1

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963 A

35528

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

CANADIAN THESES
ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES
SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR Allen Turnbull

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE Privacy, Community, and Activity Space: An Exploratory

Investigation

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ Carleton University

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/
GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE Ph.D.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ 1977

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE Dr. L. Strickland

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF
CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies
of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

*L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈ-
QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et
de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.*

*L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la
thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés
ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.*

DATED/DATE

Sept 1977

SIGNED/SIGNÉ

Allen Turnbull

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXE

c/o Psychology Dept., Carleton U. Ottawa, Canada

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

Privacy, Community, and Activity Space:

An Exploratory Investigation

by

Allen A. Turnbull, Jr.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, June, 1977

©

Allen A. Turnbull

1977

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies acceptance of the thesis

"Privacy, Community, and Activity Space:
An Exploratory Investigation"

submitted by

Allen A. Turnbull, Jr.

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis Supervisor

Chairman, Department of Psychology

Carleton University

June, 1977

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present research project was first to determine through the development of an attitude inventory, the nature of the relationships among the concepts Privacy, Community, and Activity Space. The second objective was to test several theoretical proposals concerning Privacy, Community, and Activity Space in the urban environment. A third aim was to explore the usefulness of social network mapping in understanding an urban dweller's attitudes and behavior.

In this study, Privacy was defined as "control over access to one's self or to one's group". Community was defined as "engagement in a close-knit web of meaningful relationships with others", and Activity Space was defined as "the area within which one typically conducts his activities".

An inventory to measure individual preferences for various levels of Privacy, Community, and Activity Space was constructed, and further analysis confirmed the reliability and validity of the inventory.

The data pertaining to the possible interrelationships revealed that Privacy and Community were not polar opposites, although a small negative correlation did exist between the two concepts ($r = -.25$). No relationship emerged between Privacy and Activity Space ($r = -.03$), but a significant relationship did exist between Community and Activity Space ($r = .42$).

Following from a congruence model, it was hypothesized that a large imbalance between "Desired" and "Achieved" levels of Privacy, Community

and Activity Space would result in dissatisfaction with (1) one's house, (2) one's neighborhood, (3) one's life in general, and that (4) higher anxiety levels would accompany any large imbalances. Little support was obtained for any of these hypotheses. Several explanations were presented to account for these findings.

The social network mapping results revealed that "network connectedness" was not related to measures either of anxiety or of life satisfaction; nor to measures of Desired and Achieved Privacy, Community, or Activity Space. Positive correlations were obtained between "network connectedness" and the number of friends who lived in one's neighborhood and the number of activities conducted in one's neighborhood. The potential usefulness and limitations of social network analysis was discussed briefly.

In summary, a heuristic model of independence among privacy, community, and activity space was generally confirmed. Furthermore, most of the urban residents sampled had achieved a close balance between Desired and Achieved levels of Privacy, Community, and Activity Space. Overall, the individuals interviewed were satisfied with their immediate environment and were experiencing few negative sentiments.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to the members of my Thesis Committee, Professors Lloyd Strickland, John Barefoot, Bryan Laver, Clarence Aasen, and Thomas Ryan for their suggestions and guidance in planning this research. Without their collective advice and encouragement this research could not have been completed. I am also grateful to Richard Davies and Inta Guild for their diligence in conducting the interviews and distributing the various questionnaires. Appreciation is also extended to the many members of the Glebe Neighborhood who so graciously gave of their time to facilitate collection of the data. Finally, I would like to thank Anne Dalton, Renée Gauvin, and Sally Luce for their help at various stages of this project and their continued empathy and good humour.

This research was supported in part by Canada Council Grant S74-0371.

Table of Contents

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	PRIVACY	4
	1. Definition of Privacy	5
	2. The Need for Privacy	12
	3. Types of Privacy	14
	4. Privacy Regulation Models	18
	5. Privacy Hypotheses	23
III	COMMUNITY	25
	1. Definition of Community	25
	2. The Need for Community	30
	3. Community Regulation Models	34
	4. Community Congruence Hypotheses	35
IV	ACTIVITY SPACE	38
	1. Activity Space Research	39
	2. Activity Space Hypotheses	42
V	RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PRIVACY, COMMUNITY, AND ACTIVITY SPACE	44
	1. Privacy and Community	44
	2. Privacy and Activity Space	50
	3. Community and Activity Space	52
VI	DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIRED PCA INVENTORY	53
	1. Initial Item Selection	53
	2. Final Item Selection	57
VII	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DESIRED PCA INVENTORY	63
	1. Characteristics of the Sample	63
	2. Reliability Information	64
	3. Validity Information	67
	4. Achieved PCA Inventory	73
	5. Relationships Among the Privacy, Community, and Activity Space Scales	74
VIII	THE GLEBE INTERVIEW	79
	1. Demographic PCA Results	80
	2. Desired and Achieved Congruency	82
	3. Privacy and Individual Differences	91
	4. Social Network Analyses	94
	5. Local Activity Performance and the PCA Inventories	95

Chapter

Page

	6. Relationship of the PCA Inventories to Environmental Factors	100
	7. Environmental Response Inventory Results	102
IX	SUMMARY	106
	1. Summary of the Research Project	106
	2. A Note on the Research Approach	113
	REFERENCES	116
	LIST OF APPENDICES	127

List of Tables

		<u>Page</u>
Table 1	Thirteen Definitions of Privacy	6
Table 2	Marshall's (1970) Privacy Preference Scale Items by Factor Analysis Loadings	16
Table 3	Final Desired Privacy Item - Total Score Correlation Coefficients for Sample A and Sample B	60
Table 4	Final Desired Community Item - Total Score Correlation Coefficients for Sample A and Sample B	61
Table 5	Final Desired Activity Space Item - Total Score Correlation Coefficients for Sample A and Sample B ..	62
Table 6	Hypothetical Descriptions of Persons with Very Low or Very High Preferences for Privacy, Community, and Activity Space	68
Table 7	Desired and Achieved PCA Inventory Characteristics (Glebe Sample, n = 60)	75
Table 8	Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between the Subscales on the Desired PCA and Achieved PCA Inventories	76
Table 9	Desired and Achieved Privacy, Community, and Activity Space Scores by Demographic Factors	81
Table 10	Satisfaction with House by Desired - Achieved PCA Congruency Scores	84
Table 11	Neighborhood Satisfaction by Desired - Achieved PCA Congruency Scores	85
Table 12	Present Life Satisfaction by Desired - Achieved PCA Congruency Scores	87
Table 13	Anxiety Scores by Desired - Achieved PCA Congruency Scores	88
Table 14	Anxiety, Life Satisfaction, Activities Within the Neighborhood and Percentage of Activities Within the Neighborhood by Four Levels of Network Connectedness	96

		<u>Page</u>
Table 15	Achieved and Desired Levels of Privacy, Community, and Activity Space by Network Connectedness	97
Table 16	Correlation Coefficients Between Where Activities are Routinely Conducted and Desired and Achieved Privacy, Community, and Activity Space :.....	99
Table 17	Correlation Coefficients Relating the Environmental Response Inventory to Various Items in the Glebe Interview	104

List of Figures

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 1 Overview of Relationships between Privacy, Personal Space, Territory and Crowding	19
Figure 2 Idealized Activity Space Profiles	40
Figure 3 Profile Sheet used to Classify Individuals as High or Low on the Three Desired PCA Scales	70
Figure 4 Hypothetical Placement of Four Different Privacy Ranges	109

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Friends will be much apart. They will respect
more each other's privacy than their communion.

H.D. Thoreau (1841)

"Privacy", "community", and "activity space" are frequent topics of discussion among social scientists, philosophers, lawyers, architects and urban planners. To be sure, the task of coming to an unambiguous and comprehensive understanding of either privacy (see Margulis, 1974), community, (see Clark, 1973), or activity space, (see Buttimer, 1972), presents a formidable problem. Understanding the complexities of the interrelationships among privacy, community, and activity space presents even more difficulties (see Chermayeff & Alexander, 1963; Keller, 1970; Keyes, 1973; Madge, 1969; Slater, 1970, 1974).

Many questions immediately confront the researcher approaching these concepts from the perspective of environmental psychology. Focusing first on the concept of privacy, the following questions might arise: How should privacy be defined? Is privacy a unidimensional or multidimensional concept? Is some degree of privacy necessary for the physical and psychological well-being of man? If so, how much privacy is needed, and to what extent can man adapt to changes in the level of privacy attained? Do individuals differ widely in their attitudes toward privacy? If so, are these attitudes and preferences related to privacy seeking behaviors? Do individuals in different life-cycle stages vary in their desire for different levels of privacy? Do members of some cultures adapt more easily to different levels of privacy than others? Are absolute levels

of privacy decreasing, increasing, or remaining constant in contemporary Western society? How might modern man insure the degree of privacy he deems necessary? Are psychological mechanisms alone sufficient to obtain desired privacy, or is it necessary to include the built environment as well when assessing privacy realization?

The concepts of community and activity space invite similar questions. The substitution of "community" and "activity space" for "privacy" in the questions above would not diminish the importance of obtaining adequate answers.

Of course, it would be unfeasible to consider all of these questions in one research project; nevertheless, the present endeavor was an attempt to answer several questions that seemed most important for future research in this area. The primary aim was to construct an attitudinal inventory to measure preferences for privacy, community, and activity space, in order to assess the possible interrelationships among the three concepts. A secondary aim was to relate such expressed preferences to behavior relevant for privacy, community, and activity space in the urban environment. A third aim was to explore the usefulness of mapping an urban resident's social network for understanding his attitudes and behavior.

Several theoretical models have been proposed by social scientists to explain the dynamics of these concepts. In addition, much general speculation concerning privacy, community, and activity space exists in popular literature. But in general, little empirical data is available to confirm or disconfirm the various proposals and speculation. This

research endeavor was viewed as an essential first step in the process of unravelling the complexities associated with these three concepts.

The present paper is divided into separate chapters, representing different phases of the research program. A large part of this investigation involved an attempt to integrate some of the diverse literature on privacy, community, and activity space. Accordingly, Chapters II, III, and IV are devoted to discussing each concept in detail. Working definitions are proposed; these are followed in Chapter V by a discussion of the possible interrelationships among the concepts. Chapter VI discusses the method used to construct the Privacy, Community, and Activity Space Inventory, and Chapter VII continues the discussion of the inventory by presenting its characteristics in detail. Chapter VIII presents the findings of intensive field interviews with urban residents. The interviews employed the Privacy, Community, and Activity Space Inventory as well as other attitudinal inventories. In closing, Chapter IX summarizes the major results of the research project and surveys possible directions for future research in this area of environmental psychology.

The research hypotheses to be tested in the present study are presented throughout the background chapters after discussion of the relevant literature. This sequence of presentation should facilitate linkage to the relevant literature bearing on each hypothesis.

CHAPTER II

PRIVACY

There is no such thing as solitude, nor anything that can be said to be alone and by itself, save God.

Thomas Browne¹ (1642).

During the last decade, the concept of privacy has become an increasingly popular research area for social scientists (Altman, 1975; Bates, 1964; Kelvin, 1973; Madge, 1966; Pennock & Chapman, 1971; Schwartz, 1968; Westin, 1967). This recent research reflects both theoretical and applied concerns. Even though the word "privacy" is not included in discussions of most social psychological research findings, often privacy as a broad concept is implicitly assumed at some level. A number of traditional social psychological models clearly rest on assumptions about privacy, yet few such theories discuss the concept (e.g., Zajonc's social facilitation theory, 1965, and Schachter's affiliation theory, 1959). Other research areas, such as self-disclosure, (Bridge, 1973; Cozby, 1973), evaluation apprehension, (Rosenberg, 1969), and territoriality and crowding, (Edney, 1974; Evans & Howard, 1973) have also been concerned with privacy at some level. The importance of a theoretical understanding of the concept of privacy becomes paramount, since assumptions about privacy seem to underlie a large body of social psychological literature.

Additionally, the recent increase in privacy research mirrors the relevance of the applied implications of such investigations. A general alarm exists over invasions of privacy that seem to be increasing daily (see Miller, 1971; Packard, 1967; Rule, 1974).

Indeed, the development of sophisticated surveillance devices has transformed certain fantasies in Orwell's 1984 into technological realities and has prompted both the Canadian and American governments to create special commissions to study the complex issue of an individual citizen's privacy vis-a-vis the schools, government, and private industry (see Sawyer & Schechter, 1968; Weissstub & Gotlieb, 1974). Numerous recent articles and books concerned with "invasions of privacy" attest to the sense of urgent relevance that has developed around the applied aspects of privacy.

1. Definition of Privacy

The question, "What is Privacy?" is not easily answered. As Margulis (1974) has pointed out, the concept of privacy is "experientially obvious but conceptually frustrating". However, several common themes relating to privacy seem to emerge in the definitions presented in Table 1. These definitions were selected from the most frequently cited social science literature on privacy. Considerable agreement seems to exist on three elements central to the definition of privacy as a broad concept; these are: (1) freedom of choice, (2) control over output and input, and (3) the hypothetical construct of interpersonal boundaries. Each of these elements will be briefly discussed.

Freedom of Choice

Each of the definitions of privacy listed in Table 1 includes the freedom of choice theme as a central element of privacy. Altman (1974), speaks of "regulation and control"; Bates, (1964) speaks of the self as "involved in excluding . . . other persons from knowledge in the person's possession". The other definitions

Table 1

Thirteen Definitions of Privacy

Freedom of Choice	Control over Output	Control over Input	Inter-personal Boundary
-------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------------

Altman (1974) "Privacy is an interpersonal boundary process, i.e., a series of events involving regulation and control of social interaction of "permeability" of the self to others."

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

Bates (1964) "Privacy . . . is a structured portion of a person's total phenomenological field. It is differentiated from the total field by the fact that the self is in some degree involved in excluding in some (or possibly all) other persons from knowledge in the person's possession."

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

Breckenridge (1970) "Privacy . . . is the rightful claim of the individual to determine the extent to which he wishes to share of himself with others and his control over the time, place, and circumstances to communicate to others. It means his right to withdraw or to participate as he sees fit. It is also the individual's right to control dissemination of information about himself; it is his own personal possession."

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

Thirteen Definitions of Privacy. (Cont.)

	Freedom of Choice	Control over Output	Control over Input	Inter- personal Boundary
--	-------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Jourard (1966)	X	X		
----------------	---	---	--	--

"An outcome of a person's wish to withhold from others certain knowledge as to his past and present experience and action and his intention for the future . . . a desire to be an enigma to others of, more generally, a desire to control others' perceptions and beliefs vis a vis the self-concealing person."

Kelvin (1973)	X		X	
---------------	---	--	---	--

"Privacy, in its psychological sense, may be thus defined and measured in terms of power and norms, . . . 'privacy' is 'perceived privacy' and that this, in turn, is a function of the 'perceived positive limitation of the power of others'; and that the power of others is, or is seen to be, derived from norms, rules and even formal law, and the sanctions linked to these."

Proshansky, Ittelson & Rivlin (1970)	X		X	
--	---	--	---	--

"Obtaining freedom of choice or options to achieve goals, . . . control over what, how, and to whom he communicates information about himself."

Rapoport (1972)	X	X	X	X
-----------------	---	---	---	---

"The ability to control interaction, to have options, devices and mechanisms to prevent unwanted interaction and to achieve desired interaction."

Thirteen Definitions of Privacy (Cont.)

	Freedom of Choice	Control over Output	Control over Input	Inter- personal Boundary
--	-------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Rossiter (1958) "Privacy is a special kind of independence, which can be understood as an attempt to secure autonomy in at least a few personal and spiritual concerns . . . it seeks to erect an unbreachable wall of dignity and reserve against the entire world."

Ruebhausen & Brim (1966) "The essence of privacy is no more, and certainly no less, than the freedom of the individual to pick and choose for himself the time and circumstances under which, and most importantly, the extent to which, his attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and opinions are to be shared with or withheld from others."

Shils (1966) "We may say that privacy exists where the persons whose actions engender or become the objects of information retain possession of that information, and any flow outward of that information from the persons to whom it refers (and who share it where more than one person is involved) occurs on the initiative of its possessors."

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

X

Thirteen Definitions of Privacy (Cont.)

	Freedom of Choice	Control over Output	Control over Input	Interpersonal Boundary
--	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------	------------------------

Simmel (1950)	"Control of stimulus input from others, degree of mutual knowledge and separateness of people from one another."	X	X	
---------------	--	---	---	--

Webster's Unabridged (1968)	a) "The quality or state of being apart from the company or observation of others;"	X	X	
	b) "Isolation, seclusion, or freedom from unauthorized oversight or observation by law in the enjoyment of (privacy)."		X	X

Westin (1967)	"... the claim of individuals, groups, or institutions to determine for themselves when, how, and to what extent information about them is communicated to others."	X	X	
---------------	---	---	---	--

include such phrases as "individual's right to control" (Breckenridge, 1970), "on the initiative of its possessors: (Shils, 1966), "a special kind of independence" (Rossiter, 1958), "Freedom of the individual to pick and choose" (Reubhausen & Brim, 1966), "ability to control interaction" (Rapoport, 1972), and "obtaining freedom of choice" (Proshansky, Ittelson & Rivlin, 1970). Clearly, the voluntary nature of privacy, or the personal freedom to choose when to interact or not is one element of privacy.

Inputs and Outputs

The second element found in the definitions presented in Table 1 can best be categorized as control over output to other persons and control over input from other persons and the physical environment. That is, privacy involves deciding when, what, how, and to whom information is communicated about oneself to others - the output factor. But it would also involve his ability to control unwanted intrusions from other persons and the physical environment - the input factor.

Of the definitions cited, seven focus on control over output and four focus on control over input. However, only three (Altman, Rapoport, and Rossiter) specifically mention control over both input and output. It would seem that most theorists have followed Westin's (1967) focus on the control of information that is communicated to others. Less attention has been paid to the control of external stimuli impinging on the organism.

Interpersonal Boundaries

A third dimension of privacy concerns the method by which one controls inputs and outputs. This method will be called the "interpersonal boundary control process" (Altman, 1974). Only

six of the definitions cited allude to such an interpersonal boundary. Altman speaks of the "permeability of the self to others", Breckenridge speaks of the individual's "right to withdraw or to participate as he sees fit", and Rapoport speaks of "options, devices, and mechanisms to prevent unwanted interaction and to achieve desired interaction" (see Table 1).

An individual's interpersonal boundary is constantly changing, regulating the frequency and intensity of various inputs and outputs. Lewin (1936) incorporated this notion of the changing boundaries between a person's psychological and non-psychological field in his theoretical model of an individual's life-space. The amount of privacy one obtains through interaction with his physical and social world is determined by this interpersonal boundary. There are two ways that one's interpersonal boundary might vary to control the number of outputs or inputs. On the one hand, an individual's interpersonal boundary might be viewed as a bubble or protective shield (Sommer, 1969), expanding or contracting, depending on the amount of privacy desired. However, a less conceptually troublesome model would be the one proposed by Altman (1975) which views this boundary as analogous to a cell membrane, capable of varying its permeability according to the amount of privacy desired.

In summary, the above definitional analysis of privacy yields three core aspects. First, an individual must have some degree of control over his social space; he must be able to regulate the frequency and intensity of interactions both with other persons and the physical environment. Secondly, he must define for himself what he will control; that is, particular inputs and outputs.

Some general inputs and outputs have been normatively defined by a particular culture as relating to privacy, and Kelvin (1973) emphasized the importance of cultural norms in determining what will be labelled "private". Moreover, within a particular culture, personal idiosyncracies will be manifest in a person's categorization of the particular inputs and outputs he labels as private; what might be considered private or an invasion of privacy by one person, may not be so classified by another. The third aspect of privacy is the mechanism through which a person controls the "whats" he has labelled as private. The proposed mechanism has been conceived as a permeable, interpersonal boundary which regulates the achievement of desired levels of privacy.

Altman's (1975) definition of privacy as "selective control of access to the self or to one's group" [p. 18] is used as the theoretical definition for this paper. This definition allows incorporation of the three elements extracted from the definitional analysis.

2. The Need for Privacy

A thorough analysis of privacy would be only an academic exercise if it were not for the need for some degree of privacy in everyone's life. The cultural universality of privacy as a meaningful concept has been tentatively confirmed by Altman (in press). After reviewing the anthropological literature on cultures with both maximum and minimum privacy, he concluded that people in all cultures make use of some type of interpersonal boundary to control access to the self, even though the specific behavior mechanisms differ widely among cultures. Margaret Mead (1966)

came to the same conclusion on the basis of her anthropological studies.

Flaherty (1972) discussed the universal need for privacy as stemming, in part, from a biological basis:

the desire for some degree of privacy is as near as one can come to naming a constant of human nature in Western civilization. It is a unique value with a biological basis in the demand for life-space as well as social, intellectual, and cultural rationales. [p. 242]

Other writers have also emphasized the universality of privacy-seeking behaviors in Western culture, although they proposed psychological foundations as opposed to biological ones (Madge, 1966).

Psychological Functions of Privacy

A functional approach to the study of privacy asks questions concerning the significance of various privacy behaviors in maintaining the physical and psychological well-being of the human organism. Altman (in press) listed three functions of privacy as: (1) regulation of ongoing interaction, (2) establishment of plans and strategies for dealing with others, and (3) development and maintenance of self-identity [p. 3].

Altman's first function is similar to Westin's (1967) functions of emotional release and limited and protected communication. His second function is similar to Westin's function of self-evaluation, and the third to Westin's notion of personal autonomy.

Berardo (1974) proposed four functions of privacy as related to a group, in this case the family. These were: (1) self-protection, (2) allowance of deviation from societal norms governing family behaviors, (3) insulation from internal and external

sanctions, and (4) an ameliorative function for family members. Berardo's functions of privacy for sustaining family life appear similar to Westin's (1967) functions for sustaining individual vitality.

It would seem that privacy serves to maintain individuals' or group's definitions of themselves as separate entities capable of manipulating the environment as necessary. Johnson (1974), voiced this function of privacy when he discussed privacy as "behavior selection control" [p. 92]. He underscored the control function as central in preventing undue stress and strain (see Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Glass & Singer, 1972, and Weiss, 1972, for a fuller discussion of the relationship between "control" and "stress").

If, as seems to be the case, a general agreement exists concerning the major functions of privacy, the next question to be addressed is how do we engage in privacy behaviors to realize selective control over our environment?

3. Types of Privacy

The foregoing analysis has viewed privacy as a dynamic process as opposed to a static state. However, the various typologies of privacy have often viewed "privacy" as a noun, or a concrete situation in which "privacy" is obtained. For example, Westin (1967) proposed four types of privacy: (1) solitude, (2) intimacy, (3) anonymity, and (4) reserve. Solitude is freedom from visual observation by others; intimacy is the freedom from observations and intrusions of outsiders when one is a member of a small group; anonymity is the freedom from identification and surveillance when one is in a public place; and reserve is the "creation of a psychological barrier against unwanted intrusions" [p. 32].

A more recent comprehensive privacy typology was developed by Marshall, (1970, 1972). He constructed a Privacy Preference Scale (PPS) and through factor analysis isolated several distinct types of privacy: (1) Intimacy, (2) Seclusion, (3) Solitude, (4) Anonymity, (5) Self-disclosure, and (6) Not neighboring. Marshall's items are given in Table 2.

Intercorrelations among the six subscales of the PPS showed a strong relationship between Anonymity and Not Neighboring, ($r = .61$). The Solitude subscale was positively related to both Seclusion ($r = .49$) and Intimacy ($r = .40$). A moderate relationship existed between Low Self-disclosure and Not Neighboring, ($r = .27$) and Anonymity ($r = .35$).

Marshall's analysis, though a step forward, did not go far enough; it is static, with no underlying dynamic or functional basis. She isolated several different types of privacy with no demonstration of how these types might be related to the three central dimensions of privacy that emerged in the definitional analysis discussed earlier; i.e., control over inputs and outputs through some privacy regulating mechanisms.

Some confusion seems to exist over whether a particular "type" of privacy should be viewed as a noun, a verb, or both. For example, seclusion in Marshall's terminology is identical to Westin's solitude; both pertain to physical separation from others. It is the end state of a particular behavior (e.g., walking into an empty room and closing the door) and allows for privacy regulation. On the other hand, Not Neighboring would seem at first glance to be a verb pertaining to interactions with one's neighbors. Particular behaviors (chatting with one's neighbors,

Table 2

Marshall's (1970) Privacy Preference Scale Items

by Factor Analysis Loadings

A. Intimacy Factor

1. It is important to be able to confide in someone and know that your confidence will be kept secret.
2. Close friendships require having time to be alone together.
3. I often like to go to a secluded place to talk to an intimate friend.
4. People should respect other's rights to be individual and different.
5. It is very relaxing to get away from other people with just your family or close friends.
6. I occasionally enjoy getting away from the rest of the world with an intimate friend.
7. It is important for a child to have a room of his own after he reaches a certain age.

B. Neighboring Factor

1. I want my friends to feel that they can drop in at my house any time they like.
2. I would prefer a neighborhood where neighbors had a tendency to drop in all the time to one in which it was difficult to get to know them.
3. I would dislike living in an urban area where I never get to know my neighbors.
4. It usually annoys me to have people come to my home without letting me know they are coming.
5. I would like to live in a neighborhood where people do things together now and then.
6. I would rather not have my close friends living next door to me.

C. Seclusion Factor

1. I would like to live in a secluded house out of sight of any other houses.
2. The constant noise of modern life is really rather exciting.
3. It would be comforting to be able to hear the noises of everyday living of those around our home.
4. I would rather live in a friendly, close community than in a house away from the mainstream of life.
5. Although I enjoy walking in the woods, I would rather not go alone.
6. I dislike being completely alone or secluded, either in a house or in the wilderness.
7. It is important for me to have a house away from the noise of traffic.
8. A house should be far away from a neighbor that only by yelling at the top of your lungs can one be heard.

Table 2 (cont.)

D. Solitude Factor

1. I sometimes want to get away from everyone for a while, even my close friends.
2. It is important to me to be able to be alone when I want to be.
3. Even members of a family need to get away from each other now and then.
4. I would like to have a private retreat which no one would enter without asking me.
5. There are often times when I would enjoy spending an afternoon or evening at home alone.
6. There are times when I really want other people to leave me alone and not intrude on my thoughts, even though we're in the same room.

E. Anonymity Factor

1. I would like to live in a large city because neighbors and acquaintances there would probably be less concerned about my private life.
2. I wouldn't mind living in a large city; at least everyone wouldn't know everything about you.
3. I would not like to live in a small town because there is too much gossip about your private life.
4. I like talking to my neighbors, but I wouldn't want to get very involved in them.
5. Something should be done about the increasing amounts of information large organizations have about us.
6. I enjoy going to a crowded beach because I feel that I am anonymous.

