%. And for "extra primary" networks the mean overlap was 39%. These measures were unrelated to network size (the three Yule's Q's with the relevant size measures were all negligible) but were strongly related to each other (the three Yule's Q's were all over .75). In each case the degree of overlap ranged from 0% to 100%. It is difficult to comment on these gross results because there is hardly
any even roughly equivalent work with which they can be compared.\(^4\)

The same problem arises in relation to the extent to which networks were the same sex as the respondent. On average 71% of a person's "extra primary" network consisted of people the same sex as he/she was; it is only possible to say that this shows these Canberra people do tend to some extent to associate with people the same sex as themselves. It is more meaningful to ask, what sorts of people tend to have networks the most thoroughly the same sex as themselves? What factors are associated with variations in the overlap of networks with spouse's? Brief consideration will be given to these questions before going on to look specifically at Bott's hypothesis in the next section. Table 4.2 shows the correlations between these two aspects of networks and the main independent variables.

In the case of the overlap measures, all the correlations are rather low. However, these measures (as well as the same sexness one) show some very considerable correlations with feelings of social involvement, as we shall see in the final section; this suggests they are not weak as measures - it may be they would have to be explained with the help of more personal intervening variables such as marital compatibility. Without delving deeply into these correlations a number of suggestive tendencies can be highlighted. A person who spent most of his childhood outside cities seems to have an overall network which is rather less than usually overlapped with his spouse's - which could

\(^4\) Goldthorpe et al. (1969) found ratios of non-joint to joint friends of about 1.4 for manual couples and 0.8 for white-collar couples (p.95) - which works out to be 42% overlap and 56% overlap respectively.
### Table 4.2. Correlations between Overlap with Spouse and Same Sexness, and Independent Variables
(Yule's Q or gamma)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Percent Overlap with Spouse Total Network (hi=&gt;40%) (N = 174)</th>
<th>Percent Overlap with Spouse &quot;Extra Primary&quot; Network (hi=&gt;35%) (N = 166)</th>
<th>Percent Same Sex in &quot;Extra Primary&quot; Network (hi=&gt;67%) (N = 166)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (hi = wives)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb (lo = Ainslie, med = Lyons, hi = Pearce)</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Median Age</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Time</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneers in the Area</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of House</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community (hi = not in cities)</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Available</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.40 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Schools (hi = not govt. local ones)(N=126)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Works Extra (N=87)</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Works (N=87)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.44 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Use of a Car (N=87)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Phone</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.37 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road (lo = cul-de-sac, med = small, hi = through)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the .025 level.

Note: N=174 except where indicated, and except for where an independent variable is the same for husband and wife (e.g. suburb, in which case N is halved for the overlap correlations.
simply be a sign that the spouse mostly has not come from the same part of the country. Someone who has relatives in Canberra tends to have more joint people in his "extra primary" network; and this is actually even more true for his whole Canberra network (the correlation there was .30 - signification at the .025 level - as compared with .22). Grown-up children would be shared, and so perhaps would in-laws, but not as "extra primary" contacts. Husbands who work overtime or on a second job tend to have less overlap, both in their total and their "extra primary" networks; by contrast, wives who work if anything have more overlap. This rather odd divergence can be understood if it is remembered that husbands seem to derive closer friends through work than wives do. Working wives may have no time for a social life apart from their husbands. Finally, a person with a phone evidently has more overlap in his "extra primary" network - rather than having an effect itself, a telephone may here be a sign of the sort of life-style which involves entertaining joint friends to dinner.

The proportion of "extra primary" networks who are the same sex as respondents is lower when relatives are available - which suggests that people can more easily maintain close ties with people of the opposite sex if they are relatives, and there is no question of a sexual liaison. The proportion who are the same sex is also lower, for wives, when they work - they then have an independent opportunity to meet people of the opposite sex otherwise denied them. 5

5 Wives tend to be very dependent on their husbands for getting to know people, and not vice versa - which helps to explain why lack of overlap between spouses can produce the loneliness reported in the final section. See the table on sources of contacts in Appendix D.
proportion who are the same sex is also lower for people with phones—which may be partly that phones increase opportunities to make opposite sex contact, but perhaps more likely that they are again a sign of entertaining joint friends. Notice that much the same factors are associated with mixed sexness as with overlap with spouse, which suggests there is indeed a link between these two network characteristics. Moreover, the factors connected with mixed sex networks and shared networks are much the same as those we have identified as making for the dispersed, compartmentalized and loose-knit networks typical of modern societies. The notable exception is the availability of relatives, which is connected with mixed sex and shared networks, but which we have generally seen as being linked to a less modern point on our continuum.

Testing Bott's Hypothesis

The varying extent to which conjugal roles are segregated or joint is what Bott (1957) attempted to explain by reference to patterns of primary social networks. Properly to assess a couple's role segregation would require rather more interviewing time than was available in the present study. Nevertheless, observing Platt's (1969) injunctions to attend to both norms and behaviour, and to avoid having too rigid an instrument, a question was devised and asked of the

6 "... I'd like to ask how you and your husband feel about housework—do you feel that this is your job, as wife; or that he should share in the work too? Does your husband ever do the shopping, or cook; what about washing up? How about looking after the children—seeing that they are dressed properly, etc.—do you both feel that this is your responsibility, as wife; or that he has part of the responsibility too? What sorts of things does he do for the children?" Each of these four items were rated on a three-point scale, summed and dichotomized.
women in the sample. This in combination with the rather better information collected on these women's networks was used to make a somewhat tentative examination of Bott's updated hypothesis.

The new form of the hypothesis suggests that conjugal role segregation will be associated with the presence of three separate network characteristics; if these do not tend to coincide, i.e. if there are not particularly many cases of people who have non-shared-with-spouse, dense networks of their own sex, then the hypothesis will not be predictive for many cases and there will not be many cases to test it with. Fortunately, however, we have already had indications that some at least of these network variables are intercorrelated. Table 4.3 shows the correlations between all the variables.

Table 4.3. Correlations between Variables involved in Bott's Hypothesis (Yule's Q)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density of &quot;Extra Primary&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Density controlling Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Extra Primary&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Same Sex of &quot;Extra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Overlap of &quot;Extra</td>
<td>.06 (.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary&quot; with Spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugal Role Segregation</td>
<td>.30 (.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(women only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As suspected, networks which are the same sex as a person tend not to be shared with his spouse. However, these two network characteristics do not seem to be associated in any way with the density of networks - and certainly not in such a way that they could be immediately added on to our typology. There is some slight sign of a correlation between density and conjugal role segregation (not
It seems that rather it is the sexual composition of networks and the extent to which they are shared between spouses that have the strongest influence on conjugal role arrangements.

A better idea of the relative effects of each of the three network characteristics can be had from Table 4.4. To the extent that Bott's latest hypothesis holds, the bottom right-hand group should be the least inclined to have segregated conjugal roles (which they are) and the top left-hand group should be the most inclined to have segregated conjugal roles (which they almost are). It seems that each of the variables are having some effect, which is just what Bott's hypothesis predicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Same Sexness</th>
<th>Overlap with Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>80% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>88% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>50% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>36% (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, a closer look suggests that there is still a lot of variability unaccounted for. Bott (2nd Edn., 1971) is at pains to say that it is only at the extremes that her hypothesis definitely holds; but when the means are examined of each network variable, in each of the nine uncollapsed categories of conjugal role segregation, there is no strong or consistent pattern (F tests register insignificance). For example, the five women with the most segregated conjugal roles had an "extra primary" network density of 74%, while the six with the least segregated conjugal roles had an "extra primary" network density of 71%. The differences were only a little more marked for the other two network characteristics.

In short, these results demonstrate that Bott's reformulated hypothesis is a definite improvement on the original one, but that the influence of networks on conjugal roles works in perhaps an even more complex way. A thorough test would need to look at the density, overlap and same sexness of different parts of people's networks. This is clear from what has been shown previously in this chapter concerning relatives: on the one hand they make for dense networks, but on the other hand they make for shared and mixed sex ones. It may even be necessary to investigate the normative content of networks.

Networks and Felt Social Involvement

The final section of this chapter looks at some more practical effects of networks - it relates networks to three questions concerning how people felt about social life in Canberra. Even this brief glance tends to confirm that networks are very significant in people's lives.

The first question was, for those respondents who had moved to
Canberra, "Do you find it more difficult to get to know people in Canberra?" (If yes) "Why do you think that is?" Nearly two thirds of the respondents (64% of the 163 for whom there is data) replied with an unqualified no; indeed a handful of these respondents said they though it was easier. A few respondents said yes, it was more difficult to get to know people, "but it's not due to Canberra"; these people emphasized their particular situation, for example having a young family, doing shiftwork, not working. Migrants were worried by the language barrier. Another small group said yes, "unless you work or belong to an organization", the importance of jobs, and organizations such as church, as sources of friends in Canberra came out repeatedly. Of the other respondents who felt it was more difficult, about half of them put it down to physical and social aspects of Canberra, and the rest blamed it more directly on the sort of people who live in Canberra.

Some of the physical and social characteristics which were pointed out were the newness of Canberra, the mobility of its population, the fact that many wives in Canberra were working, the absence of relatives through whom to meet people, the fact that Canberra was a place for people under 30 with young children, the mixture of people ("there's so many classes of people"), the smaller range of people, the large size of Canberra, the greater "psychological" travelling distances, the tendency for people to go everywhere by car ("they just jump into their cars and away"), transport problems and the design of neighborhoods. One Ainslie woman complained that she "didn't see anybody out in the street; perhaps because it's an old area".
Some of the respondents who posited explanations in terms of the type of people in Canberra and their behavioural norms, said that Canberrans were relatively preoccupied with getting established, and getting on: "nearly everyone is flat out on their job and paying for their house and their newly-acquired and highly-desired possessions". Others said that people live in their own worlds, they are groupy or else reserved and not out-going enough: "they stick with people from the place they know best. The fact that I'm from a minor city may be a factor. People pigeonhole you". One woman in Lyons who claimed that people were very "social conscious" said that "when we first came here, we went to High School, people would say we were from the bush, they couldn't be bothered with new people". A policeman felt "people with more basic interests, tradesmen, are easier to get to know. A lot of people in Canberra are very job-conscious ... Trying to interview a middle-to-higher ranking public servant in Canberra is impossible!" An R.A.A.F. man in Ainslie said "People look down on servicemen, we're a second-class lot. We're not very well paid, we're only here for one or two years, so people think why get to know you. We're not the class of people the Public Service want to live in Canberra". This will be referred to again in the next chapter: the simple white-collar/manual worker distinction may not adequately comprehend the sort of divisions between people which are here felt to be determining Canberra social life.

Finding it harder to get to know people was significantly associated with having young children, with being a rent-payer rather than a house buyer/owner, with being likely to move, and with not having a phone (Q's of -.38, -.36, .37 and -.40 with the relevant independent variables).
The next question was also for those respondents who hadn't spent most of their childhood in Canberra: "Do you feel you belong to Canberra, or do you still think of some other place as your home?" 76% of the respondents (there were 164 with data) felt they belonged to Canberra, 16% felt they belonged elsewhere, and the rest felt they had no real home. This question is tapping a fluctuating compound of nostalgia for previous places, satisfaction with or adjustment to present place, and hopes and plans for the future; it all depends very much on the context, for example as to whether a person thinks in terms of a whole country or a particular house. Some quotations will illustrate this. From a man who came from Italy 20 years ago: "My motherland. But that's out of the question. Memory shouldn't count. I belong here because I've got a daughter born here. This is where I'll finish my days. As far as day to day living, here." From another immigrant: "I had a trip back to England and up to then I felt that Great Britain was home, now it is definitely Canberra". From a bank manager: "I belong to Canberra. I would belong to wherever I was. I've got no real home". From a woman: "I'm beginning to get used to it". And from a man: "Just this block - I've got no special affection for the town". Another woman: "Birregurra. But when I'm in Birregurra, Canberra's home". And another man: "Western Australia is my home state. We like Canberra but we're not sure whether we want to stay yet". These of course are the interesting cases which show how people come to identify with a place. Most respondents did not have such ambivalent feelings about Canberra. Belonging to Canberra was significantly associated with time in Canberra, house ownership, no expected mobility, and availability of relatives (Q's of .33, .41, -.56 and .33).
The third question was quite blunt: "Do you ever feel a bit lonely living in Canberra?" 73% of the respondents (173 with data) replied with a firm no; those that gave the slightest hint of sometimes feeling lonely were coded as yes. Some gave more than a hint, for example the woman who during her holidays used to ring up and ask if she could go back to work early. Loneliness was significantly associated with being a woman, having young children, being likely to move, and not having a phone (Q's of .41, -.42, .42, -.40). Being a migrant is noticeably absent from all these associations, but it was associated with a very similar variable, not seeing enough people - (Q = .47). Loneliness was associated with finding it harder to get to know people, which went with not belonging to Canberra, which was associated with loneliness (Q's of .63, -.32, -.51). The correlations between these three dimensions of felt social involvement, and various characteristics of social networks, are shown in Table 4.5.

It is clear that there are a substantial number of significant relationships between Canberra network characteristics and people's subjective assessments of Canberra life. People with large Canberra networks, and within these networks a large number of contacts rated as "extra primary", evidently tend to find it less hard to get to know people in Canberra, are more likely to feel they belong to Canberra, and are less inclined to be lonely. These relationships are very much what you would expect. In addition, having a high proportion of neighbors in a Canberra network is associated with not belonging to Canberra. This is also quite understandable in the light of what has been explicated before: neighbors are first resorts for newcomers, especially housebound mothers, but are unlikely to provide much attachment in the long run.
Table 4.5. Correlations Between Network Characteristics and Aspects of Felt Social Involvement in Canberra (Yule's Q or gamma)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Characteristics</th>
<th>Harder to Know People (hi = yes)</th>
<th>Belong (hi = yes) (N = 164)</th>
<th>Loneliness (hi = yes) (N = 173)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Canberra</td>
<td>-.40 *</td>
<td>.49 *</td>
<td>-.41 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &quot;Extra Primary&quot;</td>
<td>-.30 *</td>
<td>.41 *</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Outside Canberra</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Neighbors</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.34 *</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Relatives</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Workmates</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Other Friends</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Extra Primary&quot; Network Density</td>
<td>.35 *</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Density controlling Number &quot;Extra Primary&quot;)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(-.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Overlap with Spouse</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.38 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Extra Primary&quot; Overlap with Spouse</td>
<td>-.38 *</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.43 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Same Sex of &quot;Extra Primary&quot;</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.37 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the .025 level.

The most interesting correlations are those involving density, overlap and same sexness. People with dense networks apparently find it harder to get to know people in Canberra, although those who find it harder to get to know people tend to have smaller networks and this to some extent explains why their networks are more dense. This may be a mutual relationship, denser networks being harder to break out of,
and those who find it difficult to get to know new people falling back on a smaller, tighter collection of contacts. People who have less overlap with their spouse may not belong any less to Canberra, but they evidently are more lonely and find it harder to meet people. People whose networks tend to be the same sex as themselves also appear to be more lonely. Perhaps social life in Canberra is such that shared and mixed sex networks, associated with shared marital roles, is the approach which is best adapted to it. At any rate it is clear that the pattern of people's primary social networks can be strongly related to everyday feelings of social involvement.
CHAPTER 5. THE EFFECTS OF MAKING NEIGHBORHOODS SOCIA LLY MIXED

This chapter looks at some of the effects of mixing classes resid entially. First of all, consideration is given to the effects on neighborhood networks, particularly to see whether having working and middle-class people living close to each other means that they actually strike up relations with each other - or whether they still keep to themselves. The next section reports the effects of social mix on how people feel; whether they are ill at ease amongst their neighbors, satisfied with their neighborhood, etc. A brief description is then given of social mix's effects on people's social outlooks and life-styles, the critical issue being whether working-class people who are mixed in with middle-class people thereby become more 'bourgeois'. We have seen how one aspect of life-styles, conjugal roles, can be influenced by people's networks; if the social composition of neighborhoods does make a difference to networks, then we should not be surprised to find that it has implications, via networks, for life-styles and perspectives as well.

This chapter is necessarily the most tentative part of the whole thesis, because of the difficulty, alluded to already, of pinpointing the consequences of social mix. Neighborhoods may vary along dimensions other than class composition, any of which may affect people's neighborhood networks: ethnicity, age, and mobility, for example. Moreover, classes within neighborhoods may vary not because they are mixed in with other classes, but because they are more (or less) affluent, more (or less) mobile, etc. If a working-class person living amongst middle-class people is particularly socially ambitious, it may be that his ambition explains his place of residence, rather than his
place of residence explaining his ambition.

The final section of the chapter sketches out the issues which have to be resolved in making an overall assessment of the policy of social mix. Some of these issues, such as access to facilities and socialization of children, have not been investigated in the present work. Some of the issues do not require investigation, because they are basically matters for value judgements: what sort of equality do we believe in? and do we want working-class people to be 'bourgeois'? is it worth worrying about a bit of friction with neighbors (especially if they are only a minor part of people's networks anyway)?

Social Mix and Neighborhood Networks

Goldthorpe et al. (1969) found that affluent manual workers on the whole had very little social contact with white-collar workers, but that "couples who lived in middle-class areas did in fact have appreciably more white-collar contacts than those living on council estates" (p.111). In middle-class areas more than 20% of spare-time companions and couples entertained at home were white-collar, on council estates only 11% were white-collar. One way at least in which this came about was through the "affluent workers' wives forming friendships with 'white-collar' wives among their neighbors".

Goldthorpe et al. concluded (p.112):

It would seem that 'ecological' factors can in some degree be effective in reducing status segregation and in encouraging social mixing across the manual-nonmanual division though the degree to which this happened was not very great.
In the present study there was found to be, as expected, an overall tendency for primary ties to be with people of the same class. 43%, on average, of manual respondents' non-kin networks consisted of white-collar people, whereas 86% of white-collar respondents' non-kin networks consisted of white-collar people.

What is interesting is that for manual people the tendency for primary ties to be with other manual people was not very pronounced. Certainly it was not nearly as marked as for Goldthorpe et al.'s manual workers. Timms (1967) suggests that people tend to nominate friends who are if anything, higher than themselves in the social hierarchy, and that this occurs more frequently in a community where status-striving, rather than class-solidarity, is prevalent. Accordingly, the fact that as many as 43% of the average manual respondents' contacts were white-collar, can be taken as confirmation of the common view of Canberra as a city dominated by status-striving. On the other hand, in that Canberra as a whole consists mainly of middle-class people, this figure can be interpreted as showing the strength of 'ecological' factors at the level of the city: working-class people living in a middle-class city have been able to form a considerable number of social relations with middle-class people.  

---

1 The occupations of respondents' contacts were classified as manual or white-collar using the same scheme as that shown in Appendix C for classifying the occupations of respondents themselves. For full-time housewives, classification was on the basis of their husbands' occupations.

2 For male manual workers, the proportion of non-kin ties who were white-collar was 38%, for their wives it was 47%. This may be because some of these wives had white-collar jobs - for women there is much more white-collar than manual employment in Canberra. However, Timms (1967) found a similar sex difference in Brisbane; he did not attempt to explain it.
If 'ecological' factors were important at the level of the neighborhood, then manual couples mixed in with the white-collar majority in Lyons should have more white-collar people in their networks, particularly amongst their neighbors, than manual couples living in relatively working-class Ainslie. Table 5.1 presents the figures which test this.

Table 5.1. Mean Percentage of Networks Consisting of White-Collar Contacts by Class and Suburb of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Kin Canberra Networks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>38% (36)</td>
<td>49% (29)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>86% (16)</td>
<td>80% (40)</td>
<td>91% (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Networks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>34% (26)</td>
<td>55% (16)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>83% (12)</td>
<td>67% (37)</td>
<td>82% (52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of respondents with data is given in brackets. There were only two respondents (one couple) of manual status in Pearce, so they have been omitted.

The table shows that manual respondents in Lyons did have more white-collar people in their networks, and that this was particularly so of their neighborhood networks. 55% of the neighbors in their networks were white-collar, whereas it was at least 20% less than this in the case of manual respondents in Ainslie. There was still a little segregation between classes occurring within Lyons, since perhaps 65%, rather than 55%, of all possible neighbors were white-collar (see Table 2.2). Nevertheless, it seems that social mix in Lyons has been
accompanied by actual contacts across class boundaries. A preliminary conclusion is that the policy adopted in Lyons, and in many other similar parts of Canberra, has not, in any obvious way, failed. 3

That these contacts across class boundaries in Lyons are real, and not just the figment of status-striving manual workers' imaginations, is proved by looking at the white-collar respondents in Table 5.1. White-collar respondents in Lyons had a markedly lower proportion of white-collar contacts in their networks than the white-collar respondents in, say, Pearce; and this was especially true of their neighborhood networks - only 67% of these consisted of white-collar people. It is clear that many, if not all, of manual workers' relations with white-collar workers were reciprocated.

White-collar respondents in Ainslie, on the other hand, even though they were living in the thick of manual people, had very little to do with them - even their neighborhood networks were 83% made up of white-collar contacts. Ainslie is in a sense - from an Australian rather than a Canberra point-of-view - a socially mixed area, but in Ainslie social mix patently has not worked in the same way as it has in Lyons.

A number of explanations for this suggest themselves. One is ecological differences between Ainslie and Lyons. The Ainslie area had

---

3 Goldthorpe et al. (1969) found that less important than the influence of social composition of the neighborhood in determining extent of white-collar contacts was the existence of white-collar affiliations - through job histories or through parents. Of the 87 men in the present study, 10 white-collar workers had previously worked for a year or more in manual jobs, but only one manual worker had previously had a white-collar job; so clearly job histories do not explain white-collar contacts here. Parents' class (from main occupations of fathers of husband and wife) did make some difference to proportion of white-collar contacts, but not consistent, nor marked.
government-built houses all through it, except for the whole of one block, which consisted of 15 privately-built houses. Of the government-built houses, 29 which were used for Air Force personnel were all in one block, and the Housing Officer said there was a policy not to put officers in any of them. By contrast in Lyons different sorts of houses were in smaller clumps: there were a number of cul-de-sacs with government and privately-built houses rubbing shoulders. Moreover the government-built houses in Lyons, being of more recent vintage, were perhaps a little more respectable in appearance than the rather motley ones in Ainslie. If planners want social mix to generate contacts between classes, it may be crucially important to ensure, not necessarily completely random mix, but a fairly fine grain mix, and a reasonably subtle mix.

It was pointed out in chapter 2 that an area of 35% manual workers is more likely to contain mostly manual workers who are skilled than an area of 55% manual workers, and sure enough this proved to be a difference between Lyons and Ainslie. Only in Ainslie were there semi-skilled and unskilled manual worker respondents, and this helps to explain the different patterns of contact with white-collar people. Table 5.2 shows this. The sample is admittedly fragmented into rather tiny cells, but it seems that manual respondents below supervisory or self-employed status in Lyons have no more contact with white-collar neighbors than those in Ainslie do. White-collar respondents in Ainslie may keep themselves more aloof because the manual people surrounding them are generally much further below them

---

4 This was not a problem for Goldthorpe et al. (1969), who started with a homogeneous sample of workers in factories, and then traced them to their places of residence.
in social rank. This again suggests that social mix only "works" when it is fairly gentle, not attempting to integrate too wide a range of people.