F. Self-Disclosure Factor

1. I dislike talking about personal matters to a friend in a crowded place where other people can overhear us.
2. I usually don't tell people I don't know very well personal things about myself.
3. I would dislike having a patio, balcony, or room that neighbors could see into.
4. I don't like to talk about personal things with friends until I have known them a long time.
5. I would be very upset if a friend read something I had written or my personal correspondence without my permission.
6. I would prefer not to disclose my yearly income to my friends and neighbors.
7. Acquaintances often ask questions that I consider rude and personal.

exchanging favors, tools, advice, and visiting in each other's homes) presumably would not occur very frequently and this might lead one to be classified as not very neighborly.

Self-disclosure as a type of privacy could be viewed as a noun or a verb. Does privacy pertain to the intimate content of a particular disclosure or the relative frequency with which one divulges information about oneself to others?

Hence, confusion exists over whether Marshall's types of privacy are "types" at all. Perhaps they can be better conceptualized as behaviors used to regulate one's privacy system. Privacy regulation might occur through not-neighboring, seclusion from others, anonymity, or minimal self-disclosure about private matters to others. It appears that a dynamic, functional model of privacy is necessary before a thorough understanding of the concept of privacy is possible.

4. Privacy Regulating Models

Madge (1966), Westin (1967), and Flaherty (1972) have discussed the relationship between too little and too much privacy, and have posited a general process of balance restoration between the two extremes. Altman (1975) recently developed an explicit, comprehensive dynamic model of privacy in which the two subjective states of "desired privacy" and "achieved privacy" determine which intra- and interpersonal behaviors will be emitted in an attempt to balance these two states.

Figure 1 outlines the process by which the optimum balance of the two privacy states - desired and achieved - is obtained. Altman calls this process the "interpersonal boundary control process".

Figure 1. Overview of relationships between privacy, personal space, territory and crowding (from Altman, 1975).

The permeability of one's boundary changes as a function of the desired privacy state through such mechanisms as control over personal space, the guarding of territory and verbal and non-verbal behavior. When a sense of social isolation exists (desired privacy < achieved privacy) the interpersonal boundary control process serves to make one's interpersonal boundary more permeable. When a sense of perceived crowding exists (desired privacy > achieved privacy) the interpersonal boundary control process serves to decrease the permeability of one's interpersonal boundary. Altman's "control mechanisms" appear similar to Marshall's "types" of privacy.

"Time" and Privacy Regulation

Only brief mention of "time" as an important factor was made in Altman's homeostatic model of privacy. Presumably, the cognitive assessment of the balance between desired and achieved privacy would be a continual on-going process (conscious and subconscious), and would occur at regular intervals. However, the temporal patterning of privacy-state assessment probably varies across persons and across situations, depending on the type of privacy. For example, desired and achieved levels of intimacy might be "balanced" more frequently than desired and achieved levels of neighboring or anonymity. Moreover, the conscious temporal patterning associated with self-disclosing communication may not even be apparent to someone involved in territorial defense or seclusion behavior. One might consciously monitor self-disclosure in a developing friendship, sometimes increasing and sometimes decreasing the permeability of

the interpersonal boundary through the differential revelation of personal information. On the other hand, seclusion behavior, which might be manifest in part by living in a house which is visually screened from the rest of the houses on the block, is not so easily controlled temporally, because a high hedge or fence is more or less permanent and prevents momentary fluctuation. Suffice to say for the moment that "time" as a variable is of great consequence for any privacy model and must be included in a comprehensive analysis. Although a systematic examination of "time" and "privacy" is needed, the choice of focus in the present study prevented its inclusion at this point in the research program.

"Costs" and Privacy Regulation

Another important variable warranting consideration in Altman's model of privacy is "costs". The attainment of an optimal balance between desired and achieved privacy may entail certain costs, both monetary, social, and psychological. The method by which one attempts to balance his privacy states may to a large extent be determined by these costs; hence the "costs" factor should be included in any regulatory model of privacy. An individual attempting to balance his privacy states might consider costs associated with obtaining this balance and may admit to himself prior to engaging in the necessary behavior that only a partial closing of the gap will be possible due to the associated costs. Indeed, he may decide not to seek balance at all. Two examples may better illustrate how costs enter into privacy regulation.

First, consider temporary changes in privacy balance. Suppose that a university student has more solitude or seclusion than he

prefers on a particular evening (desired privacy < achieved privacy). The student may perceive himself as lonely or socially isolated. An invitation to a party presents an opportunity for a temporary balancing of privacy states. However, there are several costs associated with going to the party: First, crucial study-time for a mid-term examination would be lost. Second, the party is some distance away and would involve taxi fares which are not easily absorbed by the student's budget. Finally, the student is shy and worries about meeting new people and interacting in a party atmosphere. The final decision whether or not to attend will depend to a large extent on these "cost" factors. Of course, costs are not only associated with obtaining an optimal balance between desired and achieved privacy states, but also with maintaining the balance once obtained.

A second example involves a more enduring state of privacy. A family of four is living in a two-bedroom garden home with a small backyard lot. The children are nine and eleven years of age, male and female, respectively. At present they share a bedroom, but the daughter has recently been pleading for a private bedroom, and this plea will only become stronger as she grows into adolescence. The parents recognize her needs for privacy; however, it is not feasible, financially or otherwise, to redesign the present home to provide separate sleeping quarters for the son and daughter. The prohibitive costs of attaining the desired level of privacy leads to a decision not to attempt balance. Consequently, the daughter is dissatisfied with her home environment, and this general dissatisfaction might be manifest in many ways.

Privacy is also a family concern as all four members of the family, particularly the parents, are dissatisfied with the level of privacy they enjoy in their backyard. The architects have designed their backyard as "private open space". Their "private" backyard is open visually, aurally, and olfactorily. Neighbors can easily see what they are doing, and detect whether they are having hamburger or steak on the barbecue. But, as with the bedroom conflict, no action can presently be taken to ensure more privacy - a redwood fence is simply too expensive.

A serious desired and achieved privacy imbalance thus exists on two accounts in this hypothetical family. It is likely that a prolongation of this privacy state imbalance would lead to some tension among the members of the household due to a lack of control over noxious stimuli.

In summary then, Altman's dynamic model of privacy is heuristically useful. A testable model of privacy regulation now exists and the effects of a desired-achieved imbalance could be assessed with the appropriate measuring devices.

5. Privacy Hypotheses

The hypotheses proposed were concerned more with chronic imbalances between desired and achieved privacy than with acute imbalances. Most individuals can cope with temporary privacy imbalances, but prolonged imbalances may lead to dissatisfaction with one's immediate environment. Consequently, the first hypotheses of this research project were as follows:

Hypothesis 1. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of privacy, the greater the dissatisfaction with one's dwelling.

Hypothesis 2. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of privacy, the greater the dissatisfaction with one's immediate neighborhood.

Hypothesis 3. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of privacy, the greater the dissatisfaction with one's life in general.

Hypothesis 4. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of privacy, the greater the anxiety experienced.

These hypotheses stemmed from speculation by Altman (1975) on the "costs" of not obtaining balance:

And there may be physiological costs such as heightened adrenal-gland functioning or excessive cardiovascular activity. Furthermore, there may be psychological costs as the boundary system fails, including stress, tension, and anxiety. If such costs are incurred over long periods of time the person may well end up in a deteriorated condition . . . It may require little energy to maintain boundaries in an elevator or restaurant, since time in the situation is usually brief. But continual, long-term attempts to manage interpersonal boundaries - as in a home with many family members and few rooms, or in a poorly insulated, noisy, dense work situation with an intrusive, nosy co-worker - in which spends unending energy in regulating interaction, may yield very high costs to the individual. [p. 45]

The final privacy hypothesis involved a replication of Marshall's (1970) finding that a negative relationship existed between the level of privacy desired and social extraversion.

Hypothesis 5. The more socially extraverted an individual is, the less privacy is desired.

Thus, an effort was made to continue gathering data on the relationship between privacy preferences and other personality traits.

CHAPTER 3

COMMUNITY

Oh, don't think that we live isolated in our little cubicles. We're reestablishing the vertical village here. We form clubs, groups, associations; we play bridge at each other's apartments.

A Paris Highrise Resident
Atlas World Review (1975)

A vast sociological literature exists concerning the concept of "community". From the early work of the Chicago school of urban sociology (Park & Burgess, 1925; Wirth, 1938), to the present (Eisinger, 1974; Suttles, 1972; Warren, 1963), community research has continued to be a central concern of urban sociologists. As with the concept of "privacy", though, many different connotations are evoked when we use the word "community". Therefore, an attempt to delineate the various meanings attached to the concept of community is in order.

1. Definition of Community

One of the earlier definitions of community was proposed by Robert McIver (1931):

Any circle of people who live together, who belong together so that they share not this or that particular interest, but a whole set of interests wide enough and complete enough to include their lives, is a community . . . the mark of a community is that one's life may be lived wholly within it, that all one's relationships may be found within it. [p. 9]

Nelson (1948) defined community as:

a group of people inhabiting a limited area, who have a sense of belonging together and who through organized relationships, share and carry on activities in pursuit of their common interests. [p. 71]

Dentler (1968) defined community as "a place within which one finds all or most of the economic, political, religious, and familial institutions around which people group to cooperate, compete, or conflict" [p. 16].

Phillip Slater (1971) also emphasized living one's life wholly within a community. He stated that "a community life exists when one can go daily to a given location at a given time and see many of the people one knows. This effortlessness is central to my definition of community life" [p. 164].

These definitions, as others (Jonassen, 1959; Mercer, 1956; Warren, 1963), seem to conceptualize "community" as including elements of locality, social activity, social structure, and sentiment (see Clark, 1973).

However, a different way of viewing community is through a word which shares its common root - communion. Minar and Greer (1969) state that community "expresses our vague yearnings for a commonality of desire, a communion with those around us, an extension of the bonds of kin and friend to all those who share a common fate with us" [p. ix].

Keyes (1973) suggested that communion with those around us results from being "known whole". A person is known whole through displaying all of his behaviors to another person or group. Keyes argued that modern man is only partly known by most of his associates, and consequently, suffers from loneliness and rootlessness. For him,

it is essential that persons be known whole to someone or some group.

The theme of wholeness was also discussed by Poplin (1972):

community as a moral phenomenon seems to involve a sense of identity and unity with one's group and a feeling of involvement and wholeness on the part of the individual. In short, the term community has been used to refer to a condition in which human beings find themselves enmeshed in a tight-knit web of meaningful relationships with their fellow human beings. [p.7]

A review of the various meanings associated with the concept of community indicates that three aspects are involved; (1) a physical or geographical place; (2) social groupings involving frequent social interaction; and (3) the confluence between (1) and (2), or the extent to which the social interaction regularly takes place in a specific geographical area.

This analysis is similar to the treatment of community by Morris and Moge (1965). They identified three aspects of community: "the type of social group, the type of physical grouping and the extent to which social and physical groupings coincide" [p. 99], and then proposed a clearer terminology. They pointed out that terms such as "neighborhood", "village", "town", and "city" adequately describe the physical grouping. Further, "primary" and "secondary groups" adequately describe the social groupings. Hence, they propose that the term "community" be reserved for the overlap of the first two aspects.

However, as Bates and Bacon (1972) pointed out, that the physical or geographical component should be included in a theory of community is only an assumption. Clark (1973) echoed this criticism of community definitions:

to argue that place influences community is a very different matter from assuming that certain geographical units or areas are synonymous with it . . . confusion has arisen because the term community has been applied to places ranging from the small neighborhood to the entire nation. [p. 398]

Other community researchers, (Webber, 1963, 1964; Wellman, 1974) have argued that the increased mobility and communication possibilities of the modern city dweller allows for a "community without propinquity". Thus, the assumed local aspect of community will not be included in this project's definition.

The working definition of community to be used in this paper resembles Poplin's (1972); it is "selective engagement in a close-knit web of meaningful relationships with others". This "community" can be objectively measured by the frequency and intensity of interactions between and among friends and other important persons in one's socio-physical space. While it may be more likely for a close-knit web of meaningful relationships to evolve within a local context rather than an urban context, this remains an empirical question and not a matter of definition.

Community as a Social Network

The phrase "close-knit web" in the proposed working definition posits an interconnected network as the understructure of community. This aspect forms the structural element of community. The functional element is suggested by the term "meaningful". The understructure must not be passive and collective but must serve to meet the members' individual needs; it must facilitate the attainment of

significant goals. This notion of an interconnected network is central to the working definition of community.

The term "network" has received increasing attention as a potentially useful concept for understanding urban systems. An entire volume of Ekistics (179, 1970) was devoted to network analysis as applied to human settlements. The term "social network" was introduced in 1954 by John Barnes, a British anthropologist. He wrote:

Each person is, as it were, in touch with a number of other people, some of whom are directly in touch with each other and some of whom are not . . . I find it convenient to talk of a social field of this kind as a network. The image I have is of a set of points, some of which are joined by lines. The points of the image are people, or sometimes groups and the lines indicate which people interact with each other. [p. 43]

Bott (1957) found the analysis of social networks useful in understanding the social environment of urban families. Recently, Mitchell (1969) has extended Barnes' early writing on social networks and has proposed various analytical dimensions that allow for a more detailed analysis of a particular network.

Sarason (1976) commented on the usefulness of network analysis for understanding the community, although he stopped short of saying that the networks are the community:

If you begin to apply the concept of the network to a community, it becomes immediately apparent that a community is comprised of networks countless in numbers and probably countless in degree of interconnectedness. The traditional bases for describing and understanding a community - social class, economic, legal, religious, political, governmental, etc., - have obviously

been productive [but] we have not used such variables in the most productive ways precisely because we tend not to view or understand them in their interrelatedness. At the very least, we would have to confront more realistically than we have that a community is impressively, if not overwhelmingly, complex and that our traditional ways of thinking about and dealing with it have not taken this complexity into account. [p. 323]

In short, the conceptualization of community as a social network allows a variety of theoretical questions to be addressed for the first time. Some of these questions will be discussed in the next section.

2. The Need for Community

Robert Nisbet in his book The Quest for Community identifies the need for community as "the single most impressive fact in the twentieth century in Western society" (1953, p. viii). He goes on to say that,

the quest for community will not be denied, for it springs from some of the powerful needs of human nature - need for a clear sense of cultural purpose, membership, status, and continuity. Without these, no amount of mere material welfare will serve to arrest the developing sense of alienation in our society. [p. 73]

Packard (1972) elaborated on man's need for community further. He argued that community is vital for shaping an individual's developing identity:

But the individual needs a sense of community. This is a point that has often been overlooked in recent years. He needs it for the shaping of his own sense of identity. He needs it if he is to achieve a sense of self-esteem and well-being. The challenge is to achieve a congenial balance between the individual's yearning for freedom and his current urgent needs for community. Ways must be evolved to slow down the accelerating social fragmentation. [p. X]

Recently, Roszak (1972) echoed the proposition that everyone needs a strong sense of community.

Yet the need of community persists stubbornly - stubble of living grass beneath the snows. We are communal beings. The communion of friends, the experience of honest citizenship are as necessary to us as are air and water. [p. 193]

Psychological Functions of Community

Many writers have emphasized the importance of "close-knit webs of meaningful relationships" for personality development. Just as privacy facilitates a sense of personal identity, so does community.

Robert Park (1950) stressed this point:

In the worlds where people come close together, human nature develops. The family, the tribe, the local community are instances. To the extent that we have intimate relations, we get responsiveness to one another. The definite personalities that we know grow up in intimate groups.. [p. 22]

Clark (1973) singled out the formation of one's identity through involvement in a close-knit group as one of the two fundamental functions of community. He termed this function "significance", or engendering the feeling that one's life counted and had a definite role within the group. Glasser (1972) in his recent book, The Identity Society, has documented contemporary man's preoccupation with the question "Who am I?", and the importance of one's social network for obtaining an adequate answer.

Clark's (1973) second fundamental function of community was "solidarity". Solidarity engenders "social unity, togetherness, social cohesion, or a sense of belonging" [p. 404]. Goldman (1965) underscores the relationship between solidarity and significance:

Emotionally, a child needs to be secure, and the roots of this need lie in the experience of love. A child therefore needs to feel he belongs, first of all, to an intimate family, then to a community which cares for him. [p. 67]

Kurt Lewin (1948) recognized the importance of community or involvement in a close-knit web of relationships which might be one's "group".

The speed and determination with which a person proceeds, his readiness to fight or submit, and other important characteristics of his behavior depend upon the firmness of the ground on which he stands and upon his general security. The group a person belongs to is one of the more important constituents of this ground. If a person is not clear about his belongingness or if he is not well established within the group, his life-space will show the characteristics of any unstable ground. [p. 85-86]

Warren (1963) listed five major functions of a "locality" based community. These were: (1) production-distribution-consumption, (2) socialization, (3) social control, (4) social participation, and (5) mutual support. Warren's functions include non-psychological functions, e.g., production-distribution-consumption, but the emphasis is still placed on solidarity (mutual support) and significance (social participation and control).

Little data are available on the degree of community necessary for minimal psychological health, but Maslow's (1970) need hierarchy might be suggestive in this regard. Man's physiological needs as well as part of his safety and security needs are satisfied through a minimal community of "production-distribution-consumption". Psychological security, however, may require a higher degree of community as has been discussed previously. Love and belongingness (solidarity) and self-esteem (significance) also may require a

higher level of community. Clinically oriented psychologists have long emphasized the necessity of a sense of community for the growth of a healthy personality (Erickson, 1968; Jourard, 1974; Sullivan, 1964); but the explicit connections rarely were delineated.

If community is in part defined by one's social network, then Sarason's (1976) comment is germane:

[network] is a concept central to the thinking and practice of clinical psychologists who always see their clients as embedded in a network of interpersonal relationships, and the overarching goal of practice is in some way or other either to use the network for therapeutic purposes or to change the quality and quantity of relationships within the network. [p. 321]

In clinical field work, Speck and Attneave (1973) have applied network theory to family problems with some success. They first establish a client's network, which is

a group made up of family, relatives, neighbors, and friends who have had varied continuing contact with one another . . . [In the course of network therapy] attenuated relationships are revived, while symbiotic ties are loosened or severed. Latent interests are energized by newly appreciated talents, and newly expressed needs elicit the sharing of practical experience. Old ghosts are exorcized and locked doors are opened; zest and fun are rediscovered. The world shifts in its ominous trend toward depersonalization, dehumanization, and loneliness. [p. 6]

The relationship between social networks and mental health is admittedly a complex one, and the proposal at this time of definite linkages would be a leap of faith. Suffice it to say for the present that this is a crucial area warranting further investigation. Nevertheless, this research project took a first step by offering the

following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 6. A negative relationship will exist between the degree of network connectedness for any particular individual and general anxiety.

Hypothesis 7. The greater the degree of network connectedness, the greater satisfaction expressed with one's life in general.

3. Community Regulation Models

No comprehensive regulatory model (similar to Altman's , 1975, model for privacy), exists for community. This may be due, in part, to the static, structural definition of community so often presented. However, the existence of a highly connected network should not preclude a balancing of fusion with the group and the maintenance of individual autonomy. Community would not only involve union and communion, but also separation and independence.

David Bakan (1966) developed this notion in his discussion of "agency" and "communion". He defined agency as the tendency of an organism to maintain its separate existence - it involves separation, self-armoring, aggrandizement, mastery, and repression. Communion is an organism's participation in some larger organism, and involves union, openness, cooperation, and expression. These two tendencies produce a desire which creates a constant tension within one's life-space. Silverman (1973) commented on this ambivalence:

What I would like to suggest is that the knowledge of human growth and development of the past century all point to a human perception of the world with a basic ambivalence built in; on the one hand we seek for the union exemplified in prototype by the womb but which carries the penalty of loss of self, and on the other hand

we have a drive toward individuation, that is to become oneself as a separate human being. Our lives are lived as a balance of these two forces, we perceive the world and develop our philosophies in these terms. Normal constructive conflict involves the carving out of a niche for ourselves while remaining a part of one or many groups. Pathological conflict involves an inability to work out a satisfactory balance. [p.128]

Lewin (1948) also recognized this problem of achieving balance when he wrote:

The problem of adaptation to, and successful living in, a group can be stated from the point of view of the individual in the following manner: How is it possible to satisfy sufficiently one's own individual needs without losing membership and status within the group? If the space of free movement of the individual is too small, in other words, if his independence of the group is insufficient, the individual will be unhappy. [p. 87]

Given that individuals prefer different basic levels of community, then it should be possible to measure discrepancies between the level one desires and the level one achieves. This balancing of community levels might require considerable more help from the environment than the balancing of privacy levels. Presumably, an increase (or decrease) in community is not as easily accomplished as an evening alone with no intrusion. Often persons may have to switch jobs or move to a different neighborhood or town in order to achieve a balance between desired and achieved community.

4. Community Congruence Hypotheses

In keeping with Michelson's (1970) "intersystem congruence model" which holds that "people rationally seek to best match a specific social, cultural, or personality variable with a planned setting" [p. 125],

several specific hypotheses were proposed.

Hypothesis 8. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of community, the greater the dissatisfaction with one's dwelling.

Hypothesis 9. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of community, the greater the dissatisfaction with one's neighborhood.

Hypothesis 10. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of community, the greater the dissatisfaction with one's life in general.

Hypothesis 11. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of community, the greater the anxiety experienced.

Before leaving the question of congruence, a statement by Slater (1974) may be instructive. He believes that most urban North Americans do not have highly connected networks, and therefore, have little difficulty balancing affiliative desires, but at the same time forfeit the "wholeness" born of involvement in a close-knit group. The "networks" of which he speaks are unconnected networks.

But urban and suburban Americans do not live in communities, they live in networks. A network is an address book - a list of people who may have little in common besides oneself. Each network has only one reference point that defines it. No two people have the same precise network. This means that everyone controls her own social milieu, and if she likes, can subsist entirely on interpersonal candy bars. The persons in her network do not all know each other, so she is never forced to integrate the disparate sides of herself but can compartmentalize them in disconnected relationships. This is one reason why people so often experience anxiety upon entering encounter groups - the exposure of compartmentalized aspects of themselves to different people at the same time makes them feel their whole personality is on the line. On the other hand, this anxiety is accompanied by feelings of

excitement, risk, and vitality . . . [p. 15]

Data to explore the question of whether in fact people do live in Slater's "networks" were collected in the present study.

CHAPTER IV

ACTIVITY SPACE

Every man hath more or less liberty, as he hath more or less space in which he employs himself: as he hath more liberty who is in a large, than he who is kept in a close prison.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679)

The concept of activity space is much simpler conceptually than the preceding concepts of privacy and community. The working definition for this research project was "the area within which one chooses to conduct most of his activities". Activities referred to typical daily events such as working, attending school, worshipping, shopping, participating in athletics, banking, eating, visiting with relatives and friends, and general recreation. This purely geographical concept allows a clear distinction to be made between the two aspects of community discussed in Chapter III -- the geographical and the social.

The physical space within which we live -- within which we can be "known whole" -- has often been identified as our neighborhood, and in the past, it may have been the case that our sense of community grew out of our neighborhood. Keller (1968) defined neighborhoods as "local areas that have physical boundaries, social networks, concentrated use of area facilities, and special emotional and symbolic connotations for their inhabitants" [pp. 156-157].

If her definition is used in order to classify certain areas within urban cities today, very few areas may be classified as

neighborhoods. Perhaps close-knit, meaningful relationships were once found in the neighborhood, but as urban areas have evolved into increasingly larger open systems, and as individual mobility has increased, this may no longer be true.

Keyes postulated that the neighborhoods that once gave rise to our sense of community are rapidly dissolving.

The communities where we used to belong have been sacrificed to mobility, privacy and convenience. Our alternatives are based on the same values - community sought anonymously from the privacy of our homes, in passing on the roads of the national hometown, and with tears shared in intimate moments with strangers. None of this satisfies and we end up seeking community everywhere like promiscuous lovers. [p. 113, emphasis added]

1. Activity Space Research

In 1949, R. K. Merton proposed the terms "localite" and "cosmopolitan" to label individuals with different activity patterns in the urban environment. He saw the two terms as defining the ends of one continuum, and he perceived mobility as influencing cosmopolitanism, and length of residence as influencing localism.

In 1972, Buttner conducted one of the first extensive investigations outlining the activity space profiles of urban residents. By mapping the residents' activities, she was able to identify a particular resident as a "localite" or an "urbanite". Figure 2 presents idealized profiles for these two types of activity patterns. Of course the two types are not discrete, but rather poles on a continuum on which individuals' activity space can be classified. The localite would be neighborhood oriented, while the urbanite

1. Localite

2. Urbanite

Legend:

- X Residence
- W Work
- F Friend
- S Shopping Services
- E Entertainment/Cultural Activities
- R Closest Relatives
- N Neighborhood Center
- Neighborhood Area
- O City Boundaries

Figure 2. Idealized Activity Space Profiles

would be oriented to the larger metropolitan area for the fulfillment of his various social needs. The localite is presumably satisfied with his activity space and prefers to center his activities within a narrowly circumscribed geographic area. Buttimer speculated about the situation involving a localite or urbanite with the opposite activity space profile, and stated that a general dissatisfaction with community life should result from such an incompatible pattern.

A second major study of activity patterns was conducted in the United States by Chapin and Brail (1969). They sampled 1,416 persons from 43 metropolitan areas and obtained information concerning their activities for a single weekday. The following activity classes were used: (1) relaxation, (2) arts, hobbies, and sports, (3) reading, (4) television and radio, (5) in-home family, (6) in-home socializing, (7) in-home obligatory, (8) out-of-home family, (9) out-of-home discretionary, (10) out-of-home socializing, (11) work related, (12) shopping and personal services, and (13) out-of-home obligatory.

Chapin and Brail (1969) defined an activity system as a "flow of activities during some specified period of time - perhaps a day, a week, a year, or even a lifetime during which the person is engaged in the pursuit of his affairs" [pp. 108-109]. This system contains a temporal aspect and a "spatial aspect which has to do with the locations of his activities in the metropolitan area" [p.108]. Unfortunately, the locational data from their extensive survey only used the two categories, in-home and out-of-home. A clearer understanding of the residents' activity space would have resulted from

a further subdivision of the out-of-home category.

Pappas (1969) reported that activity patterns varied across cultures but that a large percentage of an adult's time is spent at home. These percentages (averaged across sexes) ranged from 61% in the Soviet Union to 75% in Greece. The French, West German, and United States percentages were 71, 70, and 68, respectively. Clearly, the home is an important variable influencing one's activity profile. No data exist concerning the relative time spent in the home by Buttimer's "localite" and "urbanite". Perhaps the ratio of in-home to out-of-home activities would be similar and only the location of out-of-home activities would vary; or the urbanite might spend much less time at home than the localite.

2. Activity Space Hypotheses

The present study hypothesized that Buttimer's (1972) speculation concerning incompatible activity patterns would be confirmed.

Hypothesis 12. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of activity space, the greater the dissatisfaction with one's neighborhood.

Hypothesis 13. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of activity space, the greater the dissatisfaction with one's life in general.

Hypothesis 14. The greater the general discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of activity space, the greater the anxiety experienced.