Table 5.2. Mean Percentage of Neighborhood Networks Consisting of White-Collar Contacts, by (Husbands') Occupational Group and Suburb of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Senior Managerial, Large Businessmen</td>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td>91% (12)</td>
<td>89% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Professional, Junior Managerial, Medium Businessmen</td>
<td>94% (4)</td>
<td>51% (14)</td>
<td>82% (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians, Clerical, Salesmen, Small Proprietors, Officials</td>
<td>74% (7)</td>
<td>62% (11)</td>
<td>60% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory or Self-Employed Manual Workers</td>
<td>57% (8)</td>
<td>79% (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>21% (6)</td>
<td>16% (6)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>42% (6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>7% (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38% (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does social mix result in smaller neighborhood networks? Not so in Lyons, as Table 5.3 demonstrates. But in Ainslie, where the different classes apparently avoid each other, neighbors were considerably less important as a source of social contact. This recalls the conclusion reached in chapter 3, that neighbors tend to be most important when people have all just moved into a new area, and that they become if anything, less important as time goes by. Ainslie respondents generally had been in Canberra longer than respondents from the other two suburbs, but very few of them had been amongst the first
people to live in the area; thus, on the one hand, they did not share any pioneering days with their neighbors, and, on the other hand, many of them were less dependent on their neighbors because they knew people from elsewhere in Canberra. It is just conceivable that, as Lyons becomes as old as Ainslie, and neighbors there become less important, people will be more selective about their neighboring, and segregation between the classes there will assert itself. It may be a little premature to assume that the apparent "success" of social mix in Lyons is permanent.

Table 5.3. Mean Number of Neighbors in Networks, By Class and Suburb of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>2.9(^{3 \theta})</td>
<td>3.7(^{2 \theta})</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>2.1(^{1 \theta})</td>
<td>3.9(^{4 \theta})</td>
<td>3.7(^{5 \theta})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that, of the people in Ainslie, it is the white-collar respondents who had the most meagre neighborhood networks. They are the minority in the midst of a socially distant majority. But they are also the people best able to find and keep up alternative social contact further afield. Neighbors made up a mere 17% of their Canberra networks, and their Canberra networks were larger than for manual people in Ainslie, manual or white-collar people in Lyons, or white-collar people in Pearce. These white-collar respondents in Ainslie do not seem to be suffering from social deprivation.
Women evidently play a crucial role in the relations between classes in Lyons. Wives of manual workers in Lyons had, in their neighborhood networks, 59% white-collar people, which was extremely close to the 61% white-collar people for wives of white-collar workers. Women in Lyons generally had 4.2 neighbors in their networks, a little more than the 3.4 neighbors listed by their husbands. The figures on number of neighbors for Pearce women and men, and for Ainslie men, followed this pattern, but Ainslie women only had an average of 2.0 neighbors in their networks. The lack of relations across class boundaries in Ainslie would appear to be connected to the attenuated neighborhood networks there of women.

This leads to one more possible explanation of the divergent effects of the two versions of social mix, in Lyons and Ainslie. Women in the Ainslie sample tended to have either teenage children or pre-school ones. This in itself may not be very significant—chapter 3 has shown there was little correlation between children's median age

When women were classified by their own jobs (or job histories, if they were not currently working), the figures were the same: manual women in Lyons had 59% white-collar people in their neighborhood networks, white-collar women had 61%. Classifying women this way never proved very discriminatory. Of the 19 manual couples in Ainslie, 15 had white-collar wives, and of the 8 white-collar couples, 3 had manual wives; of the 10 manual couples in Lyons, 5 had white-collar wives, and of the 20 white-collar couples, 2 had manual wives. Wife's occupation made no difference to inter-class neighborhood contacts in Lyons, for women or for men; and it clearly cannot explain the higher level of these contacts in Lyons as compared with Ainslie. The social composition of women's networks was much more a function of their class as determined by their husband's occupation than of their own occupational group. Earlier chapters have suggested that jobs are not very important as a source of primary ties for women, but that their husbands are.
and proportion of neighbors in networks. However, it is a sign of a wide range of stages in the life-cycle existing in Ainslie. This of course was manifest in the very large number of old and other ineligible people encountered during sampling. Life-cycle stage may not be significant as a characteristic of individual respondents, but rather in aggregate as a dimension of the people living in the area. Women having children the same age instantly have something in common. In Lyons, as also in Pearce, there was a lot of families of the same age (this being tied up of course with the recent and rapid settlement of those suburbs). In Ainslie, on the other hand, the social environment is far less homogeneous in terms of life-cycle stage. It looks as though relations across classes in Lyons may only have occurred because of similarity in family age. This would fit with Carey and Mapes' (1970) finding on the importance of demographic similarity. In one sense Lyons is not an area of social mix at all.

As stated at the outset, it is impossible to sort out which aspects of these areas are critical for inter-class contact. Having considered several differences between Lyons and Ainslie, however, it can be suggested that, in order to make absolutely sure that mixing up classes makes them actually relate to each other, there should be a fine grain mix and a subtle mix, involving not too obvious divergences in house types and social classes, and that people should be as similar

---

6 Couples with primary school children tended to have a higher proportion of neighbors in their networks, but this did not persist when suburb was controlled, so it is probably an artifact of the situation being discussed here.
as possible in other ways, particularly in stage of the life-cycle. Even then there is no guarantee that social mix will be effective for long.

Experiences of Social Mix

The interpretations that have just been made about the effects of social mix on social networks can now be checked with people's feelings and perceptions relating to social mix. The picture here is not very tidy nor very clear-cut, but it provides more evidence that social mix is at least not having any patently deleterious effect.

First of all, the social classes in each area can be compared in terms of their overall feelings of social involvement in Canberra. This is possible using the three felt social involvement items which were introduced in chapter 4 because of their considerable correlations with aspects of network structure as well as of network size. Table 5.4 shows that none of these items vary massively between the classes in each area. This is understandable because they refer to feelings about Canberra generally rather than the neighborhood, and it provides a salutary reminder that social mix only affects a relatively minor part of people's lives.

Some slight variations do occur. It appears that only a quarter of the manual people in Lyons and of the white-collar people

7 Only a few characteristics of networks were actually discussed in the last section, the ones most likely to be affected by the class composition of neighborhoods. For other characteristics, such as density and overlap with spouse, correlations with social class were generally not specified by suburb as they were with those characteristics.
in Pearce find it harder to get to know people in Canberra — this is good news for anyone who might be worried that manual workers in Lyons would feel isolated. On the other hand more than half the white-collar people in Lyons evidently find the acquaintance process more difficult. Perhaps these are status-striving white-collar people who feel threatened by the scattering of slightly alien government houses in their midst, or who still feel just on the outer of higher level public service/university/diplomatic circles. It can be seen that on the second item these Lyons white-collar people also turn out to be marginally the loneliest group. The other group which appears to do slightly badly on these items are the manual people in Ainslie — oddly enough, also a majority group in a socially mixed area.

Table 5.4. Aspects of Felt Social Involvement, By Class and Suburb of Respondents
(the table shows percent "yes", of respondents with data, whose number is given in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harder to Know People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>40% (30)</td>
<td>25% (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>40% (15)</td>
<td>51% (39)</td>
<td>25% (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loneliness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>29% (38)</td>
<td>25% (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>19% (16)</td>
<td>31% (39)</td>
<td>22% (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belong</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>65% (31)</td>
<td>80% (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>87% (15)</td>
<td>79% (39)</td>
<td>75% (57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nearly as many of them as in the case of the Lyons white-collar people, said they felt lonely living in Canberra; and less than two-thirds said they felt they belonged to Canberra. This last finding is no doubt tied up with the group of regularly transferred Air Force personnel living in Ainslie. The quite small number of white-collar people in Ainslie, by contrast, mostly feel Canberra is their home, and not many feel lonely. They do not seem to be put out by living amongst a majority of manual workers with whom they have very little to do. The minorities in both mixed areas thus seem at least as satisfied as other groups with Canberra social life.

To determine whether the residents themselves see their areas as socially mixed and what categories they use in assessing whether the people around them are similar or different, respondents were asked the following open-ended question: "What sort of people are they (the ones living around here) - are they pretty much the same as you, or different? In what ways - what are you thinking of?" Nearly half (48% of the 170 respondents with data) said the people in their neighborhood were pretty much the same as them. 21% said they were different in class-type terms: "They're not as educated as me"; "different walks of life, I suppose - a public servant, he pulls in about the same as me, down to a bricklayer, who's probably earning more than me"; "they're all public servants, who feel superior"; "they're a good mixture - not all academics or street cleaners". 12% of the respondents said their neighbors were different in terms of norms or interests (without any suggestion of class): "they are more housebound than we are"; "half the time I wouldn't know what to talk about with them"; "some people are interested in the races, in the pub, in darts - I'm not"; "most of the people here visit, chat - I don't"
get involved very much". Only 6% mentioned age or life-cycle stage differences, and 5% said the main differences were in nationality or language. Notice that class differences were uppermost in people's consciousness almost as often as all other dimensions of difference put together. Variations between the classes in each area are shown in the first half of Table 5.5.

Table 5.5. Perceptions of the Neighborhood, by Class and Suburb of Respondents
(the table shows percent "yes" of respondents with data, whose number is given in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors Different from Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>41% (37)</td>
<td>45% (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>53% (15)</td>
<td>65% (40)</td>
<td>50% (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors of Different Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>19% (37)</td>
<td>15% (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>7% (15)</td>
<td>28% (40)</td>
<td>21% (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>76% (38)</td>
<td>80% (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>75% (16)</td>
<td>75% (40)</td>
<td>86% (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Present Suburb, Even if Money No Object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>66% (38)</td>
<td>80% (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>64% (16)</td>
<td>63% (39)</td>
<td>76% (58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that white-collar respondents generally expressed more consciousness of the people around them being different.

---

8 2% said different in other ways; and 5% said in some ways the same, in some ways different, or some are the same, some are different. Perhaps this question left a little too much room for people to interpret. It was hard to distinguish between class, and norms/interests, when coding answers.
than did manual respondents. This may reflect status consciousness on the part of white-collar people, or conversely it may reflect an egalitarian ideology on the part of manual people. A businessman in Pearce said "they're on a different professional level. They're a fair cross-section ... but they're certainly not blue-collar workers". Manual workers, on the other hand, would refer to "ordinary working people". As a bricklayer in Lyons said of an Air Force officer: "He across there might think he's different."

It is the white-collar majority in Lyons who stand out as most frequently thinking their neighbors are different from them; moreover, the second segment of the table shows they are the most conscious of class differences between themselves and their neighbors. These Lyons white-collar people have at least as many neighbors in their networks as any other group. Since Lyons is first-homeowner territory, it may be surmised that they have come to know their neighbors because of life-cycle stage similarities, and in the process have got to know of class and other differences. On the other hand indications have been noted that these Lyons white-collar people, compared with other groups, found it harder to get to know people in Canberra, and lonely living in Canberra. They may have been forced to mix with their neighbors for lack of adequate option.

At any rate it is clear from the table that people's perceptions of differences, and in particular of class differences, do not correspond particularly closely with the objective measures of differences used to decide whether areas were socially mixed or not. Quite a high proportion of white-collar people in Pearce are conscious of class differences in their neighborhood even though there are
extremely few manual workers in their neighborhood. This recalls Encel's statement, mentioned in chapter 2, that the lack of such an obvious working class in Canberra means "gradations within the middle class itself are more refined than usual". It also recalls the point made in chapter 4, that there are gaps between people making it hard for them to get to know each other, such as rural versus urban backgrounds, and armed servicemen versus public servants, which may not be adequately comprehended by the white-collar/manual worker distinction.

The wife of a senior public servant, living in the top street of Pearce, thought the people around her were different:

a lot of professional people ... I wouldn't be able to approach them as easily (as the people in the suburb she'd come from ... was this because they seemed more important?) Yes, partly; they're busy ... I would be scared they'd think I was asking for professional help, for example medical attention for a cut finger ... Not having had tertiary qualifications I feel a little bit wary at starting a conversation ... I'm more at ease, more outgoing, in my own social plane.

Pearce, it was thought, was the one area studied which was definitely homogeneous, but it turns out that there's social mix of sorts there too. Planning for an area to be "homogeneously white-collar" clearly does not abolish class differences and conflicts.

Just as white-collar people were more likely to feel that their neighbors were different, so they were more likely to say they had sometimes had problems with their neighbors. The majority of respondents said they had had no problems at all, and the problems most commonly mentioned were fairly minor physical impingements: hoses left on and causing flooding, incinerators smoking, cars tearing up lawns, gardens not being kept with due propriety, noisy parties, pet
cockatoos screeching, cats excreting, etc. These physical annoyances could lead to more long-standing social tensions if they were not settled amicably. One tenth of the respondents had come into conflict with their neighbors over children: stealing, fighting, not being supervised, etc. Perhaps it is white-collar people who are most fussy about moral and social influences on their children, as well as most fastidious about the appearance of their gardens.

A handful of respondents were involved in what might almost be called class warfare with their neighbors. One Lyons woman, who had come from the country and was married to a small builder, complained:

if you get anything, they are jealous or something. Like when we got outside gates the neighbors wouldn't talk to us for a couple of months until they got used to them. Same with the carpet. If they see a delivery truck, they’ll go and see what it is.

A professional man in Pearce told how -

a neighbor asked my children what I did, and when he found out I was only in the Department of Works, he stopped his children playing with mine. If I'd been an architect in N.C.D.C. it would have been different ... 

And another person in Pearce, this time the wife of a financial executive, described her neighbors as -

terrible social climbers. Coffee mornings, View Club luncheons, bore me stupid, so I haven't made the grade ... I used to feel belittled by them about my house ... My children no longer play with their children ...

These cases were far too isolated to detect any tendencies in the classes in each area. Notice that anyway the class distinctions here are again far too subtle to be described as, say, manual people versus white-collar people. This confirms the point made above: if people are separated into supposedly homogeneous areas social
distinctions between them will not necessarily disappear. Doing without social mix in Canberra might mean any social conflict problems associated with it would be simpler recreated on a finer scale.

Looking again at Table 5.5, it can be seen that at least three-quarters of respondents in each class in each area, thought their neighbors were friendly. Clearly nothing very drastic is going wrong in these residential areas, mixed or not. A more revealing question, perhaps, was the last one recorded in the table. Overall, only 19% of the 174 respondents said they would prefer to live in a different suburb of Canberra. Because people rationalize what they are stuck with, respondents were asked whether they would still prefer their present suburb even if money was no object, but only a further 11% said they would move. An easy majority of each class in each area preferred their present suburb no matter what. Two groups stand out as being particularly attached to their present area: white-collar respondents in Pearce, manual respondents in Lyons. It could be said of both these groups that they have done well, suburb-wise, for their class. The fact that the Lyons manual minority is so satisfied with their suburb provides the final answer to the argument that they would be better off if they were segregated. It has now been demonstrated that social mix in Canberra has clear cut, dire consequences neither for feelings of social involvement in Canberra as a whole, nor in terms of alienation from and conflict with neighbors, nor, finally, with regard to people's satisfaction with their suburb.

The meaning of a suburb for its residents came out quite unexpectedly and very strongly from this question on suburb preferences. Many of those respondents who wanted to move wanted to find a bigger house (or block), and many of those who wanted to stay did so because
they liked their existing house, would rather have built on to it, etc. "If we had a better house then this area would be fine". "I'd like to live in another house, I suppose it would entail living in another suburb". "The suburb doesn't matter a bit, it's the house and garden - if I could transport that somewhere else I couldn't care less where it was". A suburb was primarily just a place to have a house. Which reinforces the conclusion of chapter 3, that for social relations neighborhoods in Canberra are relatively unimportant.

Suburbs were preferred, not normally for any local community they might offer, but if they had convenient locations, and were "nice": which meant everything from physically attractive to socially desirable (usually non-socially mixed). People who lived in the old inner suburb of Ainslie tended to prize it for its proximity; a few would have preferred a "nicer" old inner suburb such as Campbell or Red Hill, and rather more looked to new suburbs, especially in Belconnen, where they could have a new house (though also where the people were younger; only one respondent mentioned better facilities). People in the new Woden Valley suburbs of Lyons and Pearce, on the other hand, if they did prefer somewhere else usually chose more established inner suburbs like Red Hill, Deakin and Griffith; but some also mentioned the elite new non-socially mixed suburbs of O'Malley and Chapman. One Lyons

9 This attitude is linked, naturally, with the home-centred lifestyles of Canberra people (covered in the next section).

10 Suburbs preferred, and indeed suburbs known about, seemed to follow the same pattern as suburbs lived in by friends etc., described in Chapter 3.
man mentioned O'Malley and was immediately labelled by his wife as a "poshie old thing". There's no doubt that people were aware that suburbs with no government houses were different. A couple of them used the word "elite" themselves.

This section ends with two questions asked directly about government houses and elite suburbs. These questions tapped a few emotions: one Pearce man's immediate response was "Hmm ... would you like a drink? while I think about this ... because this could sound a bit snobby actually". Given that some people were inclined to be righteous and defensive on these issues, it still seems safe to conclude that public opinion (amongst couples with children) in Canberra is quite strongly pro social mix. Indeed public opinion favoured a policy of social mix which was more far-reaching than the present mild one. 60% of respondents thought government houses should be scattered evenly through a suburb, compared with only 24% who supported the present policy of building them quite close together on the level land (174 respondents: 14% ambivalent, 2% indifferent). As few as 32% of respondents agreed with the recent idea of creating occasional suburbs such as Chapman with no government houses at all; though, on the other hand, not all that many (40%) were actually opposed to this idea; quite a few (22%) just didn't see it as having any direct bearing on them, and were indifferent (174 respondents: 6% ambivalent). While there is evidently a large

---

11 Respondents were generally interviewed alone, though the networks chart could sometimes be satisfactorily done by husband and wife simultaneously, and there were a few other deviations from the rule, as when a wife brought in some supper while her husband was being interviewed. The amount of contamination that occurred was felt to be negligible.

12 There were thus a number of people who, while favouring integration of government houses, saw no contradiction in having the odd suburb without any government houses - which bears witness to the complex nature of these questions as well as of people's minds.
body of support for policies of social mix which are even more thorough than Canberra has now, it can be argued that this is a matter on which minority opinion must count as well. Opinions of the classes in each area are given in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6. Attitudes to Government Houses and Elite Suburbs, by Class and Suburb of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class and Suburb of Respondents</th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual &quot;Government houses...&quot;</td>
<td>74% (38)</td>
<td>75% (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar &quot;...should be scattered evenly through a...&quot;</td>
<td>63% (16)</td>
<td>60% (40)</td>
<td>45% (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( % of all respondents with data)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual &quot;...with no government houses&quot;</td>
<td>39% (28)</td>
<td>53% (15)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar &quot;...with a definite opinion&quot;</td>
<td>36% (11)</td>
<td>52% (27)</td>
<td>43% (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: On the first item there were 24 respondents who were ambivalent (especially Lyons white-collar people) and 4 who were indifferent; on the second item there were 11 who were ambivalent and 38 who were indifferent.

Manual people represent a relatively powerless minority in Canberra, but, both in Ainslie (where they are in a residential majority) and in Lyons, three-quarters of them believed government houses should be evenly scattered. White-collar people in these two suburbs were a little cooler than manual people in their support for scattering, but most of them still did support it. Only Pearce white-collar people tended not to be enamoured with scattering - which
is hardly surprising, since they have bought themselves the benefits of having government houses clustered on the lower, flatter land.

As for elite suburbs, these were favoured most by Lyons' people — manual ones equally as much as white-collar ones. This presumably reflects these people's tendency to be status-climbers. No doubt Pearce people would have been even more in favour of elite suburbs, except that they believed their area — half a suburb, rather than a whole suburb, with no government houses — was as good as anyone could get; if whole suburbs were built with no government houses the area they had invested in would be relatively downgraded. Ainslie people, white-collar as well as manual, were most inclined to be anti suburbs with no government houses; they were living in what could be called the corollary: a suburb which had almost all government houses.

Manual workers were just referred to as a relatively powerless minority — with an implication that their opinions and preferences on this matter should count for more. In a situation where market mechanisms still play a large part in the distribution of housing (more than 70% of houses in Canberra are in private hands, for example — see Table 2.1), the poor are the people with the least opportunity to exercise their preferences. If the rich opt for segregation it may be because they know they can end up on the most comfortable side of it; it may not be because they think it is best for the community as a whole. For this reason it is significant that manual workers are strongly in favour of government houses being even scattered. But it is worth noting that there was still a minority amongst the manual people who did not want thorough-going social mix — whether because
they felt inferior to the "high and mighty", or because they knew the "high and mighty" would feel superior to them, or because they felt there were just too many real differences between them. This suggests that there is value in the proposal made in the first section, that social mix should be somewhat gradual.

Social Mix and 'Embourgeoisement'

This section looks in very summary fashion at the question of whether working-class people mixed in with middle-class people have adopted middle-class norms and outlooks. We have seen that manual couples in the mixed area of Lyons have a high proportion of white-collar people in their neighborhood networks - i.e. that social mix can promote relational 'embourgeoisement'. Now we will see whether social mix also makes for normative 'embourgeoisement'. If this does happen, then we can assume that it occurs largely through the mediation of white-collar members of manual people's networks - rather than, say, through home ownership, the mass media, or changes at work, since all of these would equally effect manual workers living by themselves. This, then, would be a very notable example of the influence that is wielded by people's primary social networks.

Goldthorpe et al. (1969) decided that their affluent manual workers had not become middle-class in their perspectives and lifestyles. These workers tended to view their work as a rather unpleasant means of securing an income - their attitude towards it was an instrumental one. Their styles of social life, while being a far cry from those of the traditional working-class community, were not the out-going, organization-joining styles supposed to be characteristic of
the middle-class - rather they tended to lead home- and family-centred lives, which Goldthorpe et al. called "privatised". In their aspirations, for instance with regard to their children, these manual workers still were motivated by material considerations more than the middle class, with its emphasis on status and fulfilment; moreover, while not necessarily seeing society as divided by an unbridgeable gulf between 'us' and 'them', they by no means universally accepted the characteristic middle-class view of society as a status ladder which any individual could climb up - rather they tended to see stratification simply as a matter of money. Goldthorpe et al. apparently did not investigate the effects of social mix on these attitudes - there is no information whether manual workers who lived in middle-class suburbs tended to be any more middle-class in these regards.

Table 5.7 shows how the classes in the three Canberra suburbs varied with respect to norms and perspectives. First of all, it can be seen that, overall, manual people differed from white-collar people on each item. This suggests that the sort of class differences Goldthorpe et al. found in their British study do apply in Canberra, and that working-class people in Canberra have by no means become indistinguishable from middle-class people in their attitudes. Manual workers were more likely to have an instrumental view of work, they belonged to fewer organisations, they were more practised in their use of leisure, they were more likely to mention economic considerations when talking about the jobs they hoped their children might end up in, and they were less inclined to have a "social ladder" view of society. It is worth noting that the differences were not always extremely
Table 5.7. Indicators of 'Embourgeoisement' with respect to Norms and Outlooks by Class and Suburb of Respondents (the table shows percent "yes", of respondents with data, whose number is given in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Attitude to Work (Husbands only)</th>
<th>All Suburbs</th>
<th>Ainslie</th>
<th>Lyons</th>
<th>Pearce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar Manual</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar Attitude to Work</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of More than One Organisation</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Privatised&quot; Non-Work Lives</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations for Children Include Economic Considerations</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A person who has ability and who works hard can always improve his position in society&quot;</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: An instrumental attitude to work means one where the main reason for being in present job was "reasonably good money" or "security", rather than "enjoyment" or "experience and the prospect of advancement". Organisations belonged to excludes nominal membership of trade unions etc. "Privatised" non-work lives are ones where, of the main things done in the morning, afternoon and evening of the previous weekend, activities which were wholly in family and in home were more than 75% of the total of these plus activities outside both family and home. The alternative proposition for the last item was "society is divided so that many people are faced with big obstacles preventing them from improving their position." Refer to Appendix B for more information on these variables.
marked, however. This suggests there may be some 'embourgeoisement' occurring at the level of Canberra as a whole - or at least some convergence between social classes in their life-styles and perspectives.