The influence of activity space, a geographical concept, on privacy and community, socio-psychological concepts, has not been adequately researched, although the relationships could have

implications for urban planners and others concerned with the built environment. It is to these possible relationships that we now turn.

CHAPTER V

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRIVACY, COMMUNITY, ACTIVITY SPACE

Love your neighbour, yet
pull not down your hedge.

George Herbert.

This chapter will discuss some of the literature pertaining to the interrelationships among privacy, community, and activity space. First, the nature of the privacy-community relationship will be discussed, followed by discussions of the privacy-activity space relationship, and finally the community-activity space relationship.

1. Privacy and Community

Margaret Mead (1966) implied a trade-off between privacy and community; i.e., the typical anonymity of the large city may be seen as a strength but it can just as easily be seen as a weakness undermining community if carried too far. The notion of a conflict between privacy and community is a recurrent theme. Altman (1975) conceptualized privacy as a dialectical process and suggested that a dynamic interplay exists between social interaction and noninteraction, between being open and being closed, but he did not propose that privacy and community are opposite ends of the same continuum. Bakan (1966) discussed agency and communion as a dialectical process involving cycles of independence and dependence, but he likewise did not propose that privacy and community are opposite ends of the same continuum.

Arguments for the Antithetical Nature of Privacy and Community

Philip Slater (1970, 1974) has been one of the more articulate and persistent voices presenting privacy and community as antithetical needs,

Who would not like to believe, for example, in the possibility of a society that would maximize personal autonomy and relatedness at the same time? But there is no way to guarantee that one man's need to be alone will never coincide with his neighbor's need to be with him. Every society tends to protect one need more than the other in a given situation. Accepting the fact that the issue must always be negotiated between people - that privacy and community are antithetical needs and cannot be simultaneously maximized - leads to full and complete despair; the despair of disillusionment. But it also enables us to notice and build upon our own fulfilling experiences. [1974, pp. 3-4]

Keyes argued that contemporary Western society tends to protect privacy more than community; thus we are currently witnessing a loss of community.

Even as we hate being unknown to each other, we crave anonymity and rather than take paths that might lead us back together, we pursue the very things that keep us cut off from each other. There are three things we cherish in particular - mobility, privacy, and convenience - which are the very sources of our lack of community. [p. 15]

Slater (1970) followed up this line of thought by suggesting that our desire for privacy is simply a reaction to our loss of community and concomitant inability to control our environment.

The longing itself is not a fundamental or driving human motive, but a reaction to crowding, complexity, and social dislocation. Those who live in stable pre-industrial communities have far less privacy and far less desire for it than we do. They feel less manipulated and intruded upon only because they can predict and influence

their daily social encounters with greater ease.
The longing for privacy is generated by the drastic
conditions that the longing for privacy produces.
[pp. 125-126, italics added]

Other critics of the modern technological city (Bookchin, 1974; Milgram, 1970) have implicated man's loss of control over his physical and social environment as a central factor in the breakdown of interpersonal bonds and the promotion of both voluntary and involuntary isolation. Bookchin (1974), especially, mirrored Slater's concern over escalating privacy needs. He argued that the "individual who withdraws himself with social neutrality and civic indifference, all the more delivers his privacy to the invasive forces from which he tried to escape" [p. 83]. This argument holds that urban complexity leads to a perceived loss of control due to stimulus overload, which in turn leads to increased seeking for privacy in an attempt to reduce stimulus inputs, which in turn leads to ever greater loss of control; at this point, the cycle begins anew.

Individual Privacy vs. Group Privacy

One persistent problem in analyzing the relationship between privacy and community is the myopic focus on individual privacy to the exclusion of group privacy. Some amount of individual privacy may be sacrificed when someone forms a close bond with one or several other individuals, but simultaneously, the dyad (e.g., marriage partners) or group (e.g., graduate students working in the same lab) develops a "we" feeling which often extends the interpersonal boundary to include every individual within the group. Now, interactions within the group may be a part of each individual's

"backstage" behavior. As a consequence, community ensues with no concomitant decrease in privacy.

Charles Horton Cooley (1929) has written about this perceptual change that occurs as a result of membership in close-knit social networks.

By primary groups I mean those characterized by intimate face-to-face association and co-operation. They are primary in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association, psychologically, is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, so that one's very self, for many purposes at least, is the common life and purpose of the group. Perhaps the simplest way of describing this wholeness is by saying that it is a "we"; it involves the sort of sympathy and mutual identification for which "we" is the natural expression. One lives in the feeling of the whole and finds the chief aims of his will in that feeling. [p. 23]

This "we" feeling may be experienced most often in a marriage relationship, and perhaps for many married couples the extent of their intimate network is their spouse. The concept of the modern nuclear family with few extended kinship ties would support this supposition. However, one question that might be posed is whether married persons have less privacy than single persons, and whether achieved community differs between married and single persons. Data were collected to answer this question, although no formal hypothesis was offered. It was speculated that no differences will exist because levels of privacy and community, as perceived, are not diminished.

Privacy and Community in the Neighborhood

In their discussion of privacy and community, Chermayeff

and Alexander (1963) argued that more privacy is needed in most residential environments. In the urban residential neighborhood, privacy serves many functions, among which are the preservation of the group, the allowance for some deviance, the allowance for secret consumption, the allowance for relaxation, and the maintenance of territoriality contracts.

Curiously, this recent emphasis on residential privacy is in direct opposition to the sentiments of the originators of the "neighborhood unit concept". In the early 1900's Howard (1902) and Perry (1929) sought to design a neighborhood that would, in their opinion, generally allow for less privacy, thus engendering a sense of community among the residents. Keller (1968) described the proposed functions of the neighborhood unit as:

1. Introduce a principle of physical order into the chaotic, fragmented, urban aggregate;
 2. Reintroduce local, face-to-face types of contacts into anonymous urban society, thereby helping to gain some sense of community;
 3. Encourage the formation of local loyalties and attachments and thereby offset the impact of extensive social and residential mobility;
 4. Stimulate feelings of identity, security, stability, and rootedness in a world threatening such feelings on all sides; and
 5. Provide a local training ground for the development of longer loyalties to city and nation.
- [p. 125]

The neighborhood unit was designed with meaningful social interaction as the guiding value rather than individual or familial privacy.

Underlying the neighborhood unit concept is a belief in architectural determinism. Howard and Perry obviously felt that the physical design of the environment determines to a large extent the social interaction patterns that develop. One of the

physical characteristics in their plan that would produce greater social interaction was proximity. There is evidence for architectural determinism in many different situations, with proximity, of course, being a very important variable (see Festinger, Schacter & Back, 1950; Yancey, 1971), but proximity alone (see the work of Gans, 1962, 1967, 1968) does not always insure community. A lengthy quote from Perin's (1970) book on environmental design illustrates this point.

Proximity, for example, can mean conflict or intimacy between people, and even though society may value intimacy over conflict, there is no basis for valuing proximity over distance in psychological terms alone. . . . to consider a "proximity" born of technical and financial objectives as "intimacy" in psychological terms is meaningless. Being able to see other people - in a neighborhood in an office corridor - is only the opportunity for interpersonal relations. Whether and where to provide that opportunity as well as the equally valid opportunity for privacy and nonrelating is a data question, not a conceptual one, to be answered by the values and priorities of the inhabitants. Without such data the design may provide each kind of opportunity just where it turns out to be least consonant with the inhabitants' values . . . [p. 37]

Proposed Relationship Between Privacy and Community

From the foregoing discussion, it should be evident that much confusion exists concerning the relationship between privacy and community. The major stumbling block is that conceptualizations of the two concepts vary dramatically. One type of privacy, seclusion, if resorted to frequently, may interfere with the establishment of community. One only has to imagine the classic hermit to understand this incompatibility between privacy and community. Moreover, another method of obtaining privacy, minimal self-disclosure, would probably increase the difficulty of forming a close-knit social network. John Dewey (1916) stated as much when he wrote that

there is "more than a verbal tie between the words common, community, and communication. Men live in a community in virtue of things which they have in common, and communication is the way in which they come to possess things in common" [p. 4]. But the assumption in both cases is that the particular privacy or community behavior is static; variation across time and situations is not allowed. If a dynamic process as outlined by Altman (1975) is taken as fundamental, then no necessary relationship need exist between privacy and community.

An additional argument to support the hypothesis that privacy and community are independent of each other is that comparing the two is similar to "adding apples and oranges". Privacy is anchored primarily in psychological and behavioral processes, while community is anchored primarily in structural processes. Thus, the following hypothesis was proposed for confirmation:

Hypothesis 15. Privacy and community, as general concepts, are unrelated to each other, and more specifically a preference for a particular level of one will not relate systematically to a preference for a particular level of the other.

2. Privacy and Activity Space

Just as others have speculated that privacy and community are in conflict, Keller (1968) speculated that privacy and activity space are, perhaps, in conflict as well. She categorized neighborhood residents along a continuum from "reserved" to "sociable";

Each type has different, and perhaps incompatible conceptions of privacy, space needs, and relations to immediate and more distant neighbors. An apt description of these types refers to the one type as "sociable"; to the other as "reserved". The sociable resident moves into an area expecting to have warm, friendly relations with neighbors; the reserved type has no such desire. His need for privacy is stronger than his need for sociability

and the reserved resident primarily wants neighbors to respect this need. The reserved type needs privacy and to be selective and more formal in his relations; the sociable type is informal and seeks to extend neighbor relations beyond neighborly bounds. Their spatial relations should be adapted to these deep seated preferences. [pp. 159-160]

It appears that this dimension might be essentially the same as a preference for privacy, with the reserved type at the high end and the sociable type at the low end. Marshall (1972) did report a negative relationship between social extroversion (sociability) and high privacy preference levels, although the correlation ($r = -.30$) was not large.

Keller's second major dimension categorizes neighborhood residents in terms of their activity space preferences. The endpoints of this continuum are labelled as either "local" or "urban" oriented individuals.

The locally-oriented resident concentrates on the immediate local area for the satisfaction of basic needs - social, personal, and material - whereas the urban-oriented type uses local facilities, services, and contacts in a much more limited and less exclusive way, essentially looking to the wider society for these things. The local resident resides in the city but lives in the neighborhood; the urban type resides in the neighborhood but lives in the city. How these two types relate to the differentiation between reserved and sociable is not yet clear, but the reserved type may be more urban, the sociable type, more local. [p. 160]

Theoretically, in keeping with the working definitions offered for privacy and activity space, there should be no relationship between the two concepts and this the formal hypothesis proposed.

Hypothesis 16. Privacy and Activity Space, as general concepts, are unrelated to each other, and more specifically a preference for a particular level of one will not relate systematically to a preference for a particular level of the other.

3. Community and Activity Space

Until recently, few researchers have systematically looked at the empirical relationship between community and activity space. As discussed in the chapter on community, much speculation abounds but little data are available to clarify the issue.

Wellman (1974) and his colleagues at the University of Toronto have begun to unravel this relationship. Wellman, Craven, Whitauer, Stevens, Shorter, DuToit, and Bakker (1973) reported that only 13 per cent of the average Toronto resident's intimate friends live in his neighborhood, only 25 per cent live within the same borough, and about 25 per cent do not live within the boundaries of metropolitan Toronto. If community is defined as intimate social networks, Webber's (1963) "community without propinquity" seems to be a reality.

Certainly, there need be no relationship between community and activity space as theoretical concepts, and for this reason the following hypothesis was offered:

Hypothesis 17. Community and Activity Space, as general concepts, are unrelated to each other, and more specifically a preference for a particular level of one will not relate systematically to a preference for a particular level of the other.

CHAPTER VI

DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIRED PCA SCALE

All science should be scholarly, but not all scholarship can be rigorously scientific . . . The terrae incognitae of the periphery contain fertile ground awaiting cultivation with the tools and in the spirit of the humanities.

John Kirkland Wright

This chapter will describe the development of the Desired Privacy, Community, and Activity Space Inventory (PCA Inventory). The primary aim of the PCA Inventory construction was to develop an index to measure an individual's preferences for privacy, community, and activity space.

The secondary aim of this phase of the study was to construct a scale in which the factors of privacy, community, and activity space were orthogonal to each other. If this proved to be not possible, then this would call for a reassessment of the proposed independence model.

1. Initial Item Selection

Item Generation

The first task was to construct a number of potentially useful items to be included in the final PCA Inventory. These items were obtained from a variety of sources. The literature on privacy, community, and activity space was reviewed and the many different aspects of these three concepts were incorporated into possible items. In addition, professors, students, and friends were asked to submit items that in their opinion would measure someone's preference for privacy, community, or activity space. This procedure

yielded 366 items that were included in the first sorting.

First Item Sorting

In order to choose items that were unambiguously related to privacy, community, or activity space, 16 sorters read each item and placed it in one of eight categories, according to three "definitions". Sorters were chosen from four different age groups (15-21, 22-30, 31-50, 51-75) and included an equal number of males and females, and apartment dwellers and residents of detached houses.

The definitions used for this first sorting were:

Definition A: The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he prefers to control (or prefers not to control) the amount of interaction, both verbal and physical, between himself and others.

Definition B: The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he wants to engage in (or avoid) activities in close-knit groups where there are people who share his interests and values.

Definition C: The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he wants (or does not want) to perform most of his activities within one small area (e.g., block or neighborhood) in which he resides.

These definitions were constructed from the working definitions presented in the previous chapters, and the working definitions were composed after an analysis of the available literature on each concept. Slight changes were made in the original theoretical definitions in order to simplify the concepts for use by the sorters, yet at the same time maintain the core meaning.

The sorters were given a booklet containing the 366 items thought to reflect an individual's preference in relation to the three definitions. They were asked (complete instructions are contained

in Appendix 1) to classify each statement as best representing one of eight categories:

1. Definition A
2. Definition B
3. Definition C
4. Definition A and B
5. Definition A and C
6. Definition B and C
7. All Three Definitions
8. None of the Three Definitions

The terms "privacy", "community", and "activity space" were not at any time used in instructing sorters. The results of this first sorting, which might be viewed as a pilot phase, were not clear-cut (the complete results are presented in Appendix 2). The difficulty in coding the items seemed to be attributable to two factors. First, many of the items were poorly worded and much too complicated.

"Double-barreled" items were too plentiful. Therefore, all items were closely scrutinized and many were reworded to improve their simplicity and directness. Secondly, the definitions were not clear enough in communicating the central themes of privacy, community, and activity space.

Spontaneous comment from many of the sorters indicated some confusion in understanding the definitions. In light of these comments, slight changes were made in the definitions for the second sorting.

Second Item Sorting

The original Definition A prevented many potential privacy items from being so classified because some of the sorters thought that an individual item must refer to both verbal and physical interaction rather than to just one of these types of interaction. Thus, the phrasing of Definition A was changed to:

Definition A: The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he prefers to control (or prefers not to control) interaction, either verbal or physical, between himself and others.

The definition of community was changed to:

Definition B: The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he prefers to engage in (or avoid) a close-knit web of meaningful relationships with others.

Definition B was constructed to connote a kinship-friendship network in which almost everyone knows everyone else. The notion in the first definition of "groups" sharing interests and values seemed to be confusing to the sorters. As well, the word "where" in the first definition might have been interpreted as referring to a particular geographical location, and one of the aims of this study was, as previously discussed, to avoid restricting community to a local place.

The definition of activity space remained the same except for the substitution of "prefers" for "wants":

Definition C: The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he prefers (or does not prefer) to perform most of his activities within one small area (e.g., block or neighborhood) in which he resides.

The second group of sixteen sorters were given a booklet containing 239 statements thought to reflect more clearly an individual's preferences in relation to these three definitions. They were asked to classify each statement as best representing one of nine categories. A new ninth category was added for this second sorting and was simply labelled "?" to allow for no placement whatsoever. The complete instructions to the sorters are contained in Appendix 3.

A high degree of consensus existed for the classification of 91 statements, or approximately 30 for each definition. Items were chosen for possible inclusion in the final brief version of the

Desired PCA Inventory if 10 or more of the sorters indicated the same placement under Definition A, Definition B, or Definition C. A summary of the second sorting results is given in Appendix 4.

2. Final Item Selection

It was next necessary to choose the 10-12 items for each of the three subscales to be included in the final Desired PCA Inventory. A limit of 40 total items was set so that the scale would be brief, easily administered, and useful for field application. The 91 items unambiguously categorized as belonging to one of the three definitions were included in a new scale from which the final items would be selected. In addition, four social desirability items were included in order to allow the elimination of any items highly correlated with the social desirability score.

The subject sample for this phase consisted of 192 respondents from urban centers in Canada and the United States. A representative cross sample was again obtained to ensure an equal number of males and females, apartment dwellers and single home dwellers, and four different age categories. Respondents were asked to read each item and indicate the degree of their agreement by checking one of six possible alternatives ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The complete instructions are contained in Appendix 5. The 95 items are listed in Appendix 6.

Selection of Items from Sample A

After collecting the 192 completed scales, the total sample was randomly divided into two sub-samples, with some adjustment made to obtain an approximately equal representation of the sex, age, and dwelling classification. Sample A had 95 cases and Sample B

had 97 cases.

First, Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients were obtained from Sample A between all 91 Privacy, Community, and Activity Space items and the Privacy, Community, Activity Space, and social desirability scale scores. This information allowed the selection of potential PCA scale items based on the following criteria:

1. An item must have a correlation coefficient of .30 or above on the appropriate scale;
2. The mean response over all respondents must be between 2.0 and 5.0 on the six point continuum;
3. An item must have a correlation coefficient under .30 on the two inappropriate scales;
4. An item must not be correlated above .20 with the social desirability scale; and
5. Items should be chosen as much as possible to be representative of the entire scale domain.

This selection criteria yielded 14, 18, and 13 possible privacy, community, and activity space items, respectively.

Selection of Items from Sample B

Sample B was now used to validate the items chosen from Sample A. The important question was whether a particular item, first chosen from Sample A, would maintain similar correlational characteristics on Sample B. The privacy, community, and activity scale totals for Sample B were computed on the basis of the 14, 18, and 13 items selected from the Sample A correlational analysis. The Sample B analysis yielded 24, 19, and 14 possible privacy, community, and activity space items respectively.

Back Validation on Sample A

These items were then back validated on Sample A using the new scale total scores obtained from the Sample B items. That is, the 24, 19, and 14 privacy, community, and activity space items that

met the five criteria for selection were re-analyzed, using Sample A this time. The items from this new analysis using Sample A were then compared with the items originally analyzed using Sample B.

Final Selection of Items

Items that met the five selection criteria in both the second and third correlational analyses, that is, from Sample B and then Sample A again, were scrutinized closely. The best ten items (allowing for approximately one-half of the items to be reversed items) for each scale were chosen and a final correlation analysis was performed to obtain item-total score coefficients with the reduced 10 item scales. The analyses from this final correlational analysis are shown in Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5, along with the actual items. At this point, these 30 items seemed to be the most useful as seen from both a psychometric and practical viewpoint.

The correlation coefficients presented in Tables 3, 4, and 5 were computed by deleting the item under scrutiny from the total score. As a result of this analysis some of the item coefficients fell below the .30 cut-off criterion, but were included in the final inventory for two reasons. First, the compound probabilities associated with the final items were all under .02 with the exception of Item 10 on the Privacy Scale which had a compound probability of .10. Most of the items had compound probabilities of under .01. Secondly, items with low item-total correlations were sometimes included to satisfy the requirement of sampling from the entire domain of privacy, community, and activity space behaviors.

Table 3
Final Desired Privacy Item - Total Score
Correlation Coefficients for Sample A
and Sample B

Mean Total Score:

Sample A = 40.8

Sample B = 40.7

Item - Total Score Correlations		Total Sample Means		Item
Sample A (n=95)	Sample B (n=97)	(n=192)		
.49	.48	4.3		1. I would like to have a private retreat which no one could enter without asking me.
.33	.38	4.7		2. I don't care if I can't be alone when I wish. (-)
.15	.51	3.8		3. When I go on vacations, I prefer to go to a secluded spot.
.35	.28	4.0		4. I want to have control over when I see other people.
.38	.36	4.2		5. I think that too much emphasis is given to the individual's right to privacy. (-)
.31	.31	3.5		6. To ensure privacy, I would want to live with a high hedge or wooden fence around my backyard.
.35	.54	4.1		7. I don't mind people knowing a lot about my activities. (-)
.47	.32	3.6		8. I am annoyed by people who try to get to know me better than I wish.
.41	.36	3.4		9. I like having people drop by my home without calling me beforehand. (-)
.10	.16	4.2		10. I would disclose my yearly income to anyone who wanted to know. (-)

Table 4
Final Desired Community Item - Total Score
Correlation Coefficients for Sample A
and Sample B

			Mean Total Score:
			Sample A = 42.7
			Sample B = 42.3
<u>Item - Total Score Correlations</u>		<u>Total Sample Means</u>	<u>Item</u>
<u>Sample A (n=95)</u>	<u>Sample B (n= 97)</u>	<u>(n=192)</u>	
.38	.31	4.6	1. I would like to have a close group of friends with whom I do things regularly.
.31	.28	4.2	2. I would like to have a few close friends who all know each other well.
.21	.18	4.8	3. I would like being a member of a family that does things together often.
.26	.36	4.1	4. I could go a long time without socializing with other people. (-)
.31	.46	5.0	5. I need to be around people who accept me as I am.
.48	.43	4.1	6. I would like to be a member of a close-knit group.
.19	.23	2.4	7. I don't need to see my close friends everyday. (-)
.15	.33	3.5	8. I can be the person I want to be without being a member of a group. (-)
.28	.25	4.2	9. I would rather work alone than as a member of a small work team. (-)
.30	.33	4.8	10. I like to engage in cooperative endeavours with others.

Table 5
 Final Desired Activity Space Item - Total Score
 Correlation Coefficients for Sample A and
 Sample B

			Mean Total Score:
			Sample A = 32.8
			Sample B = 32.2
<u>Item - Total Score Correlations</u>		<u>Total Sample Means</u>	<u>Item</u>
Sample A (n=95)	Sample B (n=97)	(n=192)	
.49	.41	3.1	1. I don't care whether I live within walking distance of a shopping area. (-)
.45	.53	2.4	2. If I could do everything I wanted within my neighborhood, I would rarely leave it.
.48	.38	3.6	3. It is important that a grocery store be near my residence.
.25	.47	3.1	4. I would prefer to live where there is a movie house near by.
.44	.45	3.5	5. I dislike having to take the car to obtain the things I need.
.38	.40	2.4	6. I would enjoy frequent trips away from my neighborhood. (-)
.32	.41	3.7	7. I prefer to spend most of my leisure time outside my neighborhood. (-)
.32	.58	3.4	8. I would like to have a restaurant within walking distance of my home.
.23	.51	2.7	9. I want most of my friends to live outside my neighborhood. (-)
.20	.26	3.7	10. I want my job to be within walking distance of my home.

CHAPTER VII

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DESIRED PCA INVENTORY

There are three kinds of lies: lies,
damned lies, and statistics.

Disraeli

The various psychometric characteristics of the Desired PCA Inventory will be discussed in this chapter along with the data bearing on the hypotheses proposing independence among privacy, community, and activity space. However, before presenting the results pertaining to the reliability and validity of the PCA Inventory, a few facts about the sample deserve consideration.

1. Characteristics of the Sample

Both the information concerning the PCA Inventory reliability and the information concerning the various hypotheses put forward in the prior chapters were gathered from a sample of 60 residents of the "Glebe" area of the city of Ottawa.¹

The Glebe is a residential area within the city of Ottawa and is approximately two miles from the city core. In 1971 (Statistics Canada), approximately 14,000 predominantly English-speaking residents resided in 4,600 dwellings. Half of the dwellings were single detached/attached houses and half were apartments; half were owner occupied and half were tenant occupied. The average income per household was \$12,000; the median household income was \$10,000. The median house value in 1971 was \$29,000.

The present sample consisted of 60 persons residing in the Glebe chosen to represent a cross-section of this area. Males and females numbered 27 and 33, respectively. Age divisions followed four categories: (1) 17-21 ($n = 15$); (2) 22-30 ($n = 15$); (3) 31-50 ($n = 15$); and (4) over 50 ($n = 15$). Approximately half of the respondents lived in single detached/attached houses ($n = 32$) and half in apartments ($n = 28$); half were owner occupied ($n = 29$) and half were tenant occupied ($n = 31$). The average income per household was approximately \$15,000. The average number of persons per dwelling was 3.1. Of the total sample, 27 persons were single and 33 married. Employed persons numbered 33, unemployed 24 (housewives and students), and 3 persons were retired. On the whole, the sample of 60 respondents was representative of the characteristics of the total Glebe population.

Possible sample bias when using volunteers is particularly important when researching privacy, and for this reason an extra effort was made to interview each person selected to form the sample. Approximately 80 per cent of the persons contacted agreed to be interviewed.

The Desired PCA Inventory, along with other attitudinal inventories, was administered to residents in their homes as part of an extensive two-hour interview. The format of the Desired PCA Inventory is presented in Appendix 7.

2. Reliability Information

Three different types of reliability data were collected relating to the inventory designed to measure desired levels of privacy, community, and activity space. The first reliability analysis sought to confirm the a priori division of the inventory into three distinct scales.

Scale Homogeneity

To do this, it was necessary to ascertain congruency within the three scales and differentiation among the three scales. A measure of internal scale homogeneity was obtained through the use of the Kuder-Richardson formula, popularly known as the KR20 (Cronbach, 1960)². The obtained KR20 coefficients were .61 for Privacy, .67 for Community, and .64 for Activity Space.

These correlations were higher than the interscale correlations between Privacy and Community (-.25), Privacy and Activity Space, (-.03), and Community and Activity Space (.42).

Hence, these results taken together support the general usefulness of the three scales and the entire inventory. The KR20 analysis indicated that the scales were measuring an underlying variable (privacy, community, or activity space), and the scale intercorrelations were evidence for the meaningful separation of the three scales.

Internal Consistency

The next task was to determine that the obtained scale scores were accurate reflections of the individuals' true scores. A split-half reliability analysis based on the sample of 60 respondents yielded Spearman-Brown corrected reliability coefficients of .75, .77, and .54 for Privacy, Community, and Activity Space, respectively.

These coefficients are, in general, acceptable for the purposes of this inventory, but the Activity Space coefficient is lower than would be desired. Several explanations for this result are plausible. First, split-half reliabilities increase as the number of items increases (Lord & Novick, 1968). Since each scale only

contained 10 items, the split-half reliabilities were based on five items in each half, a very small number by any standard. However, this loss in psychometric purity was assumed prior to constructing the scale, knowing that a trade-off between ease of administration and scale precision would be unavoidable.

Secondly, one might expect the Activity Space correlations to be lower as each item dealt with a concrete activity and only ~~the~~ sum accurately presented a general picture of one's "activity space". By chance assignment, the items forming half of the sample primarily treated the neighborhood in general versus the larger city (see items 2, 5, 6, 7 in Table 5); the items forming the other half treated the location of explicit activities such as grocery shopping, eating out, work, and going to the cinema (see items 1, 3, 4, 8, 10 in Table 5). If the "neighborhood" items were evenly represented in both halves, the correlation coefficient should increase. This is in fact the case. The Spearman-Brown corrected coefficient so computed was .65.