Looking at differences between suburbs, it is clear that, with respect to most of these attitudes, manual people mixed in with the middle class in Lyons were rather different from the rest of the manual people, and very much the same as white-collar people. Manual people in Lyons were much less likely than those in Ainslie to have an instrumental attitude to work; and they were not as inclined to have privatised leisure lives; and they did not have the same tendency to reject the "social ladder" view of society. On all these counts they were hardly distinguishable from white-collar people, (except that Lyons white-collar people were for some reason white different from all the others on the first item). It is true that with regard to membership of organisations, the opposite pattern occurred: Lyons manual people were much less involved than white-collar people, they were even less involved than Ainslie manual people. Perhaps these Lyons manual people are too preoccupied with developing a home to actually involve themselves in organized activities - they move out of the house/family more than manual people in Ainslie but apparently in a less structured way. And with regard to thinking in economic terms

13 On the other hand, neither were all the differences found by Goldthorpe et al. (1969). Between 48 and 73% of their manual workers had an instrumental attitude to work, compared with 30% of their white-collar workers (p.57). 42% of their manual respondents belonged to more than one organisation compared with 60% of their white-collar respondents (p.93). In each of these cases the differences are comparable to the ones found in the present study. With respect to privatisation of leisure activities virtually no difference was found between manual and white-collar couples (p.107), and Goldthorpe et al. cite this as an example of "normative convergence". They do not present any comparisons between manual and white-collar people with regard to the meaning of child aspirations, or class schemes.
in explaining aspirations for their children, the Lyons manual people were again not the same as white-collar people; this time they were simply no different from the Ainslie manual people. The weight of evidence points to social mix being accompanied by considerable changes in norms and outlooks.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to tell how much these Lyons manual people's norms and attitudes, converging as they in the main do with those of white-collar people, have been affected by social mix as such. One problem is that Lyons manual people differ from Ainslie manual people in level of skill - and thus in level of affluence. Even if this could be controlled for, it is still possible that a manual person goes to live in Lyons because he has certain attitudes in the first place. Bearing in mind these problems we can only conclude that social mix may very possibly, through its effects on primary social networks, dissolve differences between manual and white-collar people in their norms and outlooks. One of the questions that the final section canvasses is whether this is desirable.

To Mix or Not to Mix

... I .... wouldn't be able to live amongst those people. Not being as well off as they are, you'd feel inferior. (storeman, in government house, Ainslie).

are they so much better than us that they have to have a suburb of their own?  (wife of storeman, government house, Ainslie).

... they become a show-place. Sheehan Street and Parkhill Street, [the top streets of Pearce] add something to the city. (clerk, in ex-government house, Ainslie).

if you've got a mixture, it'd educate the people on a lower level. (transport inspector, government house, Ainslie).
I'd like to think I'd be scattered through a suburb ... I suppose if I wasn't in a government house then I'd rather they were kept together. (wife of army officer, government house, Lyons).

They're getting cheap houses. No fuck them they're getting cheap houses. They look ugly and that's the price they pay. (academic, government house, Lyons).

Quite frankly, government homes tend to lower the value of your house. I wouldn't build my house next door to one. (builder, private house, Lyons).

It enriches a society, if it is mixed. If poorer people are separated, it's an invitation for trouble ... (public servant, private house, Pearce).

Not everyone in a government house is a bastard ... (businessman, private house, Pearce).

The policy of social mix has been debated for a long time (see Etherington, 1974), and it is not intended to provide the last word on it here. Rather, there will be a quick review of the main arguments, so that the significance of the present results can be seen in relation to the total question. Each line of argument for social mix has its diametrically opposed counterpart against social mix, reflecting different beliefs about what happens in a social mix situation, or different ideologies. We start with the arguments which depend on social mix being accompanied by interaction between social classes.

1. **Social mix socializes lower classes.** One common rationale for social mix has been that it provides models (admittedly these may be only visual) for the lower classes to follow. An extension of this argument is that social mix provides increased chances of upward social mobility to members of the poorer classes - this is held to be particularly true for children, who are said to gain
from being mixed up with middle-class children in schools. 14
Against this sort of argument it is sometimes felt that such a
socializing process simply exposes poorer people to anxiety and
trauma, when they would be better off sheltered amongst their own
kind, where their own standards prevail. More radically it has
been maintained that social mix is a middle-class plot to divide
and rule, and to undermine working-class culture.

2. **Social mix is culturally enriching.** A less class-centred version
of the above argument is that social mix provides the opportunity
for two-way learning between different cultures: it makes for a
broadening of experiences. Against this view it has been argued
either that social mix does not result in these sort of interchanges,
or that these sort of interchanges will end up completely dissolving
the initial cultural differences - i.e. cultural diversity is
preserved better if different cultures are kept apart.

3. **Social mix avoids conflict.** This argument has a more minimal view
of social mix's effect on people's norms and outlooks than the
previous two: the first one saw people's activities being
altogether changed, the second one saw them being enriched, but this
third argument simply envisages people becoming more tolerant
towards each other's differences. It suggests that social mix
lessens misunderstanding, and so in the long run makes major

14 It should be no surprise to learn that this sort of empirical
issue is extremely hard to settle. Mabey (1974) found that
manual children perform slightly better where there are mainly
white-collar children in the school, though white-collar
children perform much worse where there are mainly manual children
in the school. But Mabey admitted (p.43) that she could not
isolate the effects of social composition as such. On this see
also Ford (1969).
conflict less likely. Against this argument it has been contended that social mix creates the very conflict it is intended to stop, that a better way to avoid conflict is to keep different people apart. (Occasionally social mix has been supported because it does produce conflict: conflict is thought to be vitalizing and challenging).

4. Social mix avoids invidious distinctions. This argument rests on the egalitarian ideal that people are fundamentally the same, so that it is wrong to crowd some people into poky houses on the plain, and allowing others to live in secluded, elevated mansions is just catering for snobbery. This argument underlies in part people's concern to avoid "ghettos" - these stigmatize their inhabitants. Against this, it can be argued that putting a poky house right next door to a mansion creates a much more obvious distinction. (There are purely aesthetic judgements which correspond to these points of view, and also to the ones described under the second argument: for instance it is said that suburbia will be visually more interesting if different houses are mixed up, and on the other hand it is claimed it will be visually more interesting if there are distinctive areas with houses the same).

5. Social mix implies a more equitable distribution of resources. This argument holds that the provision of hospitals, educational institutions, employment, transport facilities and environmental amenity (all aspects of a person's real income) tends to be best in areas where residents are of the highest social class. This is seen to be a cyclical process: high class residents, because of
their wealth - tapped through rates and so on - their organisational abilities and their political clout, tend to generate better facilities in their area; areas where there are better facilities can only be afforded by high class residents. Preventing concentrations of high class or low class residents is a way of equalizing people's quality of life. Against this it can be argued that the convergence of land and house prices likely to result from social mix would penalize poorer people; land commissions and housing authorities could not afford to provide so many blocks and houses if they operated in expensive areas. Social mix may entail other items being more expensive for poorer people: they may have no cheap shops. Furthermore, it has been suggested there are other methods which are superior to social mix for achieving redistribution: negative income tax and equalizing grants to local authorities, for instance. (Of course, if the causal cycle outlined above is correct, these superior methods will result in social mix).

The present study throws no light on this fifth kind of argument for social mix, important though it clearly is. With regard to the fourth argument, impressions gained in the study indicate that invidious distinctions occur where whole suburbs are composed of government houses or of private houses: the suburb name then carries with it a suggestion of "ghetto-like" (e.g. Narrabundah) or "exclusive" (e.g. Chapman). Pearce has an exclusive half, but because the bottom half has government houses the suburb as a whole does not have a distinctive aura. People who live inside Pearce seem to make stronger distinctions - those "horrible" houses - than people in Lyons, where the mix is a finer grain (admittedly there are
not quite the mansions in Lyons that there are in Pearce). Through a mixing policy which is variable (e.g. not closely associating altitude and block/house size), sensitive (e.g. involving a reasonable standard of government houses), and gradual, it should be possible, on the one hand, to avoid huge identifiable tracts of government houses, and, as well, to avoid having the potentially embarrassing situation of a mansion and a "shanty" standing side by side.

The first three arguments, depending as they do on social mix being accompanied by social relations (not necessarily amicable) between social classes, are the ones concerning which the present study can be most helpful. All the same, it is harder to prove that social mix has the positive effects which have been claimed to flow from it, than it is to show that at least in Canberra social mix does not have the negative effects sometimes attributed to it.

Social mix may socialize working-class people into middle-class attitudes and aspirations, as the first argument for social mix hopes. The study has found that working-class people thoroughly mixed in with middle-class people (as in Lyons) are rather different in their attitudes from working-class people living more on their own (as in Ainslie), and in several ways indistinguishable from the middle-class people surrounding them. But it has not been possible to establish whether this is an effect of social mix. And there remains the question of whether such 'embourgeoisement' (or at least convergence between classes) is desirable.

What is clear, however, is that these working-class people living amongst middle-class people are not being deprived of the
rich, traditional, localized community imagined by those arguing against social mix. Working-class people living in an older, predominantly working-class area (like Ainslie) show no significant vestiges of a rural, small-scale, simple society: their networks are not localized, undifferentiated, or close-knit. It is possible for working-class people in a mixed suburb like Lyons to have more neighbors in their networks than those living relatively apart as in Ainslie. And these mixed-in working-class people are not necessarily any further from traditional working-class culture: it is the working-class people in relatively working-class Ainslie who are the most privatized in their leisure lives - not at all middle-class, but utterly cut off from traditional working-class life too.

It seems that working-class networks and attitudes are being modified by factors other than neighborhood social mix - ecological factors on a large scale perhaps, or affluence, or technology. This is not to deny that in cities older than Canberra there are still pockets of the sort of working-class community Young and Willmott (1957) found in East London. But the policy of social mix must be judged within particular situations: it cannot be dismissed as a policy for new cities just because it might be ridiculous to rip working-class people out of East London and scatter them through the West End. Incidentally, this example also highlights the importance of the way social mix is implemented: it would probably not work as well in Canberra if government houses were the last to be built in a suburb rather than the first.

None of the other negative effects on social relations which are feared by those arguing against social mix have been found in the
present study. People in a socially mixed suburb like Lyons, or at least the working-class people there, apparently do not feel any more socially isolated than those living amongst their own class, nor do they feel any more divorced from their neighbors, nor are they any more likely to be involved in problems and conflict with their neighbors, nor are they any more unhappy with their neighborhood. Any problems are likely to be fairly minor, and this reflects the fact that most people's social lives are not heavily lodged in their neighborhoods anyway. Dissatisfaction with neighborly relations seems very rarely to be the reason for preferring to move to another suburb.

To the extent that people's networks are not localized, any arguments, either for or against neighborhood social mix, which focus on the social relations it induces are diminished in significance. For instance, when we remember that most neighborhood networks in Canberra are relatively unimportant, it becomes clear that cultural diversity in such a city is more likely to arise and be maintained on a non-spatial basis: neighborhood mix is unlikely to flatten it out and destroy it. Conversely, neighborhood mix

15 Because of the way house locations are allocated to people (i.e. through each person finding something on the market, or through each person coming to the top of a government waiting list), cultural diversity on a spatial basis is usually only life-cycle stage or class diversity. As well, at least in older cities like Melbourne, migrants from a particular country will sometimes pay more to be in a particular location. If cultural diversity on a spatial basis is favoured, it may be necessary to change allocation systems.
can hardly make cultural interchange an enormously significant part of people's social lives. It is worth noting, though, that if people do not meet others with diverse occupations and interests in the neighborhood then they probably will not have much chance to meet them at all. A person's neighborhood network tends to be the part of his network which is most dissimilar to himself.

Although this study has shown that social mix need not have detrimental results, it must be repeated, finally, that this may not be the case with all forms of social mix. There are several characteristics of social mix as usually practised in Canberra which makes it especially likely to "succeed". One of these, of course, is that it is fairly gradual - it does not throw side by side an extreme range either of house types or of social classes. In addition, it is a policy which applies to new suburbs, into which people move at much the same time and with much the same concerns. It will be interesting to see whether the same extent of inter-class friendliness exists in socially mixed suburbs in ten years' time. It may even be that these suburbs will be less socially mixed then; that segregation will increase over time. It has been pointed out previously, though, that such a process, underpinned by the market, in which the rich have the most choice, would in no way constitute a definitive argument against social mix. Associated with the newness of socially mixed suburbs in Canberra is the similarity of their inhabitants with respect to life-cycle stage, which appears to be a major factor in the friendliness between classes. Not only are the inhabitants similar in this respect, they are also fairly similar in other respects; for example, there is ethnic diversity,
but no clear-cut racial divisions as in America. Social mix may be feasible in Canberra partly because there are no enormous social cleavages to start with.

Most sociological arguments against social mix have come from America, where it is least likely to work (not only because of the society's heterogeneity: another reason is that more services, including schools, are funded from local taxes).
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION - IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The mark of this study has been its concern for the interrelationships between several different characteristics of primary social networks. Rather than concentrating just on neighbors or kin, or confining itself to the effects of density, the study has attempted to examine how these various dimensions of people's primary ties are connected together. The very concept of network has been extremely valuable on this exercise.

The study has thus attempted to cover a wide and still vaguely defined field of social existence - and it has looked back for causes, as well as sideways for interconnections. It has made some sense of primary relations in Canberra using a typology which describes what modern societies are like and suggests what underlies them. This typology is based on the ideas which Barnes (1954) expressed with the help of the network concept - the study can be seen as a first try at examining Barnes' ideas.

The study has found that networks in a city like Canberra do indeed seem dispersed and differentiated, loose-knit and unshared (though for one or two of these characteristics there are hardly any standards for comparison). Moreover, it is apparent that variations in networks within Canberra are explained by the same factors that could be expected to underpin the typology of modern as opposed to traditional societies. Thus the time a person has spent in Canberra was found to affect both the extent his network reached outside Canberra, and the density of his "extra primary" network inside Canberra. Having a job (away from one's place of residence) was another major determinant of network characteristics.
On the other hand, a number of revealing discrepancies have been discovered between the theorized picture of primary social networks and the actual situation in Canberra. There seems to be no strong clustering of network characteristics along the traditional-modern continuum. For example, neighbors were found to be more important in the newest suburbs. This can be understood in terms of some traditional functions of neighbors reappearing in a pioneering situation, and causing a reversion to what could be mistaken for a traditional community. These localized networks were found to be neither close-knit nor undifferentiated. The forces for modernity in Canberra are so prevalent that even a relatively old and comparatively working-class area shows no outstanding signs of an "urban village". Neighboring in new suburbs was suspected of being quite ephemeral. Perhaps modern workmating - most apparent amongst middle-class males - can similarly be illuminated as being quite different from what was involved at the traditional end of the continuum.

The extent to which a person's network is the same sex as he is and is separate from his spouse's network are two characteristics which evidently have considerable repercussions on a person's feelings of social involvement - they have been found to be quite as important as network size and dispersion in this regard, and are useful in demonstrating some of the implications of primary social networks. These two characteristics were added by Bott (2nd. edn., 1971) to density in order to predict segregation of conjugal roles, and the present study is perhaps the first specifically to test her modified hypothesis - without attempting a detailed elaboration or explanation of it. Same sexness and overlap with spouse have turned out to
be more strongly related to conjugal role segregation than density itself. These two characteristics, however, do not appear to be connected to density in any way, and cannot be easily added on to the typology of traditional/modern societies. For instance, the availability of kin makes for the dense networks typical of traditional societies, but also the shared (between spouses) and mixed sex ones thought to be common in mobile, mass societies. The situation is not straight-forward.

Rather than attempting explanations of variations in networks solely in terms of the characteristics of individuals, the study has paid particular attention to the effects of the social environment. The significance of this sort of consideration has been amply indicated - much of the neighboring in the new suburbs, for instance, can be put down to their homogeneity with regard to life-cycle stage. The class composition of neighborhoods was found in the right circumstances to influence the class composition of people's neighborhood networks - the neighborhood may offer a better opportunity than other social environments for contacts between different social classes. The study has gone on to show what has not previously been shown, that the class composition of neighborhoods may even affect, presumably via networks, people's norms and attitudes - though admittedly such effects would be hard to prove. At any rate the study has indicated that 'embourgeoisement', or at least convergence between the working class and the middle class, as a result of ecological factors is a possibility.

The life-cycle stage and class composition of each district and suburb of Canberra have been very helpful, together with proximity, in
understanding the geographical spread of non-neighbor networks around Canberra, and preferences for living in alternative suburbs. The study's findings on these matters could be useful in developing models showing the spatial expressions and determinants of social structure. Canberra is a good illustration of the extent to which the government can modify the market's role in deciding where different sorts of people, and their friends, live.

This leads us from the theoretical implications of the study to the major practical implications, which concern the policy of social mix. The study has sought signs of detrimental effects of the policy - actual or felt isolation, fights with neighbors, preferences for other suburbs, or complaints about the policy - but has found no substantial evidence of any such effects. It has been carefully pointed out that the apparent success of a typical Canberra mixed suburb such as Lyons may be dependent on the suburb's newness or life-cycle stage homogeneity; and that the way the class mix has been practised - it is fairly gradual and subtle - may be critical too. In addition there are other aspects of social mix which were not investigated, and there are value judgements involved even in the aspects that were covered - the question is far from being finally settled. Nevertheless, the findings do provide quite considerable support for social mix.

If there are any other practical pay-offs arising from the study they will be less direct and perceptible, though not necessarily less important. For example, an understanding of the comparatively minor role of neighbors, at least for many people, especially when contrasted with the continuing and prominent role of kin, may be suggestive about the organization and approach of some of those welfare
bureaucracies which are increasingly taking over functions of primary relations.

Of course the study has pointed up more questions than it has settled. Before too much weight is given to many of the findings they really need to be confirmed using larger and more wide-ranging samples. The models illustrating possible causal backgrounds of network characteristics require examining. The methodological problem of comparing the density of different sized networks needs to be overcome. Some of the more way-out ideas which have arisen - such as that people have a choice between small, dense networks and large, loose-knit ones - could be fruitfully followed up. Bott's hypothesis obviously must be tested again, with more attention to the interconnections between network characteristics in different parts of people's networks (e.g. among kin), and with more care about possible spurious correlations produced by outside variables. Similarly, all the questions surrounding social mix and 'embourgeoisement' could be investigated further, perhaps with a design which is a little closer to an experiment. Hopefully the study has at least provided an illustration of the value of studying primary social networks.
THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(It should be noted that some reply pre-codings in Parts II and III of the schedule have been omitted for reasons of space. For codings used to form variables see Appendix B).

Part I. Networks Questionnaire

"The main part of the interview consists of this chart, or questionnaire, which you fill out yourself. It's quite hard work! This part takes about half an hour, then there are a few more questions afterwards.

"We are interested in some of the people you know well, personally - they can be friends, relatives, neighbors, workmates/colleagues, anyone.

In a minute I'm going to ask you to write down the names of some of these people.

- Just first names, and the initials of surnames, are needed. It will be quite impossible for us to identify these people.

- It does not matter whether you put down only one name, or lots of names.

- To start with, just think of people who live in Canberra, or Queanbeyan, at the moment.

1. Now could you first of all write down the names of any people in Canberra you spend a lot of your spare time with.

- Not people living in this house (don't include your husband/wife).

- If there is a married couple, put a bracket round them thus: (show card)

2. Are there any other people in Canberra who come into your house, or whose house you go to, once a fortnight or more? Add their names to the list.

- If you really only see someone because he is the husband or wife of someone else, there's no need to put him down.

3. If you needed to borrow something, or if you wanted any other kind of help, are there any people in Canberra you could go and see? If so, and if not yet mentioned, write them down.
4. Is there anyone else in Canberra who is very important to you? (in a personal way). Write down their names.

Leave a few lines.

5. Now, write down any people outside Canberra you have specially strong ties with and who mean a lot to you (you would definitely visit them if you went to the city or area where they live).

Now go on and answer the questions.

(Interviewer, after first question answered:
   a. For all relatives rule out remaining two questions on page 1 - with asterisk
   b. For people outside Canberra cross off all questions on pages 2 - 5
   c. For relatives in Canberra rule out first question on page 2 - with asterisk last two questions on page 3 - with asterisk).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>How did you come to know this person?</th>
<th>Tick if you have come to know this person while you have been living in Canberra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F - parent/brother/sister of yours</td>
<td>tick one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - one of your children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R - other relative (including any by marriage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tick if you have come to know this person while you have been living in Canberra.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>First name (initial or surname)</th>
<th>F - parent/brother/sister of yours</th>
<th>C - one of your children</th>
<th>R - other relative (including any by marriage)</th>
<th>Tick if you have come to know this person since you have been married</th>
<th>Tick if this person lives within five minutes' walk</th>
<th>Which suburb in Canberra does he live in?</th>
<th>Tick if you see this person (outside work) or speak on the phone once a week or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - parent/ brother/ sister of yours</td>
<td>C - one of your children</td>
<td>R - other relative (including any by marriage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 or F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>What kind of work does he/she do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Put M if this person is a full-time housewife, answer for her husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be as specific as possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>0 - I do not tell this person about my own personal problems</td>
<td>0 - I would not worry very much if I lost contact with this person</td>
<td>0 - I wouldn't normally go to this person if I needed something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - I tell him about some of my personal problems but not all</td>
<td>1 - I'd be a little upset to lose contact with him</td>
<td>1 - I would go to him for small things e.g., an extra pen, a tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - I tell him most of my personal problems</td>
<td>3 - I would be very upset to lose contact with him</td>
<td>2 - I could always ask him for help, e.g., for money, or to look after the children if I was sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>the two people do not know each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>they know each other, but only through you and they continue to know each other just because of you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>they know each other quite apart from you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II. Further Questions

Address: ..................................................

Husband ...... / Wife ...... (tick who is answering)

A. Questions following from questionnaire

1. (Record any comments made while answering questionnaire. Ask for feelings about it - found it difficult? at all surprised at the results? etc. Also ask about obvious characteristics of network - friends of different sorts, in different groups? etc., etc.)

2. Do you have any (other) relatives in Canberra (not put down)? (don't count baby nieces and other children).
   - How many of these (ones not put down) are your brothers or sisters or parents?

3. What about brothers and sisters and parents (if two parents not yet mentioned) living outside Canberra, are there any that you haven't put down?

4. Did you live in Canberra for most of your childhood, up to the age of fifteen, or have you moved to Canberra from somewhere else?
   (If moved to Canberra)

5. Do you find it more difficult to get to know people in Canberra? (if yes) - Why do you think that is?
   (If moved to Canberra)

6. Do you feel you belong to Canberra, or do you still think of some other place as your home? (or no real home?)
   (If some other place) - How often do you go back there?

7. Do you ever feel a bit lonely living in Canberra?

8. Which one of these would you most prefer: (show card)
   (1) to see more of your relatives
   (2) to see more of your neighbours
   (3) to have more or see more of friends?
   (4) none of the above - see enough people already
B. Neighbors. Now I'd like to ask a few questions about the people in this neighborhood - I mean the people who live within about five minutes' walk.

1. Do you have very much to do with them?

2. How many do you know by name? i.e. first name or surname. Include husbands and wives ... but not children.

3. How many would you chat to outside the house - say across the fence - at least once a fortnight?

4. How many of them drop in here (i.e. without invitation), say for a cup of tea, or do you drop in on, at least once a fortnight?

5. What about inviting neighbors around or being invited by them, say for a drink or a meal; how many does that happen with, at least once or twice a year?

6. Are there any neighbours you ever receive help from? e.g. minding the children, advice, lending things. How many?
   - What sort of help?

7. Are there any you sometimes give help to? How many?
   - What sort?

8. Would you say that the people around here are friendly?

9. What sort of people are they? are they pretty much the same as you? or different?
   - In what ways? what are you thinking of? (ask of everyone)

10. Would you like to see more of your neighbors? (if yes) - Is there anything that makes this difficult?

11. Do any problems ever crop up between you and your neighbors? are you ever bothered by them?

(Wives only)

12. What was it like when you first arrived in this neighborhood - were your relations with neighbors any different from what they are now?
(Wives only)

13. How does this neighborhood compare with other neighborhoods you have lived in?

14. Would you prefer to live in a different suburb of Canberra? (If yes) - Which one? Why?
   
   (If no) - Just say money was no object, then would you rather live in a different suburb? (If yes) - Which one? Why?