In sum, these results suggest that an individual's true score lies within an acceptable range of obtained scores, as the Standard Errors were 1.2, 1.1, and 1.0 for the Privacy, Community, and Activity Space scales, respectively. An individual's average score over many administrations of the Desired PCA Inventory would be close to the obtained score on one administration.

Scale Stability

The third type of reliability information determined the stability of an individual's score over time. Approximately three months after the initial interview, 40 initial respondents were sent Desired PCA Inventories to complete and return in a stamped, self-addressed envelope.² The test-retest results were

the 32 inventories returned. The Pearson Product-Moment coefficients for Privacy, Community, and Activity Space were .87, .58, and .74, respectively.

The PCA Inventory seems to be tapping relatively enduring attitudes. An individual's preference for certain ranges of privacy, community, and activity space does not change radically within a short time. The PCA Inventory is not measuring temporary desired levels of the three concepts (which might be useful in testing the predictive power of Altman's homeostatic model for short time intervals; e.g., hours, days, weeks), but more general preferences. A tentative conclusion based on these results would be that people do think about privacy, community, and activity space in a manner consistent with the PCA Inventory items, and that they have definite preferences for various levels of each.

3. Validity Information

The validation of any attitude scale is a never ending process; nevertheless, initial data confirm that the PCA Inventory adequately measures what it was designed to measure.

Peer Nomination Technique

The peer nomination procedure used by Gough (1957) in the validation of the California Personality Inventory was one method used to assess scale validity. With this validation technique, individuals are asked to characterize someone on dimensions relevant to the scale; the scale is then administered to this person and the match between the individual's characterization and the person's score on the scale is analyzed.

Individuals were asked to read descriptions of six hypothetical persons (see Table 6). These six descriptions described persons

Table 6

Hypothetical Descriptions of Persons with Very Low
Or Very High Preferences for Privacy, Community,
and Activity Space

Privacy

1. Private Person
This person very much prefers to determine the time, place, and circumstances under which he wishes to share himself with others. This person wants to control the extent to which his attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors are to be shared or withheld from others.
2. Open Person
This person does not care about controlling the time, place, or circumstances under which he wishes to share himself with others. This person is totally unconcerned with having control over the sharing or withholding of information about himself to others.

Community

3. Interwoven Network Person
This person prefers to have friends that all know each other and who do things together, often. He enjoys working cooperatively with others, and he values close friendships.
4. Unconnected Network Person
This person prefers to have many casual friends who do not know each other well. He would not be upset if he could not see his acquaintances regularly.

Activity Space

5. Neighborhood Oriented Person
This person prefers to perform most of his activities within one small area (e.g., neighborhood) in which he resides. If he could do everything he wanted within the neighborhood, he would rarely leave it. He typically would be annoyed if he had to frequently go outside his neighborhood to do all that he wanted to do.
6. Urban Oriented Person
This person prefers to perform most of his activities outside the small area (e.g., neighborhood) in which he resides. He prefers to disperse his activities over the entire city and would be restless if required to concentrate his activities within his neighborhood.

with very high or very low preferences for Privacy, Community, or Activity Space. The nominators were next asked if they knew anyone who definitely fit one or more of the descriptions. If they knew someone who fit the description, they were asked to profile this person on the three relevant dimensions. A hypothetical profile is given in Figure 3. If the nominator profiled a friend as greater than plus or minus four on one or more dimensions, the nominator was asked to give the friend a Desired PCA Inventory to complete and return in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided. A person was "typed" according to the highest or lowest profile rating on the three scales. If someone received identical ratings on two or more scales, placement was made on the basis of the least filled category. All responses were confidential, although a special mailbox code on each envelope allowed identification of the category for which the friend had been nominated.

A t-Test analysis was performed to see if each subscale could discriminate between the high and low preference persons as nominated by their friends. The means for the high and low Privacy groups were 43.5 and 34.6, respectively, $t(19) = 3.2$, $p < .005$. The means for the high and low Community groups were 41.4 and 34.9, respectively, $t(19) = 2.0$, $p < .06$. The means for the high and low Activity Space groups were 35.0 and 27.4, respectively, $t(17) = 2.2$, $p < .05$. Higher scores on the Desired PCA Inventory indicate a greater preference for a localized Activity Space.

The PCA Inventory differentiated between individuals categorized by their friends as having low or high privacy, community, and activity

INSTRUCTIONS

Please indicate on the chart below the description of the individual to whom you plan to give the questionnaire. Place an X on each vertical line according to how you would describe the individual concerning his preferences for privacy, type of social network, and activity space.

Figure 3. Profile sheet used to classify individuals as high or low on the three Desired PCA scales.

space preferences. The means for the two Community groups were closer than were the means for the other concepts, but still can be viewed tentatively as divergent given the size of the sample. A larger sample should reduce the variance, thus increasing the statistical significance of the same mean difference between "low and high community" groups.

Concurrent Validity

An additional measure of validity is the relationship between different scales that purport to measure the same concepts. Concurrent validity is provided by a correlation of .60 between the Privacy scores on the Desired PCA Inventory and the Need Privacy scale on the Environmental Response Inventory (McKechnie, 1974). The Need Privacy items tap "isolation from stimuli, enjoyment of solitude, dislike of neighboring, and need for freedom from distraction" (McKechnie, 1974, p. 2). The Need Privacy scale does not exclusively pertain to "desired privacy" but also includes some items that could be labeled "achieved privacy", (e.g., I pride myself on having a home which is always open to friends). For this reason, a higher correlation between the Privacy scale on the Desired PCA Inventory and the Need Privacy scale on the ERI would not be expected.

Cross-Cultural Validity

Information concerning the validity of an attitude scale can also be obtained from sampling different subject populations with known differences with respect to the attitude being measured. On the basis of previously documented cultural stereotypes (Gilbert, 1951; Katz & Braly, 1933), it was hypothesized that British respondents would have higher Privacy preference scores than Canadian

respondents on the PCA Inventory. This hypothesis was supported as the mean score for 139 British respondents (London, England) was 39.0 versus 35.3 for 60 Canadian (Ottawa, Ontario) respondents, $t(197) = 2.9$, $p < .004$. No differences were hypothesized for Community and Activity Space preferences between the two populations since no cultural stereotypes were known to exist on these dimensions. There was no difference on the Community preference scores; the mean score for the British and Canadian samples were 38.6 and 38.9, respectively. However, there was a significant difference in Activity Space preferences. The mean mean scores were 32.5 for the British sample and 37.0 for the Canadian sample, $t(197) = 4.4$, $p < .001$. This difference could most likely be attributed to the known sample differences.

The Canadian sample was drawn from the Glebe section in the city of Ottawa. The Glebe is an older established neighborhood, providing many conveniences within walking distance, and many of the residents take great pride in the fact that they can walk to perform most of their daily activities. In fact, the mean Activity Space score for residents of the Glebe was two points higher than the mean for the "high" Activity Space individuals in the peer nomination sample.

The London sample was drawn primarily from the staff, faculty, and students at Oxford College. Individuals were also approached in various residential neighborhoods around London. No one self-contained neighborhood was selected for sampling, therefore the activity space scores might not be as high as those obtained from the Glebe sample. Obviously, these cross-cultural comparisons are tentative, at best, but they do provide slight additional confirmation for the ability of

the PCA Inventory to measure the purported underlying concepts.

Social Desirability

The relationship between a particular item and a measure of social desirability (summed score of four items from the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale, 1964) was reviewed when potential items were being analyzed for inclusion on the Desired PCA Inventory.³ The relationship between the final 10-item scale scores and the Social Desirability measure support the contention that an individual's PCA scores are not influenced by pressures to answer according to prevailing societal norms.

The correlations between the Social Desirability measure and Desired Privacy, Community, and Activity Space were $-.06$, $.18$, and $.02$, respectively.

4. Achieved PCA Scale

The previous reliability and validity data were collected on the Desired PCA Inventory. This inventory was designed to measure individuals' preferences of various levels of privacy, community, and activity space. An Achieved PCA Inventory was also constructed to measure obtained levels of privacy, community, and activity space.

The Achieved PCA Inventory consisted of the 30 Privacy, Community, and Activity Space items on the Desired PCA Inventory slightly reworded so that the respondent could indicate the accuracy of a statement as applied to his present situation. For example, one statement read, "I take frequent trips away from my neighborhood." The respondent was asked to indicate the accuracy of the statement on a six-point scale. The complete Achieved PCA Inventory is included in Appendix 8. The

general descriptive characteristics of both the "Desired" and "Achieved" PCA Inventories are given in Table 7.

5. Relationships Among the Privacy, Community, and Activity Space Scales

We will now turn to the primary question concerning the relationship among privacy, community, and activity space.

Correlational Analysis

The correlations between the three scales of the Desired PCA and Achieved PCA Inventories are presented in Table 8. Looking first at the Glebe results, a significant negative correlation was obtained between Desired Privacy and Desired Community ($-.25$) but not between Achieved Privacy and Achieved Community ($-.09$). There is a statistically significant relationship between both Desired Community and Activity Space ($.42$) and Achieved Community and Achieved Activity Space ($.41$). There is no relationship between either Desired Privacy and Desired Activity Space ($-.03$) or Achieved Privacy and Achieved Activity Space ($-.19$).

The British Desired PCA results are similar to the Glebe Desired PCA results, except for the relationship between Desired Community and Desired Activity Space (see Table 8).

In general, these results support the proposed model of independence. Hypothesis 15 is confirmed, as well as Hypothesis 16. Complete independence does not exist between Desired Privacy and Desired Community, but the correlation of $-.25$ is weak; no relationship exists between Achieved Privacy and Achieved Community.

Even though the amount of common variance accounted for by the $.42$ and $.41$ Glebe correlations between Community and Activity Space

Table 7.

Desired and Achieved PCA Inventory Characteristics
(Glebe Sample, n = 60)

	Desired PCA	Achieved PCA
<u>Privacy</u>		
Mean	35.4	32.8
Standard Deviation	9.2	6.4
Standard Error	1.2	0.8
Observed Minimum	16.0	18.0
Observed Maximum	59.0	50.0
<u>Community</u>		
Mean	38.8	38.6
Standard Deviation	4.4	8.1
Standard Error	1.1	1.0
Observed Minimum	14.0	18.0
Observed Maximum	56.0	58.0
<u>Activity Space</u>		
Mean	37.1	37.9
Standard Deviation	7.4	8.2
Standard Error	1.0	1.1
Observed Minimum	19.0	18.0
Observed Maximum	55.0	54.0

Table 8

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between the Subscales
On the Desired PCA and Achieved PCA Inventories.

<u>Desired PCA (Glebe Sample)</u>	
Desired Privacy with Desired Community	-.25*
Desired Privacy with Desired Activity Space	-.03
Desired Community with Desired Activity Space	.42**
<u>Desired PCA (British Sample)</u>	
Desired Privacy with Desired Community	-.22
Desired Privacy with Desired Activity Space	.03
Desired Community with Desired Activity Space	.16
<u>Achieved PCA (Glebe Sample)</u>	
Achieved Privacy with Achieved Community	-.09
Achieved Privacy with Achieved Activity Space	-.19
Achieved Community with Achieved Activity Space	.41**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

is not large (between 16-20%), it does seem that in some instances, both Desired and Achieved Community are associated with a limited activity space within the urban environment. On the basis of these results, Webber's (1963) notion of a "community without propinquity" would not be rejected, but it might be somewhat less tenable than he supposed. However, the British correlation between Desired Community and Desired Activity Space was not significant (.16). As has been mentioned, in the North American context, the Glebe might be viewed as an atypical residential neighborhood. One of its primary characteristics is the cultivation of locally based activity patterns. Perhaps a more representative national or international sample would support the British results. If further sampling revealed this to be the case, then community, as defined in this research, could be construed as entirely independent of a local area.

These results do not allow a black-and-white picture to be drawn concerning the interrelationships among privacy, community, and activity space. This is probably an accurate reflection of reality, theoretical speculation to the contrary. Often, writers concerned with these concepts have tended to phrase hypotheses concerning the interrelationships in "either - or" terminology in keeping with the prevailing statistical models; rarely has the Bayesian concept of conditional probability been emphasized (see Morrison & Henkel, 1970). For example, we might reject any theoretical relationship between Privacy and Community on the basis of the obtained correlations; yet the statistically significant, but slight, negative relationship can be meaningful as a probability statement. It remains

for future research to ascertain whether this relationship is consistent. If so, it would be useful to know which items (behaviors) contribute most to this negative relationship.

CHAPTER VIII

RESULTS OF THE GLEBE INTERVIEWS

The main body of psychology started its career by putting the wrong foot forward and it has been out of step with the march of science much of the time. Instead of beginning with studies of the whole person adjusting to a natural environment, it began with studies of a segment of a person responding to a physical stimulus in an unnatural laboratory environment.

Henry A. Murray (1948)

The purpose of this final phase of the study was to allow a number of specific hypotheses concerning individual preferences for different levels of privacy, community, and activity space to be tested through in-depth interviews of urban residents. The characteristics of the Glebe sample have already been presented in Chapter VII.

Each respondent was interviewed in his home or office by the male interviewer. The author did not conduct any interviews so as to avoid possible biases influencing the responses of the interviewees. The Glebe Interview Schedule (see Appendix 10) containing various questions about one's behavior in and attitude toward the residential environment was administered along with the Desired and Achieved PCA Inventories, the Eysenck Personality Inventory (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1963), and the Environmental Response Inventory (McKechnie, 1971). In addition, the social activities of the interviewees were mapped on scale maps of the neighborhood and city. The major

findings of these interviews are discussed in this chapter.

1. Demographic PCA Results

Table 9 presents the results of a breakdown analysis of Desired and Achieved Privacy scores by sex, age, type of dwelling, and marital status. Males and females have similar Desired Privacy, Community, and Activity Space scores (see Table 9). Moreover, only Desired Privacy scores showed significant differences among the four age groups sampled. The mean Desired Privacy score for the 22-30 age group was significantly ($p < .05$) higher than the other age groups.

This difference was also apparent in the privacy congruency scores for the various age groups. Congruence scores were obtained by subtracting Achieved Scale scores from Desired Scale scores. The mean differences for the four age groups were 1.9, 2.7, 2.1, and 2.2, respectively ($F(3, 59) = 2.8, p < .05$). The 22-30 age group had the largest discrepancy between desired and achieved levels of privacy.

Type of dwelling did not affect Desired Privacy, Community, and Activity Space scores.

Marital State and Privacy

It was speculated in the introduction that no difference should exist between Desired and Achieved Privacy and Community for single and married individuals. Even though married individuals might objectively enjoy less privacy, they would not perceive this as so due to the "we" feeling discussed by Cooley (1929). This appears to be the case for Community but not for Privacy. Married individuals desired ($p < .09$) and achieved ($p < .05$) less Privacy than single individuals. Maybe one's interpersonal boundary becomes more permeable as a result of such a close, intimate relationship.

Table 9
Desired and Achieved Privacy, Community,
and Activity Space Scores by Demographic Factors

			Privacy		Community		Activity Space	
			Desired	Achieved	Desired	Achieved	Desired	Achieved
A.	Sex:							
	Male	(n=27)	32.5	32.4	37.6	38.6	37.0	38.8
	Female	(n=33)	35.5	33.1	39.8	38.6	37.2	37.1
B.	Age:							
	15-21	(n=15)	33.5	34.5	41.5	38.7	34.1	34.7
	22-30	(n=15)	40.9*	34.2	37.1	38.3	40.1	39.2
	31-50	(n=15)	32.6	29.6	37.9	40.2	37.3	39.5
	Over 50	(n=15)	34.5	32.8	39.0	37.1	37.1	38.2
C.	Dwelling:							
	House	(n=32)	33.6	31.8	39.0	38.6	37.2	39.1
	Apartment	(n=28)	37.4	33.6	28.7	38.5	36.9	36.5
D.	Marital Status:							
	Single	(n=27)	37.6	34.6*	38.3	38.9	34.8*	37.0
	Married	(n=33)	33.6	31.3	39.3	38.3	39.0	38.7

*p < .05

However, the absolute differences were not large (see Table 9) and if age were a controlled factor, the differences might disappear. In any event, intimate involvement in a dyadic relationship does not decrease radically one's privacy • increase one's community as measured by the PCA Inventories.

Automobiles and Privacy

Interestingly, respondents who had the regular use of a car had achieved less Privacy ($n=37$, $\bar{X}$ score = 30.8) than respondents without the regular use of a car ($n=23$, $\bar{X}$ score = 36.0, $F(1, 59) = 10.6$, $p < .01$). There were no significant Desired Privacy differences across car use categories, nor were significant differences obtained for Desired or Achieved Community and Activity Space.

This result would support Altman's (1975) regulatory model of privacy. The availability of a car would allow the visitation of friends and engagement in activities to decrease "social isolation". Thus, a balance between desired and achieved levels might be obtained more easily. The respondents having the regular use of a car desired less privacy ($\bar{X} = 34.0$) than those not having such use ($\bar{X} = 37.0$), but this difference was not statistically significant.

2. Desired and Achieved Congruency

In order to test the congruency hypotheses, the sample was divided into groups representing optimal privacy (Desired Privacy = Achieved Privacy), social isolation (Desired Privacy < Achieved Privacy), and crowding (Desired Privacy > Achieved Privacy). The same division was repeated for Community and Activity Space.

The three groups were formed by subtracting the Privacy, Community, and Activity Space scores (10-item totals) on the "Achieved" PCA

Inventory from the scores on the "Desired" PCA Inventory. All respondents with a calculated score of -4 or below were placed in the "Desired < Achieved" group. Respondents obtaining a score between -3 and +3 were placed in the "Desired = Achieved" group, and respondents obtaining a score of +4 or above were placed in the "Desired > Achieved" group.

As seen in Table 10, no differences in the rating of one's house were found to result from the Privacy, Community, or Activity Space congruency scores. Most residents were very satisfied with their dwelling and their ratings did not vary as a function of the degree of congruency between the desired and achieved levels.

One might expect differences to be obtained only for Privacy and Activity Space, as the characteristics of one's house should not heavily influence Desired or Achieved Community scores. However, to the extent that Achieved Community is found within one's neighborhood, a relationship should exist between Community congruency scores and neighborhood satisfaction measures. This was not the case, as can be seen in Table 11. No differences in neighborhood satisfaction were found among the three "Desired-Achieved" Community groups. The same was true for the Privacy and Activity Space groups. The neighborhood satisfaction measure was a composite of six items: Satisfaction with neighbors, location of the neighborhood within the city, convenience to shops, appearance, amount of privacy afforded, and community spirit. Scores on each item were added to form a "neighborhood satisfaction" index.

Satisfaction with one's life in general was obtained by using Cantril's (1965) ladder technique. Respondents were asked to imagine

Table 10
Satisfaction with House by
Desired - Achieved PCA Congruency Scores

	Mean Rating of House (1 = not at all; 5 = very satisfied)	
Desired Privacy < Achieved Privacy	4.3	(n=14)
Desired Privacy = Achieved Privacy	4.6	(n=19)
Desired Privacy > Achieved Privacy	4.4	(n=27)
Desired Community < Achieved Community	4.2	(n=19)
Desired Community = Achieved Community	4.6	(n=20)
Desired Community > Achieved Community	4.5	(n=21)
Desired Activity Space < Achieved Activity Space	4.6	(n=22)
Desired Activity Space = Achieved Activity Space	4.2	(n=21)
Desired Activity Space > Achieved Activity Space	4.6	(n=17)

2

Table 11
 Neighborhood Satisfaction by
 Desired - Achieved PCA Congruency Scores

	Mean Neighborhood Satisfaction	
Desired Privacy < Achieved Privacy	25.9	(n=14)
Desired Privacy = Achieved Privacy	23.2	(n=19)
Desired Privacy > Achieved Privacy	25.3	(n=27)
Desired Community < Achieved Community	22.7	(n=19)
Desired Community = Achieved Community	25.9	(n=20)
Desired Community > Achieved Community	25.5	(n=21)
Desired Activity Space < Achieved Activity Space	25.0	(n=22)
Desired Activity Space = Achieved Activity Space	23.1	(n=21)
Desired Activity Space > Achieved Activity Space	26.4	(n=17)

the best possible life they could have as well as the worst possible life (see Appendix 9 for the exact instructions). Their images formed the top and bottom of a 10-rung ladder. They were then asked to indicate where on the ladder they would place themselves, now, five years ago, and where they expected to be five years hence. These measures constituted satisfaction with one's present, past, and future life.

Again, no differences in present life satisfaction were found to relate to congruency scores between Desired and Achieved levels of Privacy, Community, and Activity Space (see Table 12).

It was also hypothesized that incongruencies between Desired and Achieved levels of Privacy, Community, and Activity Space would lead possibly to higher anxiety scores. This relationship was tested by relating the three congruency groups to the Neuroticism (N) Scale of the Eysenck Personality Scale. Eysenck and Eysenck (1968) define this scale as tapping "emotional lability and overreactivity :: individuals report many worries, anxieties, and other disagreeable emotional feelings" [p. 6].

However, no differences in anxiety were obtained using the congruency measures for Privacy and Community. An unexpected result was that respondents achieving congruency were more anxious ($F(2, 59) = 3.7, p < .05$) than either respondents with their Achieved Activity Space smaller or larger than their Desired Activity Space (see Table 13). In retrospect the choice of the N Scale from the EPI might not have been appropriate since Privacy, Community, or Activity Space incongruency would most likely lead to temporary anxiety states and not more enduring ones as measured by the EPI.

From the above, we might conclude that imbalances between Desired and Achieved levels of Privacy, Community, and Activity

Table 12

Present Life Satisfaction by
Desired - Achieved PCA Congruency Scores

	Present Life Satisfaction	
Desired Privacy < Achieved Privacy	7.5	(n=14)
Desired Privacy = Achieved Privacy	7.0	(n=19)
Desired Privacy > Achieved Privacy	6.7	(n=27)
Desired Community < Achieved Community	7.2	(n=19)
Desired Community = Achieved Community	7.2	(n=20)
Desired Community > Achieved Community	6.6	(n=21)
Desired Activity Space < Achieved Activity Space	6.8	(n=22)
Desired Activity Space = Achieved Activity Space	6.8	(n=21)
Desired Activity Space > Achieved Activity Space	7.5	(n=17)

Table 13

Anxiety Scores

by Desired - Achieved PCA Congruency Scores

	Mean Anxiety Score	
Desired Privacy < Achieved Privacy	7.9	(n=14)
Desired Privacy = Achieved Privacy	8.8	(n=19)
Desired Privacy > Achieved Privacy	8.4	(n=27)
Desired Community < Achieved Community	7.6	(n=19)
Desired Community = Achieved Community	7.8	(n=20)
Desired Community > Achieved Community	9.7	(n=21)
Desired Activity Space < Achieved Activity Space	6.9	(n=22)
Desired Activity Space = Achieved Activity Space	10.5	(n=21)
Desired Activity Space > Achieved Activity Space	7.8	(n=17)

Space do not affect an individual's satisfaction with his immediate environment. There are many plausible explanations for the lack of a relationship between the congruency scores and the various measures of satisfaction. The first is that the cut-off points for group categorization were too low. Would it be accurate to classify someone with a score of ± 4 as experiencing incongruency between desired and achieved levels when the possible range of congruency scores was ± 50 ? What absolute congruency "score" typically reflects real "perceived" congruency on the part of the individual?

Additional analyses were run with cut-off points of ± 6 (producing group sizes of 7, 32, and 21 for Privacy; 15, 29, and 16 for Community, and 18, 31, and 11 for Activity Space) and ± 10 (producing group sizes of 1, 52, and 7 for Privacy; 9, 42, and 9 for Community, and 8, 46, and 6 for Activity Space). The results of these analyses were nonsignificant as well.

In general the Glebe respondents had obtained congruency between Desired and Achieved Privacy, Community, and Activity Space. In fact, the overall correlations between Desired and Achieved Privacy, Community, and Activity Space scores were .65, .41, and .50, respectively. This is further evidenced by the few respondents attaining congruency scores larger than ± 10 , which perhaps is the minimal difference that could be accepted as meaningful. Sampling from other neighborhoods might produce a wider range of scores, thus allowing for a more adequate test of the hypotheses.

Another explanation for the lack of relationships might be that systematic effects do exist, but these effects are very small for each individual and only through large samples would a clear relationship emerge.

A third explanation is that the dependent measures chosen to reflect the degree of congruency are particularly difficult to move around. For example, even if a large incongruency existed, general anxiety might not be the inevitable result. A study of commuters from Long Island to Manhattan revealed that 67 per cent believed that their family relations were impaired by commuting, 59 per cent experienced fatigue, but only 28 per cent experienced anxiety as a result of the three hours per day in transit (Charatan, 1973). This is also true with the life satisfaction measure (Campbell, Converse & Rodgers, 1976; Cantril, 1965). Life satisfaction is a psychological indicator that corresponds to a person's general perception of his overall life, and as such may not vary with perceived imbalances in Privacy, Community, and Activity Space. Quite conceivably, these three concepts may be rather middle class and unimportant in the lives of most people. Although in a study of three Ottawa public housing projects, Audet (1972) found that eighty-seven per cent of the total sample interviewed spontaneously voiced their opinions on the issue of privacy in their home and neighborhood. In any event, more sensitive indicators should be sought to relate to congruency measures.

It may be the case, as well, that an imbalance on any one concept would not disturb anyone, but that imbalances on all three would be unsettling. A cumulative model similar to this has been proposed by Holmes and Rahe (1967) in their research on life changes, stress, and physical illness. Unfortunately, the size of the present sample did not permit a discriminant analysis focussing on cumulative imbalances.

The final explanation which by itself or in conjunction with the previous determining factors may have led to no relationship, focuses on time. All measures of congruency were acute indicators rather than chronic indicators. The imbalances may have been temporary in the eyes of the respondent. A particular respondent may have been anticipating a move to a larger apartment to gain more privacy, joining the tennis club to make new friends, or buying a car to facilitate travel outside the neighborhood. A measure of chronic incongruency obtained through time sampling might more accurately reflect long-term disturbing imbalances.

3. Privacy and Individual Differences

Privacy and Extraversion

As hypothesized, Desired Privacy was inversely related to Extraversion as measured on the EPI ($r = -.39, p < .002$). There was no relationship between Desired Community and Extraversion ($r = .17$) or Desired Activity Space and Extraversion ($r = .00$). The negative relationship between privacy and extraversion replicates Marshall's (1970) finding. It is important to note that this was a conceptual replication as both scales used were different than those used by Marshall. This kind of replication is needed in an area where general concepts are operationalized through the choice of particular scale items, and little attention is paid to convergent validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). It was encouraging to find results similar to other researchers working independently when researching such complex issues.

Privacy and Anxiety

Desired Privacy scores were also related to the Neuroticism scores

on the EPI ($r = .38$, $p < .002$). This result is reasonable since greater control over interactions with others would allow one to cope better with fears and worries. We would expect that the more anxiety experienced by a person, the more likely that he would want to go "backstage" (Goffman, 1959) to escape continually performing in front of an "audience". The more anxious respondents also achieved more privacy as the correlation between Neuroticism and Achieved Privacy was $.47$ ($p < .001$).

Privacy and Town Size

Marshall's (1970) results relating privacy preference scores to the size of the town in which one grew up were replicated. The desired privacy means for the various groups were: (1) large city, 38.0, (2) suburb, 42.4, (3) small city, 33.0, (4) small town, 30.0, and (5) country, 31.6, $F(4, 59) = 3.09$, $p < .02$. Duncan's Multiple Range Test revealed that groups 4 and 5 were not significantly different from each other but that groups 1, 2, and 3 were all significantly different from each other at the .05 probability level. In addition, groups 1, 2, and 3 were significantly different from groups 4 and 5. Consequently, respondents who grew up in a suburb of a large city had the highest Desired Privacy scores, followed by respondents who grew up in a large city, a small city, the country, and a small town.

A similar pattern was found for Achieved Privacy. The means for Groups 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were 33.2, 39.0, 31.9, 30.6, and 28.2, respectively $F(4, 59) = 3.26$, $p < .02$. Duncan's procedure indicated that respondents who grew up in the suburbs had achieved more privacy than respondents who grew up in the country or in a large city, small city, or small town ($p < .05$).

This finding would lend support to an adaptation level interpretation (Helson, 1964) of present privacy preferences. Even though all of the respondents were living presently in the same area of a large city, their desired and achieved privacy levels were related to the previous environment to which they had adapted.

Privacy and Number of Persons in Dwelling

Another of Marshall's (1970) findings was replicated in the present study. In her study, of 29 variables in the physical environment, only two were related to her Privacy Preference Scale. These were the number of people living in one's dwelling and the number of rooms that were visually open to each other. Both were negatively related to an individual's preference for privacy. The first finding was replicated as the correlation between Desired Privacy and the number of persons in one's dwelling was $-.37, p < .005$. The correlation between Achieved Privacy and the number of persons in one's dwelling was $-.31, p < .01$. No data were collected concerning Marshall's second significant finding.

It is, of course, impossible to draw cause-effect inferences from correlational data, but these data suggest that one's early environment shaped in part one's present preferences for privacy, which in turn have influenced the density of one's immediate environment. Individuals can control to some degree, the number of persons who share their home or apartment. It must be remembered, though, that the 22-30 age group had the highest Desired Privacy scores, and these respondents would most likely have fewer persons living with them. This was in fact the case as an average of 2.3 persons inhabited the dwelling of the 22-30 age group respondents as

opposed to 3.3 for the 12-21 age group, 4.2 for the 31-50 age group, and 2.7 for the over 50 age group, $F(3, 59) = 2.8, p < .05$.

Again, the present sample is not large enough to allow the teasing apart of all of these variables through the appropriate analysis; nevertheless, the correlational data suggest possibilities for a more detailed cause-effect analysis in the future. This phase of the present project was largely exploratory.

4. Social Network Analyses

Another major aim of the present study was to explore the usefulness of social network mapping in understanding an urban dweller's attitudes and behavior. As part of the Glebe Interview, respondents mapped their activities on (1) a map of the entire urban region and (2) a detailed map of the Glebe area. The location of activities such as work, school, place of worship, corner store, and others (see Appendix 10) were noted on each respondent's map. In addition, the location of relatives and ten friends and acquaintances were noted. Furthermore, the frequency of engagement in and the subjective importance of the various activities was noted. Information was also gathered on how well the ten friends and acquaintances in the respondent's social network knew each other. The respondent was asked to indicate whether Friend A knew Friend B (1) not at all, (2) met once or twice, (3) as an acquaintance, (4) as a friend, or (5) as a very close friend. This information was used to construct a measure of the "connectedness" of a respondent's social network.

Connectedness was operationally obtained by summing the degree to which various friends knew each other, with "not at all" coded as zero and "very close friend" coded as four. Thus, connectedness

scores for a network of ten individuals could range from 0 to 360; a score of 0 would indicate that none of the respondent's friends knew each other, a score of 360 would indicate that all the friends in the respondent's network were very close. The obtained Network Connectedness mean was 119 for the 60 Glebe respondents.

Hypothesis 6 stated that a relationship should exist between Connectedness and Anxiety as measured on the EPI. This hypothesis was not supported as the correlation between Network Connectedness and Neuroticism was .01. To check for any curvilinear effects, the sample was divided into four equal groups according to the degree of Network Connectedness. The results of this division are presented in Table 14. There were no significant differences among the groups on either anxiety, present life satisfaction, or percentage of activities within the Glebe area of Ottawa.⁴

Positive correlations did exist, however, between Network Connectedness and the number of friends who lived in the Glebe ($r = .29, p < .02$), and the number of activities occurring in the Glebe ($r = .29, p < .02$). There was no significant relationship between Network Connectedness and either Desired Community ($r = .20$) or Achieved Community ($r = .17$), although the correlations were in the expected direction.

5. Local Activity Performance and the PCA Inventories

It seems that the actual number of activities one performs within his neighborhood is more important in achieving community than is the connectedness of his social network. The correlation between the number of activities routinely performed in the Glebe and Desired

Table 14

Anxiety, Life Satisfaction, Activities Within the Neighborhood and
Percentage of Activities Within the Neighborhood by Four Levels
Of Network Connectedness

Network Connectedness	Anxiety	Life Satisfaction	Number of Activities Within the Glebe	Percentage of Activities in the Glebe
Group 1, (n=15) lowest to 65	7.3	7.6	4.3	23
Group 2, (n=15) 66 to 96	9.1	6.5	4.2	20
Group 3, (n=16) 97 to 160	8.9	6.9	4.5	23
Group 4, (n=14) 161 and above	8.3	6.9	5.9	32

Table 15
 Achieved and Desired Levels of Privacy, Community,
 And Activity Space by Network Connectedness

	Network Connectedness			
	1	2	3	4
Desired Privacy	34.0	34.6	40.1	32.3*
Achieved Privacy	32.9	33.2	33.1	31.9
Desired Community	38.1	37.2	39.5	40.6
Achieved Community	38.1	34.5	41.4	40.1*
Desired Activity Space	36.4	36.5	37.8	37.7
Achieved Activity Space	40.0	33.2	38.8	39.7*

* $p < .10$

Community was .34, ($p < .01$); it was .30, ($p < .02$) with Achieved Community. As one would expect there was a high correlation between activities in the Glebe and one's Desired Activity Space score ($r = .51$, $p < .02$), and Achieved Activity Space score ($r = .50$, $p < .001$). Activity Space was scored such that a higher number indicated a preference for local concentration of activities.

There was no relationship between the number of activities performed in the Glebe and Desired Privacy ($r = -.14$) or Achieved Privacy ($r = -.24$). This would be expected on the basis of the relationship between the PCA measures of Privacy and Activity Space and again refutes Keller's (1968) suggestion that the private individual will be more urban oriented. Also, no relationship existed between Desired Privacy and activities outside of the Glebe (see Table 16).

If it is more likely that community will be achieved by performing many of one's routine activities within the neighborhood then we would not expect to find a relationship between the number of activities outside the neighborhood and community. This was in fact the case. The correlations between the number of activities outside the Glebe and Desired Community ($r = -.12$) and Achieved Community, ($r = -.02$) were non-significant. Table 16 also presents the correlations for Privacy and Activity Space. These were non-significant as well.

As would be expected, a negative relationship existed between the number of activities within the neighborhood and the number of activities outside the neighborhood ($r = -.45$, $p < .001$). However, the correlation between the number of activities within the Glebe and the percentage of activities within the Glebe (Glebe Activities /

Table 16
Correlation Coefficients Between Where Activities
Are Routinely Conducted and Desired and Achieved
Privacy, Community, and Activity Space

	Activities Within the Glebe	Activities Outside the Glebe	Percentage of Activities in the Glebe	Total Activities
Desired Privacy	-.14	.14	-.09	-.01
Achieved Privacy	-.24	.19	-.09	-.07
Desired Community	.34**	-.12	.08	.23
Achieved Community	.30*	-.02	.05	.29*
Desired Activity Space	.51***	-.06	-.11	.45***
Achieved Activity Space	.50***	-.21	.13	.32**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Total Activities) was .11; the correlation between the number of activities outside the Glebe and the percentage of activities within the Glebe was $-.70$, $p < .001$. From these two correlations we can conclude that an increase in activities outside the Glebe was the most likely factor contributing to the lower percentage of activities within the Glebe; however, the absolute number of activities within the Glebe remained stable. Thus, it is not important as a means of obtaining community to concentrate most of one's activities within the neighborhood; rather, it is only necessary to include a sufficient minimum number of activities within the neighborhood. This will insure an adequate level of community even if one is very active outside the neighborhood as well. This was born out by the general relationship between Community and Total Activity as presented in Table 16, and the lack of any significant relationships with the percentage measure of activities within the Glebe. A significant relationship existed between Achieved Community and the number of Total Activities one conducted within the urban area ($r = .29$, $p < .05$). However, a sufficient number of activities must be conducted within the neighborhood as is suggested by comparing the Achieved Community correlations for activities within and outside the Glebe.

6. Relationship Between the PCA Inventory and Environmental Factors

Desired Privacy, Community, and Activity Space scores were related to all of the questions in the interview schedule. Several of the more relevant findings are described below. First, the house in which one lives does not seem to be perceived as important in relation to Desired Privacy ($r = .09$) but does seem to be important

vis-a-vis Desired Community ($r = .31, p < .01$) and Desired Activity Space ($r = .34, p < .007$).

Desired Privacy was negatively related to the number of persons in one's dwelling ($r = -.37, p < .01$), the frequency with which one engaged in activities with one's immediate neighbors (e.g., through exchanging belongings, $r = -.26, p < .05$), and the importance of religion in one's life, ($r = -.34, p < .01$).

Desired Community was positively related to the number of times one entertained in one's home ($r = .28, p < .05$), and the importance one attaches to marriage, ($r = .32, p < .01$), family, ($r = .49, p < .001$) and friends ($r = .49, p < .001$). Desired Community was also related to the Neighborhood Activity Index which was comprised of the frequency with which one engages in neighborly activity, such as chatting with one's neighbors, exchanging favors, exchanging things, informal visiting, asking advice, and having picnics or barbecues ($r = .26, p < .05$). Desired community was negatively related to the frequency of eating meals alone ($r = -.32, p < .01$); the more often one ate alone, the more community desired.

Desired Activity Space was positively related to satisfaction with conveniences in one's neighborhood ($r = .43, p < .001$), and satisfaction with community spirit ($r = .44, p < .001$). It was also related to entertaining in one's home ($r = .28, p < .05$), and the number of friends who lived in the neighborhood ($r = .29, p < .05$).

It will be remembered that the Cantril ladder technique was used in determining the respondents' present, past, and future life satisfaction. Respondents perceived that their lot in life was improving, as evidenced by ladder scores of 5.1, 7.0, and 8.1 for the past, present, and future, respectively. A significant age effect

was also obtained on the present life satisfaction measure. The scores for the 15-21, 22-30, 31-50, and over 50 groups were 6.1, 6.9, 7.5, and 7.4, respectively, $F(3, 59) = 3.1, p < .05$. The 30-50 and over 50 respondents were in general more satisfied with their present life than the 15-21 respondents. No age differences were obtained on the past and future scores.

There were no differences in either the past, present, or future Cantril scores by sex of respondent, type of dwelling, or ownership of dwelling.

7. Environmental Response Inventory Results

Several scales from McKechnie's (1974) Environmental Response Inventory (ERI) were included in the interview schedule. It was felt that the information obtained from the ERI would allow a fuller understanding of the relationship between the urban dweller's attitudes and his behavior.

The ERI scales administered were: (1) Urbanism, (2) Environmental Adaptation, (3) Stimulus Seeking, (4) Environmental Trust, and (5) Need for Privacy. McKechnie (1974) has described the major themes of each scale as follows:

1. Urbanism (UR): Enjoyment of high density living; appreciation of unusual and varied stimulus patterns of the city; interest in cultural life; enjoyment of interpersonal richness and diversity.
2. Environmental Adaptation (EA): Modification of the environment to satisfy needs and desires, to provide comfort and leisure; opposition to government control over private land use; preference for highly designed or adapted environments; use of technology to solve environmental problems; preference for stylized environment details.
3. Stimulus Seeking (SS): Interest in travel and exploration of unusual places; enjoyment of complex and intense physical sensations; breadth of interests.

4. Environmental Trust (ET): General environmental openness, responsiveness, and trust; competence in finding one's way about the environment vs. fear of potentially dangerous environments; security of home; fear of being alone and unprotected.
5. Need for Privacy (NP): Need for privacy, isolation from stimuli; enjoyment of solitude; dislike of neighboring; need for freedom from distraction.

The relationship between the ERI scales and various measures of environmental attitudes and behavior are presented in Table 17. As previously discussed a positive correlation existed between Desired Privacy and the Need Privacy scales ($r = .60$). Achieved Privacy was also significantly related to Need Privacy (.41) but not as strongly. This would suggest that the Need Privacy scale not only measures "preferences" but also measures "obtained" levels of privacy.

Desired Community was negatively related to Need Privacy ($r = -.26$), as would be anticipated from the similar correlation between Desired Privacy and Desired Community on the PCA Inventory. Desired Community was also related ($r = .25$) to Environmental Adaptation. The more community sought, the greater the possibility that the person had manipulated his environment to satisfy his needs and desires.

Both Desired ($r = .30$) and Achieved ($r = .26$) Activity Space were related to the Urbanism Scale. This result might seem contradictory to the notion of Activity Space as presented in this paper, but it must be remembered that Activity Space is a purely geographical concept. Urbanism, as defined by McKee (1974) refers to "enjoyment of high density living . . . interest in cultural life, and enjoyment of interpersonal richness and diversity". These central

Table 17
Correlation Coefficients Relating the
Environmental Response Inventory to
Various Items in the Glebe Interview

Glebe Interview Item	UR	EA	SS	ET	NP
Desired Privacy	-.14	-.15	.08	-.06	.60***
Achieved Privacy	-.15	-.12	.15	-.17	.41***
Desired Community	.20	.25*	-.09	-.03	-.26*
Achieved Community	.08	-.03	.00	.05	-.14
Desired Activity Space	.30*	.15	-.01	.06	-.07
Achieved Activity Space	.26*	.09	-.09	.13	-.04
Activities in the Glebe	.13	.12	-.18	.10	-.18
Activities outside the Glebe	.28*	.20	.25*	.30*	.28*
Percentage of Activities in the Glebe	-.34**	-.39**	-.32**	-.49***	-.39**
Total Number of Activities	.38**	.30*	.05	.38**	.07
Neighborhood Index	.45***	.30*		.38**	
Age		-.26*	-.57***	-.25*	-.03
Frequency of Eating Alone		-.28*	.29*		.31*
Importance of Home	.31*	.33**			
Importance of Marriage		.29*			
Importance of Family			-.35**		
Extraversion				.36**	
Frequency Lonely				-.33**	
Frequency Entertain at Home					-.26*
Frequency Chat with Neighbors		.31*			
Desire to Meet New People					-.26*

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

aspects of Urbanism could well be a part of the local area within which one resided. The key behavioral component of Urbanism would seem to be simply a large number of activities, per se. The correlation between one's total number of activities, many of which are outside the Glebe, and Urbanism was .38. In fact, the ERI appears to generally tap the proportion of activities conducted outside the neighborhood as the "percentage of activities in the Glebe" measure is negatively related to the five ERI scales administered (see Table 17). Other measures are related to the ERI scales as presented in Table 17.

The ERI was included in the present study primarily because of its Need Privacy Scale. A full discussion of the ERI results is not warranted given the lack of a priori hypotheses concerning the various relationships obtained. Nevertheless, the ERI results do suggest that privacy, community, and activity space as environmental concepts are not, in general, systematically related to other environmental dispositions, but seem to cut across all the themes in McKechnie's Inventory.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY

No account of what "is", however faithful,
can deliver us from concern for what might
and ought to be.

Nicholas Haines (1966)

This chapter presents a summary of the major findings of the research project with a view to future research in this area. The potential practical application of the research is also discussed. In closing, the general importance of this type of social-personality-environmental psychology is discussed.

No attempt is made to integrate or synthesize fully all of the diverse findings of the research project. The importance of a detailed integrative model is not denied; in fact, such a model should be constructed before further research is conducted in this area. However, this summary will instead keep within the modest aims of the present exploratory endeavor.

1. Summary

The PCA Inventories

The following questions were raised in the introduction to this paper: (1) How should privacy be defined?, (2) Is privacy a unidimensional or multidimensional concept?, and (3) Do individuals differ widely in their attitudes toward privacy? The form and characteristics of the PCA Inventories permit conditional answers to these questions in regards to privacy, community, and activity space.

The present study demonstrated that privacy can be defined as a

dialectical process, yet at the same time a preference for a particular general level of privacy can be meaningfully measured as a relatively enduring personal disposition. In addition, this disposition seems to reflect a unidimensional underlying concept, "privacy." The PCA Inventories allow privacy to be usefully construed as a unidimensional phenomenon at a molar level of analysis even though it is obviously composed of various molecular parts.

For example, Wolfe and Laufer (1974) postulated nine different analytical dimensions of privacy, but all of these "dimensions" can be subsumed under the definition and operational measurement of privacy on the PCA Inventory. In fact, one of their dimensions, the life-cycle dimension, was tested and validated in the present study. It was shown that privacy preferences and conceptualizations do change as a function of life-cycle stages.

In any event, the assumption of unidimensionality seems legitimate based on the present results. Privacy, as well as community and activity space, preferences were related to a number of neighborhood behaviors in the direction one would have predicted. Therefore, the Desired and Achieved PCA Inventories seem to capture enough of the general theme of each concept to be useful in understanding individual behavior in the urban environment, while simultaneously not ruling out a more elaborate, sophisticated conceptualization underlying each concept.

Wide variation did exist in the Desired PCA scores as evidenced by the range and standard deviation of each scale (see Table 7 in Chapter VII). Therefore, an individual difference approach might be advisable in situations where it is likely that wide variation in preferences for levels of privacy,

community, and activity space would confound main effects. In regards to neighborhood design or renewal and desired levels of privacy, community, and activity space, it might be fruitful to sample residents to see whether their preferences are similar or widely divergent. If design factors facilitate achievement of different levels of privacy, community, and activity space, and this is a big "if", then it might be difficult to satisfy all of the residents without designing for diversity.

An interesting question at this point concerns the typical variation within an individual's privacy, community, and activity space ranges. Focusing first on privacy, it seems, as has been mentioned, that privacy can be defined as a dialectical process, yet the levels of privacy desired can be measured in terms of the position of an individual's homeostatic range. That is, a person's homeostatic range may fall anywhere along a desired privacy continuum and the position of the range typically will not change dramatically except perhaps as a function of life-cycle stage. But variation within each range will vary according to temporary desired privacy preferences and situational constraints. Thus, the question arises concerning the characteristics of the typical homeostatic range in a particular neighborhood, city, or culture. Just as physiological homeostatic ranges for various chemicals (e.g., sodium, glucose) vary across individuals, so too might privacy ranges. Figure 4 presents hypothetical ranges for four different persons. Person A desires a high level of privacy in most every situation; his homeostatic range is very narrow. Person B has a narrow range as well, but generally desires a lower level of privacy. Person C has an extremely wide homeostatic range and fluctuates greatly between low and high levels. Person D has an average range and desires a moderate level of

Figure 4. Hypothetical Placement of Four Different Privacy Ranges

privacy. Normative data on the average placement and the average latitude of such homeostatic ranges are not available at the present, but the PCA Inventory would be useful in obtaining measures reflecting the placement of the range and perhaps variation within the range.

A similar model could be constructed for community and activity space. For community the question would be how often does one want to engage in behaviors that involve him closely in a close-knit group; for activity space, the question would be how much variation exists in one's geographical activity patterns over time. Exclusive concern with the average preference level may obscure important information about the amount of variation within the general class of behaviors associated with privacy, community, and activity space. If great variation exists, then we might not expect stable relationships between average desired levels of these three concepts and environmental variables to emerge. Whether such an ideographic approach is useful or necessary remains to be seen, but it might warrant preliminary investigation.

Independence Model of Privacy, Community, and Activity Space

The model of independence among privacy, community, and activity space was, in general, confirmed. It appears that the three concepts are independent and that the attainment of a particular level of one will not affect attainment of a particular level of another. It is worth noting that this independence is as perceived by the respondents. Extensive behavioral observations similar to those conducted by Roger Barker and his colleagues (Barker, 1968; Barker & Gump, 1964) may reveal that this "perceived" independence is not always an experienced reality.

The implications of this model for the design of the built environment

are not entirely clear. The data from the present study do not allow a clear assessment of the role of the physical environment, as opposed to the psychological and sociological environment, in determining privacy, community and activity space behavior. Levels of Achieved Privacy, Community, and Activity Space were, in most cases, largely independent of factors in the built environment, but further study is necessary to adequately determine the nature of the relationship between these concepts and the built environment. Marshall (1970) found only two of her twenty-nine physical environment variables to significantly affect opportunities for privacy. In short, privacy is not related to the built environment as much as previously thought.

Desired-Achieved Congruence

The general lack of any relationship between Desired and Achieved Privacy, Community, and Activity Space and the measures of satisfaction employed was unexpected. Several possible explanations for this result have been presented in Chapter VIII. It might have been that the satisfaction measures used were too global in character. Perhaps residents do not think of satisfaction with their neighborhood in such general terms.

In a study of 4,619 Indiana residents, Blahe, Weigl, and Perhoff (1975), uncovered three core dimensions of an "ideal" city. These were (1) maintenance, or the availability of jobs, businesses, schools, medical services, (2) recreation, and (3) relationship, or proximity to one's family and friends. Perhaps these are the important dimensions on which incongruency would bear a relationship to residential satisfaction, life satisfaction, and measures of anxiety. Regarding the relationship dimension, data from the present study indicated that satisfaction with one neighborhood did not increase with the number of friends living within one's neighborhood ($r = .13$).

However, satisfaction with the location of one's neighborhood did increase as the number of friends living within the neighborhood increased ($r = .27$, $p < .05$). Thus, global measures of satisfaction may not be appropriate for assessing privacy, community, or activity space incongruences.

Of course, it is possible that Desired-Achieved congruency relationships were not obtained because Altman's (1975) homeostatic model and Michelson's (1970) congruency model are based on inaccurate assumptions of human nature. Cantril (1965) argued that the principles of homeostasis and balance overlook the need for some tension in one's motivational system. Consequently, every individual is not simply trying to maintain an optimal state of balance, but continually reassesses any achieved satisfaction. This view of human motivation limits the tenability of the congruency hypotheses offered in the present study.

Social Networks

The analysis of social networks indicated that "network connectedness" as measured in the present study was not significantly related to Achieved Community ($r = .17$); nor was it related to satisfaction with one's neighborhood or life in general. In addition, no relationship was obtained between network connectedness and feelings of anxiety. It was felt that the support mechanisms available within a highly connected network would perhaps be a positive factor in promoting mental health (see Wellman et. al., 1973). It now appears that such a global notion was too simplistic. A significant relationship with another individual may be necessary in promoting positive mental health as evidenced by the significant correlation between anxiety and the frequency one felt lonely ($r = .42$, $p < .001$), but involvement in a close-knit web of meaningful relationships is not essential.

Network connectedness was related to the number of friends one had in the Glebe ($r = .30$, $p < .05$). This ties in to the notion of "probabilistic encounter." A critical question concerning rural or urban life is "What is the probability that Person A will encounter Person B within a particular period of time?" The next task would be to further breakdown the probabilities of encounter by level of encounter; e.g., passing on a busy street, chatting briefly in public, and so on to perhaps intimate social involvement. Such an analysis might indicate that seemingly unimportant behaviors at the individual level are extremely important at the aggregate level.

In summary, simultaneously looking at three correlations: (1) Achieved Community with Network Connectedness, $r = .17$, (2) Network Connectedness with the number of friends in the Glebe, $r = .30$, $p < .05$, and (3) Achieved Community with the number of friends in the Glebe, $r = .34$, $p < .01$, suggests that an imperfect fit exists among the three factors, but that further analysis is warranted to unravel the interrelationships among local friendships, community, and network connectedness. Fischer (1975) stressed the priority of this type of research when he wrote,

Examination of the structures and contents of personal networks is intended to reveal both processes by which social environments influence people and those by which individuals in turn act upon their social worlds. For urban sociology, it promises to provide the conceptual link between individual and community. [pp.77-78]

2. A Note on the Research Approach

In many ways, the present research project can be viewed as a small part of a larger evaluation process, and evaluation studies of the fit between the person and the urban environment are urgently needed. Sommer (1973) has even argued that an evaluation model is more appropriate to most social problems than a pure research model.

Psychologists must self consciously examine alternatives to the research model as a means of generating socially useful information. As one such alternative, the evaluation model should be upgraded and given a place of prominence in the training of social psychologists. [p.133]

The advantages and disadvantages of the evaluation model have been extensively discussed in Deutsch and Hornstein's edited book, Applying Social Psychology (1975). The acceptance of the evaluation model does not lead to abandonment of proper research design or theoretical frameworks within which evaluation research can proceed. On the contrary, a theoretical basis may be all the more important in trying to understand "ongoing behavior and experience in the context of meaningful human activities occurring in their relevant physical settings," Proshansky's (1973, p.95) goal for environmental psychology. He continued,

the plea for theory that is made here is a far more modest and indeed realistic one. Perhaps it would be best to describe it as a plea for theoretical analysis and development. What we mean by this is the use of words, ideas, concepts, and the relationships among them so as to guide thinking and research; the need for such analyses is in the case of research which is of an exploratory-descriptive nature in its attempt to seek out, define, and establish man-environment phenomena. [p.96]

The present research project sought to increase our understanding of an individual's behavior in the urban environment through the development of an inventory to measure preferences for various levels of privacy, community, and activity space. It was felt that individual differences must be taken into account by any complete model of urban behavior. Situational factors are, of course, important in influencing urban behavior; however, the relative importance of personality factors, situational factors, and the interaction between the two cannot be determined until an adequate means of tapping the personality variables of interest exists. Following from this, it is

hoped that the PCA Inventories will be of use to researchers working in this area.

In closing, mention should be made of the general importance of this type of research. Some of the potential applications must await further refinement of the techniques used in this research. However, the importance of environmental research need not rest solely on its immediate applications.