15. In the new suburbs at the moment government houses are usually built all quite close together on the level land. I'd like to know your opinion of this policy.

Do you agree that gov't houses should be kept together on the level land?

or do you think they should be scattered evenly through a suburb?

- Why?

16. Just recently there are three suburbs which have been built with no government houses: Hawker, Weetangera and Chapman.

Are you in favour of these, or against them?

- Why?

17. In many new suburbs the higher streets have larger blocks of land. Do you think

   certain areas should have only large blocks;
   
   there should be some large blocks, but evenly scattered everywhere;
   
   all blocks should be the same size.

   - Why?

C. Life-styles, etc. Now I'm going to ask just half a dozen general questions about your way of life and your views on various things.

(Husbands only)

1. First of all, about your work. Which is your main reason for being in your present job? (show card)

   (a) reasonably good money got from the job
   
   (b) the security of the job
   
   (c) enjoyment got from the job
   
   (d) experience and the prospect of advancement
(Wives only)

2. First of all, I'd like to ask how you and your husband feel about housework - do you both feel that this is your job, as wife; or that he should share in the work too?

only wife's ... husband a bit ... husband almost equally ...

- Does your husband ever do the shopping? or cook? what about washing up?

doesn't help ... sometimes helps a bit, in an emergency etc. ...

- How about looking after the children - seeing that they are dressed properly, etc. - do you both feel that this is your responsibility, as wife; or that he has part of the responsibility too?

only wife's ... husband a bit ... husband almost equally ...

- What sorts of things does he do for the children?

doesn't help ... sometimes helps a bit ... helps a lot ...

3. (Identify oldest boy - or girl if no boy - not yet left secondary school): Have you got a son at secondary/primary school? is so-and-so your oldest son? etc., etc. What sort of job do you hope that X will eventually end up in? (press a little)

(IF job mentioned) - Why is that? (probe ....)

4. Do you feel that society is divided, so that many people are faced with big obstacles preventing them from improving their position; or do you feel that a person who has ability and who works hard can always improve his position in society? (show card). Which of these views is closest to the truth?

5. A couple of questions about your leisure time. Do you belong to any clubs or organizations or anything like that? Here's a list with some examples of the kind of thing we mean - these are only samples. (show card)

Trade union
Workmen's, servicemen's, national or social club
Political party
Church or church group Baby-sitting group
P. & C. association Sporting club
Social service organization Special interest society

(IF any, ask of each) - Are you just an ordinary member, or have you held any particular position in it?

(ALSO) - Does this organization usually hold meetings in - (this suburb)?
6. I know it's difficult, but could you think back to last weekend - what were the main things you did on each day, in the morning, the afternoon, and the evening? (Main things mean took up most time - only one allowed for each period). (show chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Housework, odd jobs (including gardening)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leisure at home (T.V., reading, relaxing, playing with children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Having visitors at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family outing (a drive, to movies, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Going out, seeing other people (visiting, party, church, sport, club, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working or studying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Are you likely to move from this house in the next three years?

Interviewer: ........................................

(If husband, be sure to ask income question in Part III).
Part III. Background Information - for wife or husband, about both.

1. Address: ........................................

2. Time living in this house.

3. How long have you lived in Canberra, altogether? (i.e. including any previous periods). And your husband/wife (Mr.-/Mrs.-)?

4. Did you live in Canberra (for six months or more) before you were married? What about your husband/wife?

5. How long have you been married?

6. How many different residences have you had in the last 3 years? (if married less than 5 yrs) What about your husband/wife?

7. How many children do you have living at home?

8. How old are they? (each child living at home; age last birthday in years).

9. What schools do your children go to (now)? (all children at school)

10. Do you have any children who live away from home? - How many of these live in Canberra?

11. Are there any other people, besides your children, living with you? - Who are they? (e.g. wife's mother)

12. Country (nationality) of birth; if not Australia, length of residence. (Husband and wife).

13. What year were you born in? And your husband/wife?

14. Up to the age of fifteen, did you mainly live in cities, in country towns (i.e. of less than 20,000), out of towns? (Also spouse)

15. What grade were you in when you left school? (Also spouse)
16. Have you had any education or training since leaving school? (Also spouse).

17. What has been, or was (vary with age), the main sort of work done by your father? (be specific). (Also spouse's father).

About husbands
18. What is your/your husband's present job? What exactly do you do? (skill level? no. of employees? etc.)

19. Have you/has he had any other main jobs before the present one? (or a year or more).

20. About how many hours a week, if any, do you/does he work overtime or on a second job? or as a part-time student?

About wives
21. Do you/does your wife work at all?

22. What is your/her job, or was your/her main job before getting married?

(Husband to answer)
23. We would like a rough idea of your gross family income - i.e. husband's and wife's combined, including any overtime or income from other sources, and before paying tax. Which of these categories does it come into? (show card)

(1) $2,000 or less a year, gross (i.e. $0-38 gross per week)
(2) $2,001-3,000
(3) $3,001-4,000
(4) $4,001-5,000
(5) $5,001-6,000
(6) $6,001-7,000
(7) $7,001-8,000
(8) $8,001-10,000
(9) $10,001-12,000
(10) $12,001-15,000
(11) $15,001-20,000
(12) over $20,000

24. Do you have a phone?

25. Have you any cars? (If at least one car) - Is one available to (the wife) during the day?
26. Do you rent this house, or own (are buying) it?

27. Were you amongst the first people to live in this area, or did you come later?
VARIABLES

Below is set out for each variable the question on which it is based (refer to Appendix A), the categories used and their marginal frequencies, and the extent of missing data (MD).

Network Characteristics
(all of these are based on Part I of the Interview Schedule - the Networks Questionnaire).

Number in Canberra. From initial list of names. 0-10, 86; > 10, 88. MD, 0.

Number Outside Canberra. From initial list. 0-8, 84; > 8, 90. MD, 0.

Number "Extra Primary" (of those in Canberra). Initial list scoring 3+ on page 4 items summed. 0-6, 93; > 6, 81. MD, 0.

Percent Neighbors (of no. in Canberra). 2nd page of Networks Questionnaire. 0-27%, 85; > 27%, 87. MD (because no. in Canb. = 0), 2.

Percent Relatives (of no. in Canb.). Column next to initial list. 0-20%, 134; > 20%, 38. MD, 2.

Percent Workmates (of no. in Canb.). 3rd page. 0%, 88; > 0%, 84. MD, 2.

Percent Other Friends (of no. in Canb.). Those not neighbors, relatives or workmates. 0-48%, 83; > 48%, 89. MD, 2.

Density of "Extra Primary" Network. 5th page. 0-69%, 82; > 69%, 83. MD (including 8 because no. "extra primary" = 0), 9.

Total Overlap with Spouse. Percent of total in and outside Canb. also listed by spouse. 0-40%, 93; > 40%, 81. MD, 0.

"Extra Primary" Overlap with Spouse. Percent of "extra primary" also "extra primary" for spouse. 0-35%, 83; > 35%, 83. MD (because no. "extra primary" = 0), 8.

Percent Same Sex of "Extra Primary" Network. 3rd page. 0-67%, 87; > 67%, 79. MD (because no. "extra primary" = 0), 8.


Independent Variables

Sex. No question. Male, 87; female, 87. MD, 0.

Suburb. Part III of Interview Schedule, Q.1. Ainslie, 54; Lyons, 60; Pearce, 60. MD, 0.

Children's Median Age. Part III, Q.8. 0-4 years, 56; 5-11 years, 54; > 11 years, 64. MD, 0.

Canberra Time. Part III, Q.3. 0-8 years, 96; > 8 years, 78. MD, 0.

House Time. Part III, Q.2. 0-4 years, 79; > 4 years, 95. MD, 0.

Pioneers in the Area. Part III, Q.27. No, 90; yes, 84. MD, 0.

Ownership of House. Part III, Q.26. Renting, 64; own or buying, 110. MD, 0.

Expected Mobility. Part II, C, Q.7. Not at all likely to move, 85; possibly, likely, definitely will move, 89. MD, 0.

Childhood Community. Part III, Q.14. In cities (i.e. > 20,000 population), 92; out of cities, 82. MD, 0.


Class. Part III, Q.18; and see classification in Appendix C. Manual, 60; white-collar, 114. MD, 0.

Relatives Available. Part I, column next to list of names, and Part II, Q.2. No, 95; yes, 79. MD, 0.

Children's Schools. Part III, Q.9. Mainly to local, government schools, 84; other schools, 82. MD (because no children of school age), 48.

Husband Works Extra. Part III, Q.20. 0-10 hours a week, 38; > 10 hours, 49. MD, 0.

Wife Works. Part III, Q.21. No, 80; part-time or full time, 94. MD, 0.

Wife's Use of a Car. Part III, Q.25. Does not drive, or has use of car < 4 times/week, 28; 4 or more times/week, 59. MD, 0.

Having a Phone. Part III, Q.24. No, 38; yes, 136. MD, 0.

Road. Part III, Q.1. Cul-de-sac, 44; small road, 76; through road, 54. MD, 0.
Other Variables

Conjugal Role Segregation. Part II, C, Q.2. Summing to 5-8 (joint roles), 37; 0-4 (segregated roles), 50. MD, 0.

Harder to Know People. Part II, A, Q.5. Definitely no, 105; yes, 58. MD (including 8 because had not moved to Canberra), 11.

Belong. Part II, A, Q.6. Belong elsewhere or nowhere, 40; belong in Canberra, 124. MD (including 8 because had not moved to Canberra), 10.


Neighbors Different from Respondent. Part II, B, Q.9. No, 82; yes, 88. MD (includes don't know), 4.

Neighbors of Different Class. Part II, B, Q.9. Not different, or not different in terms of class, 134; different in terms of class, 36. MD, 4.

Neighbors Friendly. Part II, B, Q.8. Not friendly, 37; friendly or very friendly, 137. MD, 0.

Prefer Present Suburb, Even if Money No Object. Part II, B, Q.14. Prefer different suburb, 53; prefer present one, even if money no object, 121. MD, 0.

Government Houses Opinion. Part II, B, Q.15. Should be kept together, 42; should be scattered, 104; ambivalent, 24; indifferent, 4. MD, 0.

Elite Suburbs Opinion. Part II, B, Q.16. Against, 70; in favour, 55; ambivalent, 11; indifferent, 38. MD, 0.

Instrumental Attitude to Work. Part II, C, Q.1. Enjoyment or experience, 50; money or security, 34. MD, 3.

Member of More than One Organization. Part II, C, Q.5. 0-1 organizations, 78; > 1 organization, 96. MD, 0.

"Privatized" Non-Work Lives. Part II, C, Q.6. Percent housework, odd jobs, and leisure at home of this plus going out, seeing other people. 0-75%, 89; > 75%, 82. MD (no activities totally intra- or extra- home and family), 3.

Aspirations for Children Include Economic Considerations. Part II, C, Q.3. Economic considerations not mentioned, 73; mentioned, 22. MD (includes children too young and no particular aspirations), 79.

Class Scheme. Part II, C, Q.4. Society is divided, 38; a person can improve his position, 96. MD, 6.
APPENDIX C

THE CLASSIFICATION OF OCCUPATIONS

The classification of occupations set out below is based largely on the one used by Goldthorpe et al. (1969). It differs slightly from the classification by Broom, Jones and Zubrzycki (1965) which is most commonly used in Australia - and indeed which was used in this study to draw a social map of Canberra - in that where possible it grades people according to the size of their business, their rank in the armed services and public service, etc., rather than their occupation as such. This ranking within occupations owes something to the scheme used in analyzing results from the Canberra Mental Health Survey, which was worked out in conjunction with the Department of Labour and National Service - see Hennessy et al. (1973). Some adjustments to Goldthorpe et al.'s classification were made because of Australian conditions (e.g. shop assistants were classified as semi-skilled manual workers), but on the whole it was felt to be a good one to follow, especially in examining 'embourgeoisement'.