Proshansky (1973) stated as much when he wrote,

The point cannot be made too strongly that the development of an "environmental psychology" has a validity in its own right, apart from the need to solve the problems of urban living and urban stress. The fact is that no body of knowledge about human behavior and experience can be complete or fully meaningful without the inclusion of concepts and principles relevant to the influence of physical settings regardless of how much or little it contributes to the variance in such behavior and experience. [pp.105-106]

It is hoped that the present research has made some, albeit tentative, contribution to gauging the amount of variance associated with urban behavior and privacy, community, and activity space.

References

- Altman, I. Privacy: A conceptual analysis. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, September, 1974.
- Altman, I. The environment and social behavior. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks Cole, 1975.
- Altman, I. Privacy regulation: Cultural universal or cultural specific. Journal of Social Issues, in press.
- Audet, J. The impact of a public housing program on the users: A study of three Ottawa public housing projects. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Sociology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, 1972.
- Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Boston: Beacon, 1966.
- Barker, R. G. Ecological psychology. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1968.
- Barker, R. G., & Gump, P. V. Big school, small school. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Barnes, J. Class and committees in a Norwegian island parish. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 39-58.
- Bates, A. P. Privacy - A useful concept? Social Forces, 1964, 42, 429-434.
- Bates, F. L., & Bacon, L. Community as a social system. Social Forces, 1972, 50, 371-379.
- Berardo, F. M. Marital invisibility and family privacy. In S. Margulis (Ed.), Privacy. Symposium at the meetings of the Environmental Design Research Association, Milwaukee, 1974.

- Blake, B. F., Weigl, K., & Perloff, R. Perceptions of the ideal community. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 612-615.
- Bookchin, M. The limits of the city. New York: Harper Colophon, 1974.
- Bott, E. Family and social network. London: Tavistock, 1957.
- Breckenridge, A. C. The right to privacy. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.
- Bridge, R. G. Methodological issues in self-disclosure research: Would you like being a prostitute: Why or why not. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Anaheim, Calif., 1973.
- Buttimer, A. Social space and the planning of residential areas. Environment and Behavior, 1972, 4, 279-318.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., & Rodgers, W. L. The quality of American life. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 81-105.
- Cantril, H. The pattern of human concerns. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- Chapin, F. S., & Brail, R. K. Human activity systems in the metropolitan United States. Environment and Behavior, 1969, 1, 107-130.
- Charatan, F. Study cited in P. G. Zimbardo and F. L. Ruch, Psychology and life (9th ed.). Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1975.

- Chermayeff, S., & Alexander, C. Community and privacy. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1963.
- Clark, D. The concept of community: A re-examination. Sociological Review, 1973, 21, 397-416.
- Cooley, C. H. Social Organization. New York: Charles Scribner's & Sons, 1929.
- Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 73-91.
- Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of psychological testing (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
- Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- Dentler, R. A. American community problems. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Deutsch, M. & Hornstein, H. A. [Eds.]. Applying social psychology. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum Associates, 1975.
- Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan Company, 1916.
- Edney, J. J. Human territories: Comment on functional properties. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, 1974.
- Eisinger, P. K. The urban crisis as a failure of community. Urban Affairs Quarterly, 1974, 9, 437-461.
- Erickson, E. H. Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: W. W. Norton, 1968.
- Evans, G. W., & Howard, R. B. Personal space. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 334-344.

- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. The validity of questionnaires and rating assessments of extraversion and neuroticism and their factorial validity. British Journal of Psychology, 1963, 54, 51-62.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. Eysenck Personality Inventory Manual. San Diego, Cal.: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1968.
- Festinger, L., Schacter, S., & Back, K. Social pressures in informal groups: A study of human factors in housing. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Fischer, C. The study of urban community and personality. Annual Review of Sociology, 1975.
- Flaherty, D. H. Privacy in colonial New England: 1630-1776. Charlottesville, Va.: University Press of Virginia, 1972.
- Gans, H. H. The urban villagers. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
- Gans, H. J. The Levittowners. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.
- Gans, H. J. The effect of a community on its residents: Some considerations for sociological theory and planning practice. In H. Gans [Ed.], People and plans. New York: Basic Books, 1968.
- Gilbert, G. M. Stereotype persistence and change among college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 245-254.
- Glass, D. C., & Singer, J. E. Urban stress: Experiments on noise and social stressors. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Glasser, W. The identity society. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Doubleday, 1959.
- Goldman, R. Readiness for religion. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

- Gough, H. G. Manual for the California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1957.
- Helson, H. Adaptation level theory. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Hillery, G. A. Definitions of community: Areas of agreement. Rural Sociology, 1955, 20, 111-123.
- Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. The social readjustment rating scale. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 1967, 11, 213-218.
- Howard, E. Garden cities of tomorrow. London: Faber & Faber, 1902.
- Johnson, C. A. Privacy as personal control. In S. Margulis [Ed.], Privacy. Symposium at the meetings of the Environmental Design Research Association, Milwaukee, 1974.
- Jonassen, C. T. Community typology. In M. Sussman, [Ed.], Community structure and analysis. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1959.
- Jourard, S. Some psychological aspects of privacy. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1966, 31, 307-318.
- Jourard, S. Healthy personality. New York: Macmillan, 1974.
- Katz, D., & Braly, K. Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1933, 28, 280-290.
- Keller, S. The urban neighborhood: A sociological perspective. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Keller, S. Human communication and social networks at the micro-scale. Ekistics, 1970, 179, 306-308.
- Kelvin, P. A social-psychological examination of privacy. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 12, 248-261.
- Keyes, R. We, the lonely people: Searching for community. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Lewin, K. Principles of topological psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936.

- Lewin, K. Resolving social conflicts. New York: Harper & Row, 1948.
- Lord, F. M., & Novick, M. R. Statistical theories of mental test scores. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
- MacIver, R. M. Society: Its structure and changes. New York: R. Long & R. R. Smith, 1931.
- Madge, J. Privacy and social interaction. Social Science Information, 1969, 8, 84-104.
- Margulis, S. T. Privacy as a behavioral phenomenon: Coming of Age. In S. Margulis [Ed.], Privacy. Symposium at the meetings of the Environmental Design Research Association, Milwaukee, 1974.
- Marshall, N. J. C. Orientations toward privacy: Environmental and personality components. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, California, 1970.
- Marshall, N. J. C. Privacy and environment. Human Ecology, 1972, 1, 93-110.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- McKechnie, G. E. Environmental Response Inventory. Palo-Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1971.
- McKechnie, G. E. Environmental Response Inventory Manual. Palo-Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1974.
- Mead, M. Neighborhoods and human needs. Ekistics, 1966, 123, 124-126.
- Mercer, B. E. The American community. New York: Random House, 1956.
- Merton, R. K. Patterns of influence: A study of interpersonal influence and of communications behavior in a local community. In P. Lazarsfeld & F. Stanton [Eds.], Communication Research, 1948-1949. New York: Harper & Row, 1949.

- Michelson, W. Man and his urban environment: A sociological approach. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1970.
- Milgram, S. The experience of living in cities. Science, 1970, 167, 1461-1468.
- Miller, A. R. The assault on privacy. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1971.
- Minar, D., & Greer, S. The concept of community. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.
- Mitchell, J. C. [Ed.], Social networks in urban situations. Manchester, G. B.: Manchester University Press, 1969.
- Morrison, D. E. & Henkel, R. E. [Eds.], The significance test controversy. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.
- Morris, R. N., & Moge, J. The sociology of housing. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965.
- Nelson, L. Rural Sociology. New York: American Book Co., 1948.
- Nisbet, R. The quest for community. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Packard, V. The naked society. New York: David McKay, 1967.
- Packard, V. A nation of strangers. New York: David McKay, 1972.
- Pappas, P. Time allocation study in eighteen Athens communities. Ergonomics, 1967, 10, 110-127.
- Park, R. E. Race and culture. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950.
- Park, R. E., & Burgess, E. W. The city. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.
- Pennock, R., & Chapman, J. W. [Eds.], Privacy - Nomos XIII. New York: Atherton Press, 1971.

- Perin, C. With man in mind. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1972.
- Perry, C. A. The neighborhood unit. Regional survey of New York and its environs, VII. New York: Committee on Regional Plan of New York and its Environs, 1929.
- Poplin, D. E. Communities: A survey of theories and methods of research. New York: Macmillan, 1972.
- Proshansky, H. M. Theoretical issues in environmental psychology. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1973, 4, 93-107.
- Proshansky, H. M., Ittelson, W. H., & Rivlin, L. G. [Eds.], Environmental psychology: Man and his physical setting. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1970.
- Rapoport, A. Some perspectives on human use and organization of space. Paper presented at the meeting of the Australian Association of Social Anthropologists, Melbourne, Australia, 1972.
- Reubhausen, O., & Brim, O. Privacy and behavioral research. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 423-437.
- Rosenberg, M. J. The conditions and consequences of evaluation apprehension. In R. Rosenthal & R. L. Rosnow [Eds.], Artifact in behavioral research. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Rossiter, C. L. The pattern of liberty. In M. Konvitz & C. Rossiter [Eds.], Aspects of liberty. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1958.
- Roszak, T. [Ed.], Sources. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1972.
- Rule, J. B. Private lives and public surveillance - social control in the computer age. New York: Schocken Books, 1974.
- Sarason, S. B. Community psychology, networks and Mr. Everyman. American Psychologist, 1976, 31, (5), 317-327.

- Sawyer, J., & Schecter, H. Computers, privacy, and the national data center: The responsibility of social scientists. American Psychologist, 1968, 23, 810-818.
- Schachter, S. The psychology of affiliation: Experimental studies of sources of gregariousness. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Schwartz, B. The social psychology of privacy. American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 741-752.
- Shils, E. Privacy: Its constitution and vicissitudes. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1966, 31, 281-305.
- Silverman, S. M. Conflict avoidance and resolution: Problems and prospects. International Journal of Group Tensions, 1973, 3, 112-129.
- Simmel, G. The sociology of Georg Simmel. Translated by K. H. Wolff. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1950.
- Slater, P. The pursuit of loneliness. American culture at the breaking point. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.
- Slater, P. Must marriage cheat today's young woman? Redbook, February 1971, pp. 164 ff.
- Slater, P. Earthwalk. Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Press, 1974.
- Sommer, R. Personal space: The behavioral basis of design. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Sommer, R. Evaluation, yes; Research maybe. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1973, 4, 127-133.
- Speck, R. V., & Attneave, C. L. Family Networks. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

Statistics Canada. 1971 Census of Canada: Census Tract Bulletin.

Series A-B, Ottawaw-Hull, Catalogue 95-715 (April 1973), Catalogue 95-745 (July 1974).

Sullivan, H. S. The fusion of psychiatry and social science. New York: W. W. Norton, 1964.

Suttles, G. D. The social construction of communities. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Warren, R. L. The community in America. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

Warren, R. L. The community in America (2nd ed.). Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally, 1971.

Webber, M. M. Order in diversity: Community without propinquity. In L. Wingo [Ed.], Cities and space. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1963.

Webber, M. M. The urban place and the nonplace urban realm. In M. M. Webber [Ed.], Explorations into urban structure. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964.

Weiss, J. M. Psychological factors in stress and disease. Scientific American, 1972, 226, 104-113.

Weisstub, D. N., & Gotlieb, C. C. The nature of privacy. A study for the Privacy and Computers Task Force, Communications Canada, Ottawa, Canada, 1974.

Wellman, B. The form and function of future communities. In L. S. Bourne, R. D. Mackinnon, J. Siegel, & J. W. Simmons, Urban futures for Central Canada: Perspectives on forecasting urban growth and form. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

- Wellman, B., Craven P., Whitaker, M., Stevens, H., Shorter, A.,
DuToit, S., & Bakker, H. Community ties and support systems:
From intimacy to support. In L. S. Bourne, R. D. Mackinnon,
& J. W. Simmons, The form of cities in Central Canada. Toronto:
University of Toronto Press, 1973.
- Westin, A. Privacy and freedom. New York: Atheneum, 1967.
- Wirth, L. Urbanism as a way of life. American Journal of Sociology,
1938, 44, 1-24.
- Wolfe, M., & Laufer, R. The concept of privacy in childhood and
adolescence. In S. Margulis [Ed.], Privacy. Symposium at the
meetings of the Environmental Design Research Association,
Milwaukee, 1974.
- Yancey, W. L. Architecture, interactions, and social control: The
case of a large-scale public housing project. Environment and
Behavior, 1971, 3, 3-21.
- Zajonc, R. B. Social facilitation. Science, 1965, 149, 269-274.

Notes

1. The Glebe area of the city of Ottawa was selected for initial study because of its neighborhood cohesiveness and representativeness of a typical middle to upper middle class residential area. The eventual aim of this research project was to compare data collected in the Glebe to data collected from other residential areas with quite different environmental, social, and economic characteristics. However, in terms of the testing of exploratory hypotheses the Glebe proved not to be as useful as perhaps a city-wide area sample would have been. Truncated distributions on a number of variables prevented adequate testing of several hypotheses.
2. During the initial data collection many respondents took time from their busy schedules to allow an intensive two hour interview to be conducted, but they expressed their desire that they not be contacted again for subsequent data collection. Accordingly, the second administration of the PCA Inventory was limited to the approximately forty respondents who had indicated a willingness to answer additional questions.
3. The amount of time for administration of the entire Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale prevented its inclusion even though some information concerning the relationship between social desirability and the PCA Inventory items was necessary. A compromise solution was adopted in that the four Crowne-Marlowe items with the highest item-total score correlations were chosen for inclusion in the PCA Inventory. Two of the items were reversed items.
4. It may be true that no relationship exists between Network Connectedness and Anxiety, but several plausible explanations can be offered for the nonconfirmation of Hypothesis 6. As stated previously, the measure of anxiety employed may be insensitive to temporary changes in the constellation of one's life space. As well, individual preferences for various levels of connectedness should be taken into account when assessing concomitant feelings of anxiety. Following from the Privacy, Community, and Activity Space congruency hypotheses, we would not expect Network Connectedness to relate to other variables without taken into account the preference levels. Finally, a high anxiety score may only result from a Network Connectedness score of zero. Only in the extreme case would Hypothesis 6 be supported. It is probably sufficient for many individuals to have a small (two or three friends) closely connected network.

List of Appendices

		<u>Page</u>
Appendix 1	Instructions for the First Sorting of Potential Items for the Desired PCA Inventory	128
Appendix 2	Sorting Results for Each Item Included in the First Sorting	131
Appendix 3	Instructions for the Second Sorting of Potential Items for the Desired PCA Inventory	156
Appendix 4	Sorting Results for Each Item Included in the Second Sorting	159
Appendix 5	Instructions for the Preliminary Desired PCA Inventory	174
Appendix 6	Preliminary Desired PCA Inventory Items from Which the Final Items for the Brief Desired PCA Inventory Were Chosen	175
Appendix 7	Final Desired PCA Inventory	181
Appendix 8	Final Achieved PCA Inventory	184
Appendix 9	Cantril Ladder Instructions	187
Appendix 10	Glebe Interview Schedule	188
Appendix 11	Response Scales Used in the Glebe Interview	195

Appendix 1

Instructions for the First Sorting of
Potential PCA Scale Items

This booklet contains a number of statements concerning our everyday attitudes and activities. I'd like your help in sorting these statements. I am interested in the type of activities people perform daily, and their preferences for performing these activities in a certain manner, in a certain place, and with a certain group of people. Eventually, I will construct a questionnaire to ask people about their attitudes and activities. But first, I need to know which attitudes and activities are related or go together. This is why I have asked your help. I would like you to classify the various attitudes and activities listed in this booklet according to eight categories that I will explain. This is not a psychological test. I simply need your opinion concerning which attitudes and activities belong in which categories.

Please proceed according to the following instructions:

1. First, carefully read these three definitions.

Definition A. The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he prefers to control (or prefers not to control) the amount of interaction, both verbal physical, between himself and others.

Definition B. The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he wants to engage in (or avoid) activities in close-knit groups where there are people who share his interests and values.

Definition C. The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he wants (or does not want) to perform most of his activities within one small area (e.g., block or neighborhood) in which he resides.

Now read again these definitions until you have a clear understanding of what you think the definitions mean. I cannot answer questions concerning these definitions. What is important is what you think these definitions mean. You should refer back to these definitions throughout your classification.

2. Some of the statements you will be sorting may apply to only one of the definitions. Other statements may apply to two of the definitions; and still others may apply to all three of the definitions, A, B, and C. Or it may be that a statement does not apply to any of the three definitions. Your job is to classify each statement as belonging in one of eight categories. These categories are:

1. Definition A
2. Definition B
3. Definition C
4. Definition A and B
5. Definition A and C
6. Definition B and C
7. All three definitions
8. None of the three definitions

Again, your job is to sort the statements you will be reading as best belonging in one of the eight categories.

The following examples should clarify how you might sort the statements. A check has been placed under the category heading into which you would probably sort the example statement.

1. I prefer to do my grocery shopping in the next city. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
2. I enjoy playing tennis. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
3. I would enjoy going to a neighborhood function such as a square dance or outdoor cookout. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
4. I prefer not to talk about my personal life with anyone. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
5. I want to be able to walk to my bank. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
6. I would enjoy going to group meetings at a church or synagogue. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?

3. You do not have to assign approximately the same number of statements in each category. Indeed, you may not even use some of the categories. Again, let me emphasize that how you assign the statement to the eight categories is entirely up to you based on your understanding of the definitions for A, B, and C. Some statement may more easily be seen to belong in one category than in another; others may be more difficult to place and may require that you think about them for awhile. Simply assign the statements to a particular category as best you can according to the definitions given.

4. There is no time limit for completing this booklet. Take your time and think about each placement for as long as you like. If you want to change a placement after you initial placement, feel free to do so. Simply erase your first placement and assign a new category. You may even want to review some of your placements after you have gone through all the cards.

5. If you follow the instructions as outlined, you should have little difficulty in completing this booklet. If you have any questions, please ask me now; otherwise you may begin assigning the statements to one, and only one, of the eight categories.

Appendix 2

Sorting Results for Each Item
Included in the First Sorting.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
1. I would like to have a private retreat which no one would enter without asking me.	10A, 3AB, 2AC, 1A11
2. Upon moving to a new community I would contact a community agent to find out how I could become involved in my new community.	3B, 2C, 1AB, 9BC 1A11
3. I would not like to live in a boarding house where everyone would know a lot about everyone else.	7A, 2B, 2C, 1AC, 3A11, 1None
4. I would definitely want to live where there are several "hang-outs", or places where one could accidentally run into friends in his community.	1A, 2B, 1C, 1AB, 1AC, 6BC, 2A11, 1None
5. I prefer houses with a few big, open rooms where it is easier for everyone to interact freely.	6A, 1B, 1C, 6AB, 2AC
6. I believe it is important to feel secure in one's home.	6A, 1B, 2AC, 1A11, 6None
7. I would like to participate in an on-going group where everyone reveals personal information about himself to the others.	4A, 3B, 6AB, 1BC, 2None
8. It is my opinion that minor conflicts between one's own comfort and convenience and that of a neighbor should be resolved in favor of the neighbor more often than not.	2A, 4B, 1AB, 1AC, 8None
9. I believe a well-adjusted and mature person seeks and enjoys social contacts and likes to affiliate with others.	4A, 5B, 2AB, 1BC, 2A11, 2None
10. I believe the only way to attain appropriate self-evaluation is by comparing myself with the community in which one lives.	1A, 2B, 4C, 1AC, 2BC, 1A11, 5None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
11. It is important to me that the members of a family really know each other.	3A, 6B, 4AB, 1A11, 2None
12. I believe that one's own religion is very personal thing and should not be discussed with others.	10A, 1B, 3AB, 2None
13. I do not enjoy discussing my private religious views with someone else.	13A, 3AB
14. It is my opinion that neighborhood residents should greet each other as they pass in front of each others' homes when they are out walking or bicycling.	1A, 2B, 3C, 1AB, 3AC, 3BC, 3None
15. If I couldn't contain most of my activities within my neighborhood, I would probably leave it often.	1A, 14C, 1AC
16. I would like to have various groups of friends who need not know each other.	2A, 3B, 3AB, 1AC, 1BC, 3A11, 3None
17. I feel it is important to have a definite role to play in one's residential community.	2A, 6C, 1AB, 3AC, 1BC, 2A11, 1None
18. I find that I study better when others around me are also studying or reading.	3A, 8B, 2AB, 1BC, 2None
19. I seldom want to get away from everyone for a while even my close friends.	8A, 2B, 1C, 4AB, 1BC
20. I would occasionally enjoy getting away with a friend from the rest of the world.	6A, 2B, 5AB, 1BC, 2A11
21. I guess I've never actually chosen a place to live because it allowed a high degree of privacy.	9A, 1C, 1AB, 1BC, 3A11, 1None
22. I would rather shop at a large, impersonal store where no one knows me than at a smaller store where I would be known by the personee.	4A, 1B, 3C, 1AB, 6AC, 1BC
23. I really get angry when I feel that other people are using me.	8A, 1B, 1AB, 6None
24. It doesn't bother me to feel lonely fairly often.	6A, 3B, 5AB, 1A11, 1None
25. I like to be frequently invited out by friends.	3A, 8B, 2AB, 2BC, 1None
26. I believe that one should avoid dependence upon other persons.	9A, 3AB, 1BC, 2A11, 1None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
27. I believe that acting to protect the rights and interests of other members of one's community is a major obligation for all persons.	3A, 1B, 4C, 1AC, 3BC, 1A11, 3None
28. I get depressed when I don't see my close friends often enough.	1A, 8B, 4AB, 2A11, 1None
29. I'd be willing to form a citizen's group to promote pride in my neighborhood.	1A, 2B, 6C, 1AB, 2AC, 2BC, 2A11
30. I wouldn't mind doing more than my share of a group task.	2A, 5B, 5AB, 1AC, 1BC, 1A11, 1None
31. I believe that it is important to remember one's loyal ties to his group.	1A, 10B, 2AB, 2BC, 1None
32. I prefer letting other people do all the work for the group, and not getting involved myself.	3A, 2B, 6AB, 2BC, 2A11, 1None
33. I would not mind performing unpleasant tasks, if these were required by my group.	1A, 8B, 1C, 2AB, 1AC, 1BC, 1A11, 1None
34. When I go on vacations, I prefer to go to a secluded place.	6A, 1B, 1C, 3AB, 1AC, 1BC, 3A11
35. It bothers me if I do a foolish thing in front of my friends.	3A, 3B, 2AB, 8None
36. I would prefer not to live in a single family house so the neighbors cannot easily see my comings and goings.	7A, 2C, 1AB, 4AC, 1A11, 1None
37. It is comforting for me to know that there are places where I can go everyday and be sure that I will see familiar faces.	3A, 4B, 4C, 1AB, 1BC, 2A11, 1None
38. I dislike talking about personal matters to a friend in a crowded place where other people can overhear us.	8A, 2C, 2AB, 2AC, 2None
39. I am bothered by the transience of things that I once felt were permanent.	1AB, 1BC, 2A11, 12None
40. If possible, I prefer to take the bus for local errands rather than drive a car.	3A, 7C, 1AC, 1A11, 4None
41. I would not want to have a definite role to play in my residential community.	2A, 2B, 2C, 4AC, 1BC, 4A11, 1None
42. If possible, I prefer to take the bus for local errands rather than drive a car.	4A, 6C, 1AC, 1A11, 4None

Item	Sorting Results
43. I believe that man's natural state is an independent, unattached individual; he acts in conflict with his essential qualities when he acts with others as a member of a highly unified group.	4A, 2B, 9AB, 1A11
44. I feel it is important to spend time working with others toward common goals.	1A, 9B, 3AB, 2BC, 1A11
45. I believe every person should give some of his time for the good of his town.	2A, 1B, 5C, 1AB, 1AC, 3BC, 3None
46. I prefer to have very few intimate friends.	8A, 2B, 5AB, 1A11
47. I believe in "going it alone" for the most part, assuring myself of privacy, having much time to myself.	8A, 1B, 7AB
48. In my opinion people who identify strongly with some group usually do so at the expense of their development and individual self-fulfillment.	3A, 1B, 9AB, 1BC 1A11, 1None
49. I'd like to live in an apartment complex where nobody knows me.	6A, 2C, 3AB, 3AC, 2A11
50. I would not want to belong to a group in which I must accept the group consensus at least, sometimes, like it or not.	2A, 7B, 1A, 5AB, 1None
51. When a community is faced with a problem everyone should dig in and try to solve it.	1A, 1A, 8C, 1AB, 1AC, 2BC, 2None
52. It is not important for me to identify myself with my place of residence.	1A, 10C, 5None
53. It isn't important for me to be able to be alone when I want to be.	14A, 1AB, 1None
54. I want my friends to feel that they can drop in at my house any time they like.	5A, 3B, 1C, 6AB, 1None
55. I wouldn't mind living with several other people if I had a room of my own.	5A, 2B, 2C, 6AB, 1A11
56. It wouldn't be very important for me to have a corner store near my place of residence.	11C, 1BC, 4None
57. I'd like to live in an apartment complex where I could carry out most of my leisure activities.	1A, 13C, 1AC, 1A11
58. I usually don't tell people I don't know very well personal things about myself.	15A, 1None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
59. I would want to be a member of a family where everyone can express his or her true feelings about any topic.	3A, 5B, 7AB, 1A11
60. I would prefer that the residents of my neighborhood or block not meddle in each others' affairs.	7A, 2C, 1AB, 5AC, 1A11
61. I am usually not very interested in what goes on in my neighborhood.	3A, 9C, 2BC, 1A11 1None
62. I dislike talking about personal matters over the phone.	11A, 1B, 1AB, 3None
63. I would like to live in a neighborhood where people occasionally do things together.	1A, 3B, 3C, 1AC, 7BC 1A11
64. I do not like to discuss with other friends feelings about my sexual adequacy.	14A, 2AB
65. It is important for me to be able to exert some influence over my neighborhood affairs.	4A, 2C, 5AC, 3BC 1A11, 1None
66. I wish our neighborhood was patrolled by a policeman on foot rather than in a car.	3A, 2C, 1AC, 10None
67. I don't mind if others see me when I am very angry.	8A, 2AC, 1A11, 5None
68. I would like to live in a society where everyone was open and honest with others and there was no need for fences and walls that separate people.	4A, 2B, 2AB, 1AC, 1BC 6A11
69. I would like to join clubs where there are people like myself.	9B, 2C, 5AB, 1BC
70. In my opinion helpful neighborliness in an apartment building or condominium should be encouraged.	3A, 3B, 2C, 1AC, 4BC 1A11, 2None
71. I would enjoy community parades and pageants because they create a community spirit.	8C, 1AB, 6BC, 1None
72. There are times when I want other people to intrude on my thoughts and make me talk about what is on my mind.	12A, 2B, 2AB
73. I often like to go to a secluded place to talk to an intimate friend.	6A, 1B, 4AB, 1AC, 2A11, 2None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
74. I would like to live in a secluded house, out of sight of any other house.	7A, 2C, 1AB, 5AC, 1A11
75. It is very important for me to have some private space around my home or apartment to which I can sometimes retreat.	10A, 1C, 1AB, 3AC, 1None
76. There are times when I like to get away from people who know me by getting lost in a large group.	4A, 1B, 1C, 7AB, 1AC, 1A11, 1None
77. I enjoy going to places where I feel free to do anything without the fear of being seen by someone I know.	9A, 1B, 1C, 1AB, 1AC, 1BC, 2A11
78. I would not want my neighbors to see me when I am sunbathing in my yard.	8A, 2AB, 3AC, 1BC, 2None
79. In my opinion the integrated person is capable of getting along by himself and avoids unnecessary social contacts.	8A, 1B, 4AB, 1AC, 2A11
80. I don't care if I can't live where I can do what I want without bothering other people.	6A, 2B, 2C, 1AB, 3AC, 2None
81. I like to talk about personal matters with friends after I have known them only a short time.	7A, 4B, 5AB
82. I'd be willing to join a neighborhood improvement association.	1A, 1B, 7C, 2AC, 4BC, 1A11
83. It is important for me to be around people who accept me as I am.	5A, 3B, 4AB, 3None
84. I think it is best to know a few selected individuals rather than a lot of different individuals.	8A, 2B, 3AB, 1A11, 2None
85. I feel it is important for the people working in the neighborhood corner store to know the names of young children in the neighborhood.	2A, 5C, 1AC, 2BC, 1A11, 5None
86. I would rather shop at a smaller store where I would be known by the personnel than a large, impersonal store where no one knows me.	4A, 4C, 3AB, 3AC, 1BC, 1A11
87. I don't care to go to small parties where everyone knows one another, rather I prefer larger parties where few people know each other.	2A, 5B, 7AB, 1BC, 1A11