White-collar occupations.

1. Professional, senior managerial, large businessmen. (Public Service clerks class 9 and above, armed services officers of Lt. Colonel or the equivalent, and above, secondary or higher level teachers, graziers, scientists, engineers, etc.).

2. Semi-professional, junior managerial, medium businessmen. (Public service clerks class 4-8, other armed services officers, primary school teachers, dairy farmers, nurses, surveyors, librarians, computer programmers).

3. Technicians, clerical, salesmen, small proprietors, officials. (Public service clerks below class 4, and clerical assistants, bank cashiers, small shop proprietors, insurance assessors, draftsmen, laboratory technicians, small builders, stenographer/secretaries, police constables, bookkeepers, receptionists, typists, telephonists).

Manual occupations.

4. Supervisory manual workers, or self-employed manual workers (no employees or expensive capital equipment). (Bus inspector, jobbing window cleaner, bricklaying subcontractor, self-employed plumber, taxi owner-driver, meter-reader).
5. **Skilled manual workers (usually with apprenticeship).**
   (Craftsmen and tradesmen, not self-employed: e.g. fitters, mechanics, butchers, electricians, carpenters, painters, bricklayers, compositors, hairdressers).

6. **Semi-skilled manual workers.**
   (Machine and plant operators, assemblers and process workers, non-proprietary drivers, shop assistants, postmen, electrical linesmen, waitresses, storemen).

7. **Unskilled manual workers.**
   (Builder's labourers, cleaners or gardeners not self-employed, packers, nightwatchmen, workers on railways, domestics).
### Table D.1. Correlations between Other Network Characteristics and Independent Variables (Yule's Q or gamma).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Number &quot;Extra Primary&quot; (hi=6)</th>
<th>Percent Relatives (hi=20%)</th>
<th>Percent Workmates (hi=0%)</th>
<th>Percent Other Friends (hi=48%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (hi = wives)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.81 *</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb (lo = Ainslie, med = Lyons, hi = Pearce)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.48 *</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Median Age</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.76 *</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Time</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneers in the Area</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of House</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.36 *</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community (hi = not in cities)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.34 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.36 *</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Available</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.00 *</td>
<td>-.30 *</td>
<td>-.36 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Schools (hi = not govt. local ones) (N = 126)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Works Extra (N = 87)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Works (N = 87)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>1.00 *</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Use of Car (N = 87)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Phone</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.39 *</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.37 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road (lo = cul-de-sac, med = small, hi = through)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* statistically significant at the .025 level.

Note: N=172 for the three network characteristics which are proportions, and apart from that N=174 unless otherwise indicated.
Table D.2. Correlations amongst Network Characteristics
(Yule's Q).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Canberra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Outside Canberra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &quot;Extra Primary&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Neighbors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Relatives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Workmates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Other Friends</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of &quot;Extra Primary&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Density contr. No. &quot;Extra Prim.&quot;)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(-.39)</td>
<td>(-.12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(-.37)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(-.14)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Overlap with Spouse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Extra Primary&quot; Overlap with Spouse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>(.17)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Same Sex of &quot;Extra Prim.&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>(-.20)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Independent Variables
Table D.3. Correlations amongst Independent Variables  
(Yule's Q)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (wives)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb (Pearce)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Median Age</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Time</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneers in the Area</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of House</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Available</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Schools</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Works Extra</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Works</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Use of Car</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Phone</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband Works Extra</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Works</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Use of Car</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a Phone</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D.4. Total Number of Non-Neighbor Contacts Living in Each Suburb, by Suburb of Respondent
(figures are for respondents in Ainslie, then Lyons, and then Pearce in each case. Note that differences in overall figures are often due to differences in suburb size).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belconnen</th>
<th>South Canberra</th>
<th>Woden</th>
<th>Queanbeyan Etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranda</td>
<td>18, 4, 20</td>
<td>Deakin</td>
<td>4, 8, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>16, 2, 7</td>
<td>Forrest</td>
<td>2, 0, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn</td>
<td>4, 6, 0</td>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>10, 1, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker</td>
<td>1, 5, 7</td>
<td>Narrabundah</td>
<td>23, 16, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins</td>
<td>9, 9, 3</td>
<td>Red Hill</td>
<td>6, 12, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>7, 5, 0</td>
<td>Yarralumla</td>
<td>5, 20, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham</td>
<td>7, 2, 1</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor</td>
<td>3, 12, 0</td>
<td>(Barton, Fyshwick, Kingston,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>9, 0, 1</td>
<td>Manuka)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scullin</td>
<td>14, 6, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weetangera</td>
<td>11, 3, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Evatt, Macquarie, Melba, not spec.)</td>
<td>9, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| North Canberra  |                          |                                 |                                       |
|-----------------|                          |                                 |                                       |
| Ainslie         | 35, 8, 3                 | Chifley                         | 1, 18, 13                             |
| Braddon         | 7, 3, 0                  | Curtin                          | 12, 71, 22                            |
| Campbell        | 18, 8, 34                | Duffy                           | 4, 13, 9                              |
| Dickson         | 15, 3, 12                | Farrer                          | 12, 23, 30                            |
| Downer          | 13, 11, 1                | Fisher                          | 13, 15, 10                            |
| Hackett         | 21, 5, 15                | Garran                          | 9, 9, 23                              |
| O'Connor        | 30, 19, 8                | Holder                          | 4, 6, 10                              |
| Reid            | 14, 2, 4                 | Hughes                          | 4, 15, 48                             |
| Turner          | 15, 2, 8                 | Lyons                           | 1, 12, 19                             |
| Watson          | 29, 7, 5                 | Mawson                          | 9, 12, 10                             |
| Fairbairn/      |                          | Pearce                          | 5, 12, 15                             |
| Duntroo         | 12, 7, 1                 | Rivett                          | 2, 13, 4                              |
| Other           |                          | Torrens                         | 3, 13, 22                             |
| (City, Lyneham, Piallago) | 6, 3, 7           | Waramanga                       | 0, 17, 12                             |
|                 |                          | Weston                          | 2, 29, 3                              |
|                 |                          | Other                           |                                       |
|                 |                          | (Chapman, Phillip, not spec.)   | 2, 2, 3                               |

Queanbeyan Etc.

| Queanbeyan      | 26, 16, 9                 |                                 |                                       |
| Other           |                          |                                 |                                       |
| (Symonston, Hall etc.) | 3, 1, 4    |                                 |                                       |
Table D.5. Mean Percentage of Non-Kin Networks Met in Various Ways (figures in brackets compare husbands and wives)

"How did you come to know this person?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met in Canberra (husbands, wives)</th>
<th>Met Outside Canberra (husbands, wives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living within 5 minutes' walk</td>
<td>28 (23, 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school/college/university</td>
<td>1 (1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working together</td>
<td>20 (30, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through my children</td>
<td>5 (3, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through my husband/wife</td>
<td>14 (10, 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through other relatives, or friends</td>
<td>12 (15, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From an organisation or interest</td>
<td>15 (17, 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 (6, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of respondents with contacts/data: 170 (Canberra), 123 (Outside Canberra)

Mean contacts with no data (N = 174): 0.1 (Canberra), 1.0 (Outside Canberra)

Mean total no. of contacts (N = 174): 9.9 (Canberra), 5.1 (Outside Canberra)

Note: For each respondent with at least one contact with data, the percentage of his contacts made in each way was found - contacts with no data being excluded. The table shows the mean of these percentages for all these respondents.

Comment: The most striking comparison is that on average 28% of people met in Canberra were met through being neighbors as against only 10% of people met outside Canberra. This was quite contrary to what was originally expected, but it is far easier to understand in the light of the picture which has gradually been built up in chapter 3. First of all, it should be pointed out that relationships with neighbors in general tend to be short-lived, each person having a big turnover in them as he or they move; thus a person living anywhere would tend on the whole to have
current neighbors rather than past neighbors in his network. More than this, however, it is clear that neighbors provide an important immediate source of social contacts for people, particularly house-bound women, moving into a new city. They seldom provide very close social relationships - though they are used for talking about problems - and the longer a person lives in a city the more the initial importance of neighbors fades. In addition neighbors are presumably most important to married couples with children at home; many of the contacts outside Canberra would have been made before people reached this life-cycle stage. The other very striking comparisons are that men are far more likely to make friends through work (both in Canberra and out) than women, and women are far more dependent on their spouse as a source of friends. Obviously joint friends are usually derived from the husband.
DEVELOPING CAUSAL MODELS USING YULE'S Q

The procedure for developing causal models using Yule's Q is described in detail in chapter 5 of Davis (1971). In short, particular causal models correspond to particular patterns of correlations. Given a three-variable model, six predictions about correlations can be made. It is only a little more difficult to develop a model than it is to test a model, although a model that has been developed is clearly not as well supported as one that has been tested. The sign of any causal link had normally to be the same as the partial, and the sign of the differential minus the partial had to equal the product of the signs of the causal links involving the third variable. Theoretical considerations must be used in developing models, especially in deciding on the direction of causal relationships.

A summary of this kind of analysis for the major correlates of size of Canberra networks follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Pair</th>
<th>Zero-Order Q</th>
<th>Partial Controlling 3rd Variable</th>
<th>Differential minus Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility/Canberra Number</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Canberra Number</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.08 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility/Class</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is the only one of the six figures in the last two columns which does not fit the model, and it is in the right direction. It is assumed that partials, and differentials minus partials, are significant if they are ≥ .10 or ≤ -.10, which is the criterion recommended by Davis but may be dubious for the present sample.
### Variable Pair and Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Pair</th>
<th>Zero-Order Q</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Differential minus Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility/Canberra Number</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives Available/Canberra Number</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.06 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility/Relatives Available</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Diagram:

```
Expected Mobility ←                                      Canberra Number
```

#### Notes:

- * Does not fit the model, though in the right direction.

### Additional Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Pair</th>
<th>Zero-Order Q</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Differential minus Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility/Canberra Number</td>
<td>-.29 +</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.17 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Schools/Canberra Number</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Mobility/Children's Schools</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Diagram:

```
Expected Mobility ←                                      Canberra Number
```

#### Notes:

- For the 126 cases where children went to school and thus there was data on the third variable.

* This figure should have been negative according to the model. It is hard to see how to correct the model. It is possible the link between expected mobility and children's schools can be explained by Canberra number but this doesn't help the fit. There is evidence for specification or interaction: for people whose children went to local government schools there was a negative correlation (-.51) between expected mobility and Canberra number, for people whose children didn't go to these schools there was a positive correlation (+.41); for the non-mobile there was no correlation (.02) between children's schools and Canberra number while for the mobile there was a positive correlation (.77) between children going to non-local, non-government schools and Canberra number. This may indicate distinctions between the enforced mobility of say Air Force workers, and more ambitious mobility. The chi squares - see Davis, 1971, p.100 - are significant but one cell has only 3 cases.
Table E.1 shows the relevant statistics for developing causal models explaining size of network outside Canberra.
Table E.1. Statistics Testing Correlates of Outside Canberra Network Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Pair</th>
<th>Zero-Order Q</th>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Diff. minus Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Number Outside</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>Childhood Community</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community/Number Outside</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Childhood Community</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>Number Outside</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time/Number Outside</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Number Outside</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>Canberra Time</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time/Class</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>Number Outside</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time/Number Outside</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>Children's Schools</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Schools/Number Outside</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>Canberra Time</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra Time/Children's Schools</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>Number Outside</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community/Number Outside</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant/Number Outside</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>Childhood Community</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community/Migrant</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>Number Outside</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community/Number Outside</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Number Outside</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>Childhood Community</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community/Class</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>Number Outside</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community/Number Outside</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>Children's Schools</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Schools/Number Outside</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>Childhood Community</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Community/Children's Schools</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>Number Outside</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Number Outside</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>Children's Schools</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Schools/Number Outside</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Children's Schools</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>Number Outside</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ For 126 cases where children attend school.

* Does not quite fit the suggested model.
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