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
88. I believe that one's major obligation to other men is to let them alone so that they may sink or swim by their own efforts.	9A, 1B, 1AB, 2A11 3None
89. If necessary, I would give up part of my individuality in order to conform and be a part of a continuing community.	1A, 2B, 2C, 2AB, 4AC, 3BC, 2A11
90. I wouldn't like to live in an apartment complex where nobody knows me.	6A, 2C, 2AB, 3AC 1BC, 2None
91. I feel people worry too much about their individual privacy.	10A, 1AB, 1BC, 1A11 3None
92. There are times when I really want other people to leave me alone and not intrude on my thoughts, even though we're in the same room.	10A, 1B, 3AB, 2AC
93. I don't always like to be part of a group.	3A, 5B, 7AB, 1A11
94. I would enjoy joining with others in some activity for the realization of common goals.	1A, 7B, 1C, 4AB 3BC
95. I would enjoy discussing my private religious views with someone else.	8A, 5B, 2AB, 1BC
96. It would be very important for me to have a corner store near my place of residence.	1A, 12C, 1A11, 2None
97. I would like my job to be within walking distance of my home.	13C, 1AC, 1A11, 1None
98. In my opinion unsolicited telephone calls attempting to sell something are an invasion of my privacy.	14A, 2None
99. I often enjoy being alone and not talking with anyone for a day or so.	12A, 1B, 3AB
100. It does not bother me if I do not have several close friends nearby with whom I can get together with often.	3B, 1C, 5AB, 2AC 4A11, 1None
101. For me some of life's greatest satisfactions would be found in working cooperatively with others.	7B, 2C, 4AB, 1BC, 1A11, 1None
102. Although I enjoy walking in the woods, I would rather not go alone.	6A, 3B, 1C, 1AB, 5None
103. It is very important for me to feel that I can trust the residents of my community.	1A, 1B, 1C, 2AC, 4BC, 2A11, 5None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
104. I would rather walk to a church close by rather than drive to one farther away.	1B, 13C, 2BC
105. I feel that the right to privacy is currently very overemphasized.	9A, 1B, 2AB, 1BC, 1A11, 2None
106. It seems to me that these days everything seems to be on too large a scale.	1A, 1AC, 1BC, 1A11, 12None
107. I don't find I study better when others around me are also studying or reading.	7A, 5B, 4None
108. Only by remaining aloof from social organizations and group allegiances can I fully develop my potential as an individual.	3A, 3B, 8AB, 1A11, 1None
109. I would enjoy taking a carload of children for an outing.	7A, 2B, 1C, 3A11, 3None
110. I believe that a good neighbor is someone with whom you can exchange favors, and borrow and lend things.	3A, 2B, 1C, 2AB, 2AC, 1BC, 1A11, 4None
111. I don't like looking in my neighbors open windows at night.	8A, 2AB, 1AC, 5None
112. I like talking about personal matters over the phone.	12A, 1AB, 3None
113. I would like to live in a neighborhood where it is easy to make acquaintances.	1A, 5B, 1C, 3AC, 2BC, 3A11, 1None
114. I wouldn't have difficulty concentrating on my work if other people were around.	7A, 2B, 1AB, 1BC, 5None
115. I don't believe that one's own religion is a very personal thing and should not be discussed with others.	9A, 4B, 1AB, 2None
116. I wouldn't like to participate in an on-going group where everyone reveals personal information about himself to the others.	3A, 2B, 10AB, 1A11
117. I would rather live in a large city than in a small town.	2A, 10C, 1AB, 1AC, 2None
118. I feel that individuals should feel no obligation to participate in the group activities of the community in which they happen to live or work.	1B, 1C, 2AB, 6AC, 5BC, 1A11
119. I would prefer not to play card games with the people on my street, because they arouse petty rivalry and gossip.	3B, 1C, 5AC, 3BC, 3A11, 1None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
120. In my opinion things work best when people concern themselves with their own welfare and let others take care of themselves.	9A, 1B, 1AC, 1A11, 4None
121. I would enjoy sharing my belongings with other people.	6A, 1B, 1C, 4AB, 4None
122. I would rather not know anothers' secrets.	14A, 2AB
123. I would not mind discussing with my friends why some people do not like me.	6A, 5B, 2AB, 1AC, 2None
124. I would hate to live in a cold, impersonal neighborhood.	3A, 3B, 1C, 2AC, 3BC, 1A11, 1None
125. I think it is better for a community to have a few large parks and playgrounds rather than many smaller neighborhood ones.	2A, 10C, 2BC, 2None
126. I would not like to live in a neighborhood where people put themselves out to help other people.	6A, 2B, 1C, 1AB, 4AC, 1A11, 1None
127. I don't mind going along with the crowd.	3A, 6B, 3AB, 1AC 1A11, 2None
128. I prefer to reveal a lot about my personal life to my close neighbors.	9A, 2B, 2AB, 1AC, 2A11
129. I prefer houses which have hedges or fences around the front and back yards.	9A, 1C, 2AB, 2AC, 2None
130. I would like to live in an area where there are community facilities available, such as public barbecues, pools, parks with tennis courts etc.	10C, 1AC, 2BC, 2A11, 1None
131. I believe that what is lacking in the world today is the old kind of friendship that lasted for a life-time.	4A, 6B, 1AB, 1A11, 4None
132. I appreciate the anonymity of large cities.	6A, 1B, 2C, 1AB, 3AC, 2A11, 1None
133. I believe that families should set aside a definite time every day or so when all the members get together to just talk about what is happening in their lives.	2A, 5B, 7AB, 1A11, 1None
134. I would like to live in a secluded house out of sight of any other houses.	7A, 1B, 1C, 2AB, 2AC, 3A11

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
135. I believe that it is sometimes necessary to exclude others from an ongoing close group of friends.	3A, 4B, 5AB, 1AC,
136. The availability of day-care centres and nurseries within walking distance of my home would be an important consideration in choosing my place of residence.	11C, 1AB, 1AC, 3None
137. I like to have someone to whom I can tell everything about myself, even my deepest and most personal thoughts and feelings.	10A, 2B, 4AB
138. It doesn't bother me when I don't get to visit friends as often as I'd really like.	9A, 3B, 3AB, 1None
139. I often feel that strangers are looking at me critically.	7A, 1AC, 8None
140. In my opinion, it is more important to work toward group goals and adhere to the established rules of the group than to gratify one's individual desires.	1A, 8B, 5AB, 1AC, 1BC
141. I am reluctant to shout through a window in my residence to someone on the street.	9A, 1B, 2AC, 4None
142. It isn't important for me to live in a community of manageable size.	2A, 7C, 1AB, 2AC, 1BC, 3None
143. I believe individuals do not really fulfill their human potentials unless they involve themselves deeply in some group.	8B, 1C, 4AB, 2BC, 1None
144. I would like to have acquaintances at work, in clubs, etc., that don't know each other.	6A, 2B, 5AB, 1A11, 2None
145. If I had a swimming pool, my neighbors would be free to come anytime they wished.	4A, 1C, 5AB, 2AC, 2BC, 2A11
146. I wouldn't want my close friends to know each other.	8A, 2B, 3AB, 3None
147. It doesn't bother me if I frequently have to travel across the city to buy something I need.	10C, 2AC, 4None
148. I don't care if I live within easy walking distance of a shopping center.	12C, 4None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
149. I am never annoyed by people who try to get to know me better than I want them to.	11A, 4AB, 1A11
150. I would like to see activities planned by the schools so that we could meet other parents.	1A, 2B, 3C, 2AB, 2AC, 5BC, 1A11
151. I like to take an active part in organizing small group affairs.	1A, 6B, 1C, 6AB, 1AC, 1BC
152. I rarely make a special effort to get to know my neighbors.	4A, 2B, 1C, 4AC, 1BC, 2A11, 2None
153. In my opinion it is a waste of time to "pass the time of day" talking with neighbors.	3A, 1B, 2AB, 5AC, 1BC, 1A11, 3None
154. I believe that to belong to a group, I must accept the group consensus at least sometimes; like it or not.	1A, 5B, 4AB, 2AC, 2BC, 2None
155. To me, news about my home town seems more meaningful than other news found in the newspaper.	5C, 1AC, 1BC, 9None
156. I enjoy participating as a volunteer in community organizations.	1A, 2B, 3C, 1AB, 3AC, 5BC, 1None
157. It is a nice feeling to have the sales persons in stores where I shop recognize me.	5A, 1B, 3C, 1AB, 2AC, 1A11, 3None
158. I would dislike having a patio or balcony into which neighbors or passerbys could see.	10A, 1B, 1AB, 2AC, 1BC, 1None
159. It is important for me to live in an area where I feel good about the other residents.	3A, 1C, 1AB, 2AC, 5BC, 1A11, 3None
160. I often leave the curtains open in order to feel that I am part of the neighborhood activities which are going on outside.	7A, 1C, 3AB, 3AC, 2A11
161. I would prefer to live in a place where I felt it was safe to let myself be fully known.	7A, 1C, 1AB, 5AC, 2A11
162. It isn't very important for me to feel that I can trust the residents of my community.	3A, 1B, 2C, 2AC, 2BC, 6None
163. I don't believe that it is crucial for an intimate community to control its own influx of new members.	2A, 2B, 1C, 3AC, 1BC, 1A11, 4None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
164. I don't believe that it is sometimes necessary to exclude others from an ongoing close group of friends.	3A, 4B, 1C, 5AB, 1BC, 2None
165. I wouldn't like to live in a society where everyone was open and honest with others and there was no need for fences and walls that separate people.	9A, 1C, 3AB, 3A11
166. I really enjoy the companionship found through a social group.	11B, 4AB, 1BC
167. I don't feel it is important to spend time working with others toward common goals.	2A, 8B, 1C, 2AB, 1AC, 1BC, 1None
168. I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable.	4A, 1B, 1A11, 10None
169. I believe it's a good idea to look around for a place to settle but there's nothing like setting one's roots in one spot.	8C, 1AC, 1BC, 1A11, 5None
170. I would prefer a neighborhood where neighbors had a tendency to drop in all the time to one in which it was difficult to get to know them.	5A, 2C, 2AB, 2BC, 5A11
171. I frequently like to participate in informal neighborhood social activities.	1A, 1B, 4C, 1AB, 1AC, 6BC, 2A11
172. I have no difficulty concentrating on my work when other people are around.	9A, 1B, 1AC, 1A11, 4None
173. I would like to have a local neighborhood newspaper to help me keep up on news and activities in the area.	1A, 3B, 7C, 3BC, 2None
174. I think that man is a social animal; he cannot flourish and grow without identifying himself with some group.	1A, 8B, 2AB, 2BC, 1A11, 2None
175. I want to actively participate in the social life of my community.	5C, 2AB, 1AC, 5BC, 3A11
176. I would not mind living in a communal type residential arrangement where most possessions are owned by the group rather than the individual.	1A, 1B, 3AB, 7BC, 4A11
177. I don't mind people knowing about me and my actions, as long as they don't try to interfere.	9A, 1B, 1AC, 1BC, 2A11, 2None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
178. I would enjoy being part of a team.	1A, 10B, 2AB, 1BC, 1A11, 1None
179. My interests are generally away from intimate social groups.	4A, 5B, 1C, 5AB, 1None
180. I would like to live in an apartment or on a block where activities were organized to allow the residents to meet each other and communicate.	2B, 2C, 3AB, 1AC, 5BC, 3A11
181. It doesn't bother me if I do a foolish thing in front of my friends.	6A, 1B, 2AB, 1BC, 1A11, 4None
182. I would like having a patio or balcony into which neighbors or passerbys could see into, and I could see out.	10A, 1C, 1AB, 1AC, 1BC, 2None
183. I believe that it is crucial for an intimate community to control its own influx of new members.	2A, 4B, 2C, 2AB, 3AC, 1BC, 2None
184. I believe in getting by with as little involvement in organizations as possible.	5A, 2B, 4AB, 1AC, 1BC, 2A11, 1None
185. It is important to me that I be closely identified with at least one group.	4A, 7B, 1AB, 2BC, 1None
186. I don't mind people knowing about me and my activities.	10A, 3AB, 1BC, 1A11, 1None
187. When I go on vacations I like to go to a crowded place.	12A, 1AB, 3None
188. I do not believe one ought to be allowed a private life and a public one, completely separate.	6A, 1B, 1AC, 2A11, 6None
189. I enjoy having friends living nearby who feel free to come into my home when they please.	3A, 1B, 6AB, 1AC, 2BC, 3A11
190. I would like to have a place within my neighborhood where teenagers could gather to socialize.	2A, 4C, 5BC, 1A11, 4None
191. For me, it is sympathetic love among persons which alone gives significance to life.	2A, 2B, 4AB, 1A11, 7None
192. I think that men are first and foremost individual beings; the identifications they may have with groups never really alters their essential separateness from one another.	4A, 2B, 4AB, 1A11, 3None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
193. It isn't important to me to know that my confidence will be kept secret.	12A, 1AB, 3None
194. Acquaintances often ask questions that I consider rude and personal.	13A, 2B, 1AB
195. I would not mind living in an apartment with two or three other persons.	6A, 1B, 6AB, 2AC, 1BC
196. I would prefer to live in an area where people sit out on their front steps and porches rather than in their enclosed backyards.	6A, 4C, 1AB, 2AC, 2BC-, 1None
197. It is important to me to work and live in harmony with other people.	4A, 5B, 1AB, 1BC, 2A11, 3None
198. I would prefer that most of my close friends not live in my immediate neighborhood.	3A, 1B, 3C, 3AB, 3AC, 1BC, 2A11
199. I am often bothered by people outside, on buses, in stores, etc., watching me.	9A, 1AB, 1AC, 1A11, 4None
200. In my opinion nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.	12A, 1B, 1AB, 2A11
201. I wouldn't enjoy participating as a volunteer in community organizations.	2A, 2B, 2C, 1AB, 3AC, 3BC, 1A11, 2None
202. Most of the time, I prefer to "go it alone", and not depend on others.	8A, 1B, 4AB, 1BC, 2A11
203. I hate having the sales persons in stores where I shop recognize me.	10A, 1C, 1AB, 3AC, 1A11
204. It is important to me that the area where I reside be friendly and congenial.	1A, 1C, 1AB, 4AC, 5BC, 1A11, 3None
205. I believe next door neighbors should not get to know one another too well.	8A, 5AC, 3A11
206. I really enjoy being able to lend things to friends.	5A, 1B, 5AB, 1BC, 4None
207. It would not bother me if I could not easily walk from my house to the nearest high school and university.	1A, 10C, 2AC, 3None
208. I feel a good neighbor is someone who is friendly but minds his/or her own business.	10A, 1B, 2AB, 2AC, 1None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
209. I always look forward to Spring because people are outside of their houses more and talking to each other.	5A, 2B, 1C, 3AB, 1AC, 2BC, 2None
210. I would like to live in a neighborhood or apartment block where it is easy to get a group together for card games, singing, or going to the movies.	2C, 2AB, 1AC, 8BC, 3A11
211. It isn't important for the people working in the neighborhood corner store to know the names of young children in the neighborhood.	3A, 1B, 2C, 2AC, 2BC, 1A11, 5None
212. I would prefer not to lend a hand on a community project in my neighborhood.	1A, 2B, 2C, 2AB, 2AC, 3BC, 2A11, 2None
213. I would prefer to live near a playground where my children could play safely.	1A, 10C, 1AC, 4None
214. I would be very upset if a friend read my personal correspondence without my permission.	12A, 1AB, 2None
215. I don't think neighbors should exert considerable pressure on one another to live up to expected codes of conduct.	4A, 1B, 2AB, 3AC, 3BC, 3None
216. In my opinion even intimate friends should respect my desire to keep certain things to myself.	9A, 6AB, 1None
217. I would prefer to have two really good friends in one place than five or six friends in several different places.	2A, 1C, 1AB, 5AC, 3BC, 3A11, 2None
218. When I have a very important decision to make I prefer to make it with others.	4A, 4B, 5AB, 1A11, 2None
219. I never enjoy spending an afternoon or evening at home alone.	5A, 6B, 2AB, 1AC, 1BC, 1None
220. I would prefer to have my children participate in activities close to home, to which they could walk.	1A, 11C, 1A11, 3None
221. I would rather not have my close friends living next door to me.	3A, 1B, 1C, 4AB, 3AC, 1BC, 2A11
222. I care very much about what others think of me.	6A, 2B, 1BC, 2A11, 5None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
223. I am very careful to look my best when I go out in public.	5A, 1AB, 2AC, 1A11 7None
224. I don't often leave the curtains open as I don't like everyone seeing inside.	12A, 2AC, 2None
225. Although I occasionally enjoy talking to my neighbors, I don't like to get very involved with them.	7A, 1C, 4AB, 1AC, 3A11
226. I am embarrassed easily when someone is telling "dirty jokes" to a group of which I am a member.	4A, 4B, 4AB, 1BC, 1A11, 2None
227. I worry when I see society cutting the roots which bind people together.	3A, 3B, 3AB, 2BC, 1A11, 4None
228. It is important for me to live where I can do what I want without bothering other people.	10A, 4AC, 1A11, 1None
229. I would prefer to live on a busy street where I might have the chance to talk to people as they walk by.	5A, 1C, 1AB, 3AC, 4BC, 2None
230. I do not like to meet new people and get acquainted with them.	8A, 1AB, 1AC, 3BC, 1A11, 2None
231. If I could contain most of my activities within my neighborhood, I would probably rarely leave it.	13C, 2BC, 1A11
232. I think children should play in backyards where a member of the family can adequately supervise them rather than on the streets.	2A, 5C, 1AC, 1BC, 1A11, 6None
233. There are often times when I enjoy spending an afternoon or evening at home alone.	8A, 1B, 1C, 4AB, 1AC, 1None
234. I believe that an individual's responsibility for the welfare of others extends no further than the boundaries of his immediate circle of friends and relatives.	1A, 3B, 5AB, 2BC, 2A11, 3None
235. It is my opinion that it would be nice to live in an area where there is a neighborhood theatre.	1B, 11C, 1AC, 1BC, 2None
236. I don't care if I don't see my close friends often enough.	7A, 5B, 2AB, 2None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
237. I would like to be a member of a tightly organized group.	10B, 1C, 5AB
238. It bothers me when I frequently have to travel across the city to buy something I need, rather than just walking to a store close by.	1A, 13C, 1AC, 1None
239. I would like to live in a community where on special occasions people celebrate common holidays together.	2A, 3C, 1AB, 1AC, 5BC, 3None
240. I think even members of a family need to get away from each other now and then.	5A, 2B, 6AB, 2None
241. It is important to me to live where I can do what I want without bothering other people.	8A, 1C, 1AB, 2AC, 1BC, 1A11, 1None
242. I would be willing to sacrifice many of my private interests in order to preserve a cohesive neighborhood community.	2B, 1C, 2AB, 3AC, 3BC, 3A11, 1None
243. I do not prefer houses which have hedges or fences around the front and back yards.	7A, 1B, 1C, 1AB, 3AC, 2None
244. I would prefer to walk to my neighborhood hairdresser (barber) rather than drive to one farther away.	1A, 13C, 1None
245. It wouldn't matter to me if my place of residence did not have a laundry and dry cleaning shop close by.	1A, 12C, 2None
246. I don't like to talk about personal things with friends until I have known them a long time.	10A, 5AB
247. It is important for me to live my life as I please without being questioned or criticized by neighbors or acquaintances.	7A, 2AB, 3AC, 1A11, 2None
248. I feel it is not necessary to have adequate leisure facilities close to one's home.	1A, 13C, 1None
249. I do not like to put on an act when I am with friends.	6A, 4AB, 6None
250. I would not mind discussing with my fellow employees any marital difficulties I might be having.	10A, 3AB, 1AC, 1A11, 1None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
251. It would bother me if some of my close friends knew all the many sides of my personality.	11A, 1B, 3AB, 1None
252. I would like to be a member of a group in which most people will go out of their way to help someone else.	1A, 9B, 2AB, 2AC, 1A11, 1None
253. It is important for me to have people around me that I can count on.	3A, 8B, 3AB, 1AC, 1None
254. I think it is almost impossible for one person to really understand the feelings of another.	6A, 1B, 1AB, 8None
255. I would like to live within easy walking distance of a shopping area.	1A, 12C, 1AB, 2None
256. I wouldn't mind living in a large city - - at least everyone would not know everything about me.	7A, 2C, 1AB, 3AC, 2A11, 1None
257. I would prefer to live in an area where there is a great variety of age groups, incomes, and status.	4A, 1C, 1AB, 2AC, 1A11 7None
258. I frequently like to participate in informal social activities in the community.	1A, 3B, 1C, 1AB, 3AC, 6BC, 1None
259. In my opinion too many people in our society are just out for themselves and don't really care for anyone else.	6A, 1B, 1BC, 1A11, 7None
260. In my opinion people were better off in the old days when everyone knew just how he was expected to act.	7A, 1AC, 8None
261. I feel that people nowadays are much too secretive.	10A, 3AB, 1AC, 2None
262. I don't mind disclosing my yearly income to anyone who wants to know.	12A, 1B, 1AC, 1A11, 1None
263. I like to leave the living room curtains open in the evening, so that I don't feel closed off from the outside.	7A, 4AC, 5None
264. I would prefer to work in a small organization rather than a large one.	3A, 4B, 1C, 3AB, 1AC, 2A11, 2None
265. I dislike having to drive long distances to acquire the services I need.	1A, 13C, 2None

Item	Sorting Results
266. I would prefer to be a member of many small groups rather than a few large ones.	2A, 7B, 3AB, 2BC, 1A11, 1None
267. It infuriates me to think that neighborhoods are rarely designed to include most of the residents' activities.	1B, 10C, 3AC, 2A11
268. It is important to me to feel that I belong in my particular neighborhood or block.	2B, 2C, 1AB, 3AC, 4BC, 1A11, 3None
269. I would dislike living in an urban area where I never got to know my neighbors.	3A, 2B, 1C, 5AC, 3BC, 2None
270. I prefer not to reveal too much of my personal life to my close friends.	10A, 6AB
271. The whole "invasion of privacy" issue has never upset me too much since I feel it's somewhat overrated.	12A, 1AB, 3A11
272. I wouldn't want to live in a communal type residential arrangement where most possessions are owned by the group rather than the individual.	3A, 6AB, 1AC, 2BC, 3A11, 1None
273. I am annoyed by people who try to get to know me better than I want them to.	14A, 1B, 1AB
274. I would prefer to live far enough away from my immediate family to allow me to visit them at my convenience.	4A, 3C, 5AB, 1AC, 1BC, 2A11
275. I am not reluctant to shout through a window in my residence to someone on the street.	4A, 4AC, 1BC, 1A11, 6None
276. I would prefer to live in the centre of the city rather than the suburbs.	2A, 2B, 4C, 2AC, 6None
277. I think that people who complain about a lack of privacy probably have something to hide.	10A, 1B, 2A11, 3None
278. I dislike being completely alone, either in a house or in the wilderness.	11A, 1B, 2AB, 1BC, 1None
279. I wouldn't be at all upset if a friend read my personal correspondence without my permission.	12A, 4AB

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
280. I like to control how much social contact I have with others.	14A, 1AB, 1A11
281. When I think of the ways the government is invading our privacy everyday, I get angry.	13A, 3None
282. I wouldn't like for my house to be so far away from my neighbors that "only by yelling at the top of my lungs" can I be heard.	4A, 2B, 1C, 1AB, 6AC, 1BC, 1None
283. I feel more secure living in a place where I am recognized by those around me.	5A, 1AB, 4AC, 1BC, 2A11, 3None
284. I am indifferent about the fact that neighborhoods are rarely designed to include most of the residents' activities.	12C, 1AC, 1A11, 1None
285. I don't think that everyone has the right to control how much other people know about their private lives.	12A, 2AB, 1None
286. I would hate to live in a cold, impersonal town.	6A, 1B, 1C, 1AB, 1AC, 1BC, 3A11, 2None
287. I believe that commitment and time are the basic ingredients of building a true neighborhood community.	2B, 4C, 1AB, 2AC, 3BC, 2A11, 2None
288. I would be willing to sacrifice at least part of my individuality in order to be a part of a continuing community.	2A, 2B, 2AB, 4AC, 3BC, 2A11, 1None
289. I would like to live in a neighborhood where people do things together now and then.	1A, 2B, 4C, 1AB, 2AC, 2BC, 3A11, 1None
290. I like to be open and honest with people so they will really know what kind of person I am.	10A, 3AB, 1AC, 1A11, 1None
291. I would not want to live in a community in which people were very concerned with each others' morality as well as their own.	7A, 1C, 2AB, 3AC, 1A11, 2None
292. If necessary, I wouldn't give up part of my individuality in order to conform and be a part of a continuing community.	4A, 2B, 2AB, 3AC, 2BC, 2A11, 1None
293. It is not important to me to have a cafe or restaurant within walking distance of my home.	2A, 12C, 2None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
294. I believe one ought to be allowed a private life and a public one, completely separate.	12A, 1AC, 2A11, 1None
295. I usually don't like to talk much unless I am with people I know very well.	8A, 1B, 5AB, 2None
296. I would dislike living in a neighborhood where people couldn't help noticing me come and go.	7A, 1C, 5AC, 2A11, 1None
297. I believe there should be an area in the house where the husband and wife can get away from the rest of the family.	11A, 1B, 2AB, 1BC, 1None
298. It is important to me to be able to be alone when I want to be.	14A, 1AB, 1BC
299. I would prefer to be a member of a few large groups rather than many small ones.	3A, 4B, 1C, 5AB, 2AC, 1None
300. It isn't important for me to share risks and hardships with others outside of my immediate family.	4A, 5B, 4AB, 1BC, 2None
301. I would be willing to live in a residential area where the closest "corner store" is a five minute car ride.	2A, 13C, 1None
302. It is my opinion that commercial buildings should be in separate areas from homes.	1A, 7C, 1AC, 7None
303. I would never tell the other residents in my block about the things in my past of which I am most ashamed.	1A, 1B, 4C, 1AB, 2AC, 2BC, 1A11, 4None
304. I probably would not go house to house to distribute a weekly neighborhood news bulletin.	10A, 2AB, 3AC, 1A11
305. It is important that the people on my residential block know me, and watch out for me as a member of the block.	2A, 1B, 3C, 2AB, 4AC, 2A11, 2None
306. A good relationship with my family is very important to me.	3A, 4B, 6AB, 1A11, 2None
307. I would like to have most of my adult friends live within a ten minute walk of my house.	1A, 7C, 1AB, 1AC, 2BC, 2A11, 2None
308. When I have a very important decision to make I prefer to make it alone.	11A, 1B, 1AB, 3None

Item	Sorting Results
309. I wouldn't like to have most of my adult friends live within a ten minute walk of my home.	4A, 5C, 2AB, 1BC, 2A11, 1None
310. I would like to play card games with people on my street to hear about the gossip.	2A, 3B, 1C, 1AB, 2AC, 2BC, 4A11, 1None
311. I would like to live in a large city because neighbors and acquaintances there would probably be less concerned about my private life.	8A, 1AB, 5AC, 1BC, 1A11
312. It is important for me to share risks and hardships with others outside of my immediate family.	3A, 6B, 2AB, 1AC, 2BC, 1A11, 1None
313. I would like to be able to quickly get a group of friends together for social activities.	6B, 4AB, 3BC, 2A11, 1None
314. I wouldn't want to spend most of my leisure time in my neighborhood area.	13C, 2AB, 1BC
315. It is important that my closest friend know the "true me"; that is, my personal feelings problems, hopes and fears.	11A, 5AB
316. I feel it is very important to discuss the things I feel guiltiest about with someone else.	8A, 5AB, 3None
317. I usually feel nervous if I have to meet a lot of people.	11A, 2AB, 1A11, 2None
318. In my opinion people would be a lot better off if they could live far away from other people and never have to do anything for them.	3A, 1C, 3AB, 6AC, 2A11, 1None
319. I believe schools and colleges should teach their students to accept their morals of society and to adjust themselves to community life.	2A, 1B, 3AC, 3A11, 7None
320. I believe people should respect others' right to be individualistic or different.	9A, 2B, 1AB, 1A11, 3None
321. I do not mind people probing into even my most personal and private matters.	13A, 1B, 1AB, 1A11
322. I would not want to live in a large city -- few people know anything about me.	6A, 2C, 1AB, 2AC, 3BC, 1A11, 1None
323. I would like to live near a local tavern where I could meet my neighbors.	1A, 1B, 3C, 2AB, 2AC, 5BC, 2A11

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
324. It would not bother me if the residents of my neighborhood knew about my family problems.	10A, 2AB, 1AC, 3A11
325. I believe that Robert Frost's statement "Good fences make good neighbors" contains a great deal of truth.	9A, 1AB, 4AC, 1BC, 1None
326. I have no secrets.	11A, 1AB, 4None
327. It usually annoys me to have people come to my home without letting me know they are coming.	12A, 2AB, 1AC, 1None
328. I would prefer to live in a neighborhood where children have many playmates close-by.	1A, 8C, 1AB, 2AC, 4None
329. It isn't important for me to be around people who accept me as I am.	8A, 3B, 2AB, 1A11, 2None
330. I would enjoy going out of my way to make a new neighbor feel at home.	3A, 5B, 1AB, 4AC, 2BC, 1None
331. It doesn't annoy me to have people come to my home without letting me know when they are coming.	11A, 1AB, 1AC, 1BC, 2None
332. I wouldn't want to live in a place where I felt it was safe to let myself be fully known.	11A, 2AB, 2AC, 1A11
333. It is important that I have someone in my life whose happiness means as much to myself as my own.	5A, 2B, 3AB, 1A11, 5None
334. It is my opinion that people in general are very adaptable -- they can adjust to almost any amount of crowding with no ill effects.	8A, 2AB, 1AC, 2A11, 3None
335. I really don't enjoy being able to lend things to friends.	6A, 1B, 4AB, 1BC, 4None
336. I would want my friends to call me before dropping over.	10A, 4AB, 1AC, 1None
337. It is important for me to recognize most of the people who live in my residential area.	2A, 3C, 1AB, 3AC, 2BC, 4A11, 1None
338. I would like to have regular places close by where I can go and people will know me.	1A, 3C, 1AB, 2AC, 6BC, 2A11, 1None
339. I enjoy frequent trips away from my immediate neighborhood area.	1A, 1B, 10C, 3AC, 1BC
340. I would like for my house to be so far away from my neighbors that only by "yelling at the top of my lungs" can I be heard.	6A, 1B, 2AB, 4AC, 1BC, 1A11, 1None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
341. I feel that it is important for my closest friend of the opposite sex to know the "true me"; that is, my personal feelings, problems, hopes, and aspirations.	9A, 1B, 6AB
342. It is important to me that my life contain cooperative group enjoyment.	8B, 1C, 5AB, 1BC, 4A11
343. I wouldn't want my job to be within walking distance of my home.	2A, 12C, 1AC, 1None
344. I would prefer to live in a quiet residential neighborhood rather than in a mixture of types of buildings and facilities.	3A, 5C, 1AC, 6None
345. I would rather not live near the people that I work with.	6A, 2C, 1AB, 2AC, 3A11
346. In my opinion everyone has the right to control how much other people know about their private lives.	14A, 2AB
347. I would not like to live in a large city because neighbors and acquaintances there would probably be less concerned about my private life.	7A, 2AB, 1AC, 3BC, 2A11, 1None
348. It isn't important for me to live in an area where I feel good about the other residents.	5A, 2C, 1AB, 2AC, 3BC, 3None
349. I would prefer that my neighbor not be a close friend.	4A, 1C, 3AB, 3AC, 1BC, 3A11, 1None
350. Besides just knowing me, I would definitely want my close friend to know each other.	2A, 5B, 5AB, 1AC, 2None
351. I would like to have only about 10-12 persons in my intimate group of friends.	3A, 2B, 8AB, 1AC, 2None
352. I sometimes want to get away from everyone for a while, even my close friends.	10A, 2B, 3AB, 1None
253. I like the idea of having "block parties" in neighborhoods, where everyone participates and contributes, and where you really get to know your neighbors.	1C, 3AB, 3AC, 6BC, 2A11, 1None
354. I find that I can't trust the friendship of anyone who hasn't seen the worst of me.	12A, 1B, 1AB, 2None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
355. I am happiest when I am a secure member of a small group.	10B, 5AB, 1BC.
356. I would like to live near a high school or university where I could walk to evening classes.	2A, 11C, 1AC, 2None
357. I would not want to become involved in community affairs.	1A, 1B, 4C, 1AB, 2AC, 2BC, 3All, 2None
358. It is important for me to live in a community of manageable size.	2A, 8C, 2AC, 1All, 3None
359. I prefer to spend most of my leisure time in my neighborhood area.	13C, 2AC, 1BC
360. It would bother me when other children play in my yard, when they are not invited over.	6A, 2C, 2AB, 2AC, 4None
361. It is important to know that your confidence will be kept secret.	12A, 2AB, 2None
362. I wouldn't want to live in an area where there is a great variety of age groups, incomes, and status.	5A, 1B, 1C, 4AC, 1All, 4None
363. I would enjoy going to neighborhood functions such as bingo parties, dances, charity bazaars.	9C, 2AB, 2AC, 2BC, 1All
364. In my home I prefer to have my own place to do my work and hobbies.	7A, 1B, 1C, 4AB, 2AC, 1None
365. I am usually upset if other members of my family open my bedroom door and enter without first asking my permission.	10A, 4AB, 1AC, 1None
366. I wouldn't be willing to join a neighborhood improvement association.	2B, 2C, 2AB, 2AC, 5BC, 2All, 1None

Appendix 3

Instructions for the Second Sorting
of Potential Items for the PCA Scale.

This booklet contains a number of statements concerning our everyday attitudes and activities. I'd like your help in sorting these statements. I am interested in the type of activities people perform daily, and their preferences for performing these activities in a certain manner, in a certain place, and with a certain group of people. Eventually, I will construct a questionnaire to ask people about their attitudes and activities. But first, I need to know which attitudes and activities are related or go together. This is why I have asked for your help. I would like you to classify the various attitudes and activities listed in this booklet according to eight categories that I will explain. This is not a psychological test. I simply need your opinion concerning which attitudes and activities belong in which categories. You are to read each statement and place it in the category you think best.

Please proceed according to the following instructions:

1. First, carefully read these three definitions.

Definition A. The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he prefers to control (or prefers not to control) interaction, either verbal or physical, between himself and others.

Definition B. The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he prefers to engage in (or avoid) a close-knit web of meaningful relationships with others.

Definition C. The person making this statement is indicating the degree to which he prefers (or does not prefer) to perform most of his activities within one small area (e.g., block or neighborhood) in which he resides.

Now read again these definitions until you have a clear understanding of what you think the definitions mean. I cannot answer questions concerning these definitions. What is important is what you think these definitions mean. You should refer to these definitions (typed on the loose sheet) while classifying the statements.

2. Some of the statements you will be sorting may apply to only one of the definitions. Other statements may apply to two of the definitions; and still others may apply to all three of the definitions, A, B, and C. Or it may be that a statement does not apply to any of the three definitions. Your job is to classify each statement as belonging to one of the eight categories. These categories are:

1. Definition A
2. Definition B
3. Definition C
4. Definition A and B
5. Definition A and C
6. Definition B and C
7. All three definitions
8. None of the three definitions

Again, your job is to sort the statements you will be reading as best belonging in one of the eight categories. A ninth category(?) is available for items that are totally ambiguous and make no sense to you whatsoever. Use this category only if a particular statement is not clearly worded and uninterpretable.

The following examples should clarify how you might sort the statement. A check has been placed under the category heading into which you would probably sort the statement.

1. I prefer to do my grocery shopping in the next city. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
2. I enjoy jogging. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
3. I would enjoy going to a neighborhood function such as a square dance or outdoor cookout. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
4. I prefer not to talk about my personal life with anyone. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
5. I want to be able to walk to my bank. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?
6. I would enjoy belonging to a close group of friends. A B C AB AC BC ALL NONE ?

3. You do not have to assign the same number of statements to each category. Indeed, you may not even use some of the categories. Let me emphasize that how you assign a statement to a category is entirely up to you, based on your understanding of the definitions for A, B, and C. Naturally, I would hope that the statements could be clearly and unambiguously placed in the first three categories, that is either A, B, or C. I am trying to weed out the statements that fall under more than one of the definitions. Some statements may more easily be seen to belong in one category than in another; others may be more difficult to place and may require that you think about them for a while. Simply

assign the statements to a particular category as best you can according to the definitions given.

4. There is no time limit for completing this booklet. Take your time and think about each placement for as long as you like. If you want to change a placement, feel free to do so. Simply erase your first check mark and assign the statement to a new category. You may even want to review some of your placements after you have gone through all the statements.

5. If you follow the instructions as outlined, you should have little difficulty in completing this booklet. If you have any questions, please ask me now; otherwise you may begin assigning the statements, each to one, and only one, of the nine categories.

Appendix 4

Sorting Results for Each Item
Included in the Second Sorting.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
1. I would like to have a private retreat which no one would enter without asking me.	12A, 2C, 2AC
2. Upon moving to a new community I would want to become involved in community activities.	4B, 1AB, 1AC, 6BC, 1None, 1?
3. I want to form sincere friendships with others.	2A, 10B, 4AB
4. I would not like to live where everyone would know a lot about me.	7A, 5B, 2C, 1AB, 1AC
5. I would prefer to live in a small town where I would often accidentally meet my friends.	2A, 4B, 2C, 4AC, 2BC, 1A11, 1None.
6. I would enjoy revealing personal information about myself to others.	7A, 2B, 7AB
7. I try to avoid becoming too involved with others.	5A, 6B, 5AB
8. I prefer frequent social contacts with others.	4A, 9B, 3AB
9. It is important to me that the members of my family really know each other well.	15B, 1None
10. I would like to have a close group of friends with whom I do things regularly.	13B, 3AB
11. I would not enjoy discussing my private religious views with someone else.	13A, 2B, 1None
12. I want my neighbors to greet each other as they pass in front of each other's homes.	4A, 2B, 2AB, 2BC, 3A11, 3None
13. I would leave my neighborhood often even if I could contain most of my activities within it.	11C, 1AC, 4BC
14. I prefer to have separate groups of friends who do not know each other.	5A, 5B, 5AB, 1None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
15. I want to have a meaningful role to play in my residential community.	2B, 4C, 3AC, 2A11
16. I prefer to study or read when others around me are also studying or reading.	9A, 2B, 1AB, 1BC, 3None
17. I seldom want to get away from everyone for a while.	4A, 5B, 3AB, 2BC, 1A11, 1None
18. I would occasionally enjoy getting away from the rest of the world.	8A, 3B, 2BC, 1A11, 2None
19. A high amount of privacy has never been an important consideration in my choosing a place to live.	9A, 1C, 1AB, 2AC, 2A11, 1None
20. I prefer to shop at large, impersonal stores where no one knows me.	3A, 2B, 5C, 4AC, 1BC, 1A11
21. It wouldn't bother me to feel lonely fairly often.	3A, 7B, 4AB, 2None
22. I would enjoy being frequently invited out by friends.	4A, 7B, 3AB, 1AC, 1None
23. I prefer to avoid dependence upon other persons.	4A, 5B, 1C, 5AB, 1None
24. I want everyone to protect each other's rights and interests in my group.	5A, 2B, 6AB, 1AC, 1A11, 1None
25. I would get depressed if I didn't see my close friends often.	11B, 3AB, 1BC, 1?
26. I'd be willing to form a citizen's group to promote pride in my neighborhood.	7C, 3AC, 2BC, 3A11, 1None
27. I wouldn't mind doing more than my share of a task involving close friends.	1A, 13B, 2AB
28. It is important to me to remember my loyalties to my close friends.	15B, 1AB
29. I like to have small parties with just my close friends attending.	5B, 10AB, 1A11
30. I would not mind performing unpleasant tasks, if these were required by my family.	2A, 10B, 1AB, 2None, 1?
31. When I go on vacations, I prefer to go to a secluded place.	9A, 1B, 2C, 1AB, 2AC, 1A11

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
32. I would prefer not to live in a place where my neighbors could easily see my comings and goings.	4A, 2C, 5AC, 1BC, 3A11, 1None
33. I need places where I can go everyday and be sure of seeing familiar faces.	4A, 3B, 3C, 3BC, 3A11
34. I dislike talking about personal matters to a friend.	5A, 3B, 8AB
35. I enjoy having my friends visit me in my home.	3A, 2B, 2C, 2AB, 1AC, 5BC, 1None
36. I want to be an independent unattached individual.	3A, 2B, 9AB, 1A11, 1?
37. I would enjoy spending time working with others toward common goals.	3A, 9B, 2AB, 2None
38. I would like to give some of my time for the good of my town.	1A, 3C, 1AC, 5BC, 5None, 1?
39. I prefer to have very few intimate friends.	2A, 9B, 5AB
40. I believe in "going it alone" for the most part.	4A, 6B, 5AB, 1None
41. I would enjoy going away for the weekend with a group of friends.	2A, 6B, 1C, 2AB, 1AC, 4BC
42. I prefer to have a few close friends who all know each other.	13B, 3AB
43. I would not belong to a group in which I must accept the group consensus sometimes.	10A, 1B, 3AB, 2None
44. I do not want my friends to know me too well.	4A, 4B, 7AB, 1None
45. It is not important that I identify myself with my place of residence.	1A, 9C, 1AC, 1BC, 4None
46. It doesn't matter if I can't be alone when I want.	13A, 1B, 2AB
47. I wouldn't care if there were no corner store near my place of residence.	15C, 1AC
48. I'd like to live in a housing complex where I could carry out most of my leisure activities.	13C, 2AC, 1BC
49. I usually don't tell people I don't know very well, personal things about myself.	9A, 3B, 1AB, 1None, 2?

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
50. I would want to be a member of a close-knit family.	16B
51. I would like to live in a commune.	5B, 3C, 1AC, 2BC, 4A11, 1None
52. I do not want others meddling in my affairs.	10A, 2B, 4AB
53. I am not very interested in what goes on in my neighborhood.	9C, 4BC, 3None
54. I dislike talking about personal matters.	9A, 2B, 4AB, 1None
55. I would like to live in a neighborhood where people do things together.	1B, 6C, 2AC, 7BC
56. I do not like to discuss with friends feelings about my sexual adequacy.	8A, 4B, 3AB, 1None
57. I want to be able to exert some control over my relationships with others.	12A, 1B, 3AB
58. I need to have a close-knit group of friends in order to be happy.	15B, 1AB
59. I don't mind if friends see me when I am very angry.	6A, 5B, 2AB, 2None, 1?
60. I would like to live in a society where everyone was open and honest with each other.	3A, 6B, 2AB, 1A11, 4None
61. I would like to join clubs where there are people like myself.	3A, 6B, 1AB, 1AC, 1BC, 3None, 1?
62. There are times when I want other people to intrude on my thoughts and make me talk about what is on my mind.	9A, 3B, 4AB
63. I often like to go to a secluded place.	11A, 3C, 1AB, 1BC
64. I would like to live in a secluded house, out of sight of any other house.	5A, 1B, 2C, 1AB, 5AC, 2A11
65. It is very important for me to have some private space around my home to which I can sometimes retreat.	6A, 1C, 1AB, 5AC, 2A11, 1?
66. There are times when I like to get away from people who know me.	5A, 2B, 7AB, 1BC, 1None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
67. I enjoy feeling free to do anything without the fear of being seen by someone I know.	7A, 3B, 1AC, 2BC, 1A11, 2None
68. I would not want my friends to know the way I act in many different situations.	1A, 5B, 7AB, 2A11, 1None
69. I prefer to get along by myself and avoid unnecessary social contacts.	3A, 4B, 9AB
70. I would like to have friends who do things together.	2A, 12B, 1AB, 1None
71. I don't mind talking about personal matters with someone I have known only a short time.	7A, 5B, 1C, 2AB, 1None
72. I'd like to join a neighborhood improvement association.	1A, 4C, 1AB, 4BC, 2A11, 2None
73. I need to be around people who accept me as I am.	2A, 10B, 3AB, 1None
74. I prefer to know a few individuals well rather than many individuals casually.	2A, 12B, 2AB
75. I prefer to shop at a small store where I am known by the personnel.	3A, 2B, 4C, 3AC, 2BC, 1A11, 1?
76. I prefer large parties where few people know each other, to small parties where everyone knows one another.	1A, 10B, 5AB
77. I usually don't like helping others when they are in trouble.	7A, 4B, 1AB, 1A11, 1None, 2?
78. I would like to be a member of a close-knit group.	15B, 1BC
79. I wouldn't like living in a housing complex where no one knew me.	3A, 4B, 2C, 1AB, 2BC, 1A11, 3None
80. I often worry about the loss of my individual privacy	11A, 1B, 1AB, 3None
81. There are times when I really want other people to leave me alone and not intrude on my thoughts.	10A, 1B, 4AB, 1None
82. I don't want to have other people depend on me.	5A, 7B, 3AB, 1None
83. I would enjoy joining with others for the realization of a common goal.	3A, 9B, 3AB, 1None
84. I wouldn't mind discussing my private secrets with someone else.	7A, 7B, 2AB

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
85. It is very important for me to have a corner store near my place of residence.	15C, 1AC
86. I would like my job to be within walking distance of my home.	15C, 1BC
87. Unsolicited telephone calls attempting to sell me something are an invasion of my privacy.	15A, 1None
88. I often enjoy being alone and not talking with anyone.	11A, 4AB, 1None
89. It would not bother me if I did not have several close friends with whom I could get together often.	1A, 13B, 2AB
90. I would really enjoy working cooperatively with others in a small group.	1A, 9B, 4AB, 1None, 1?
91. If forced to choose, I would rather have just one close friend than many casual acquaintances.	3A, 10B, 3AB
92. I would rather walk to a church close by rather than drive to one farther away.	16C
93. I feel that currently the individual's right to privacy is overemphasized.	15A, 1AB
94. I would enjoy going on an outing with a group of children.	5A, 4B, 1AB, 6None
95. I would want to exchange favors, and borrow and lend things with my neighbor.	3A, 3B, 2AC, 5BC, 2A11, 1None
96. I would like to live where it is easy to make acquaintances.	2A, 3B, 1C, 2AB, 3AC, 3BC, 2A11
97. I prefer not to participate in group activities at work.	4A, 7B, 3AB, 1BC, 1None
98. Things work best when I concern myself with my own welfare and let others take care of themselves.	6A, 3B, 6AB, 1AC
99. I would enjoy sharing my belongings with my friends.	4A, 8B, 2AB, 2None
100. I would rather not know others' secrets.	8A, 9B, 3AB
101. I don't like feeling obligated to others.	8A, 3B, 4AB, 1?

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
102. I like to reveal alot about my personal life to my closest neighbor.	4A, 4B, 2AB, 1AC, 3BC, 2A11
103. I would want to live in a house which had a hedge or fence around the front and backyard.	10A, 1B, 2AB, 1AC, 1A11, 1None
104. I would like to live in an area where there are facilities available close by, such as public barbecues, pools, parks with tennis courts, etc.	14C, 1BC, 1A11
105. I prefer meaningful friendships that last for a lifetime.	1A, 12B, 3AB
106. I enjoy the anonymity found in large cities.	3A, 2B, 1C, 4AB, 1AC, 2BC, 1A11, 1None, 1?
107. I would like to set aside a definite time everyday or so when all the members of my family could get together.	3A, 4B, 9AB
108. The availability of daycare centres and nurseries within walking distance of my home would be an important consideration in choosing my place of residence.	15C, 1None
109. I like to have someone to whom I can tell everything about myself, even my deepest and most personal thoughts and feelings.	4A, 10B, 2AB
110. It doesn't bother me when I don't get to visit my friends very often.	2A, 10B, 2AB, 1BC, 1None
111. I would enjoy working toward meaningful group goals.	1A, 12B, 3None
112. I am reluctant to shout through my window to someone on the street.	9A, 1BC, 3None, 3?
113. I would not feel that I were fulfilling my human potential unless I were involved deeply in some group.	1A, 13B, 2AB
114. I would prefer that my various acquaintances at work in clubs, etc., not know each other.	5A, 3B, 5AB, 1BC, 2None
115. I would prefer that my close friends not know each other.	5A, 4B, 6AB
116. It doesn't bother me if I frequently have to travel across the city to buy something I need.	15C, 1AC

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
117. It's not important that I live within easy walking distance of a shopping center.	15C, 1AC
118. I am never annoyed by people who try to get to know me better than I want.	11A, 4B, 1AB
119. I would rarely make a special effort to get to know my neighbors.	5A, 5B, 1AB, 2BC, 2All, 1None
120. I think it is a waste of time to "pass the time of day" talking with neighbors.	3A, 5B, 2C, 1AC, 2BC, 1None
121. I would enjoy participating as a volunteer in various organizations.	3A, 7B, 1AB, 1BC, 4None
122. It would be a nice feeling to have the sales persons in stores where I shop recognize me.	6A, 5B, 3C, 1AC, 1BC
123. I would dislike having a patio or balcony into which passersby could see.	13A, 2B, 1AC
124. I would like to belong to a group in which I felt it was safe to let myself be fully known.	1A, 8B, 7AB
125. I really enjoy the companionship found through a social group.	3A, 10B, 1AB, 1BC, 1?
126. I dislike working with others toward common goals.	4A, 7B, 2AB, 3None
127. I would like to set my roots in one spot and develop meaningful relationships with others.	7B, 1AB, 5BC, 3All
128. I would prefer a neighborhood in which it is easy to get to know my neighbors.	3A, 3B, 2AB, 1AC, 6BC, 1All
129. If forced to choose, I would rather have many casual acquaintances than just one close friend.	1A, 12B, 3AB
130. I believe that I cannot flourish and grow without identifying myself with others.	3A, 12B, 1AB
131. I want to have a meaningful social life.	1A, 9B, 5AB, 1None
132. I would enjoy being part of a work team.	4A, 8B, 1AB, 3None
133. I want my work to have meaning.	1A, 1B, 1AB, 12None, 1?
134. I prefer not to form intimate associations with social groups.	2A, 8B, 6AB

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
135. I want my friends to understand the "real me".	2A, 10B, 3AB, 1None
136. I believe that it is crucial for an intimate group to control the influx of new members.	6A, 2B, 7AB, 1?
137. I prefer to get by with as little involvement in close-knit organizations as possible.	2A, 7B, 7AB
138. I would like to be closely identified with a group of friends..	13B, 3AB
139. I don't mind people knowing a lot about my activities.	12A, 2B, 1AB, 1None
140. I don't care if my confidences are not kept secret.	13A, 1B, 1AB, 1None
141. When I go on a vacation I prefer to go to a crowded place.	10A, 1C, 1AB, 1A11, 2None, 1?
142. I would not mind performing unpleasant tasks, if these were required by my group of friends.	12B, 2AB, 2None
143. I prefer to live a very private life.	7A, 2B, 6AB, 1A11
144. I enjoy having friends who feel free to come into my home anytime they please.	5A, 3B, 5AB, 1BC, 1A11, 1None
145. For me, it is meaningful love among persons which alone gives significance to life.	1A, 11B, 2AB, 1None 1?
146. I prefer to be first and foremost an individual.	6A, 3B, 3AB, 4None
147. Acquaintances often ask questions that I consider rude and personal.	10A, 3B, 2AB, 1None
148. I prefer to work and live in harmony with other people who know me well.	1A, 6B, 5AB, 1AC, 2BC, 1None
149. I would prefer that most of my close friends <u>not</u> live in my immediate neighborhood.	2A, 2C, 1AB, 4BC, 7A11
150. I get upset when people pry into matters that I consider personal and private.	10A, 2B, 4AB
151. I prefer not to participate as a volunteer in community organizations.	2A, 4B, 1C, 1AB, 3AC, 1A11, 4None
152. Most of the time, I prefer to "go it alone", and not depend on others for meaningful companionship.	1A, 6B, 8AB, 1A11

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
153. It would not bother me if I could not easily walk from my home to a high school or university.	15C, 1AC
154. I prefer a neighbor that minds his own business.	9A, 1B, 4AB, 1BC, 1A11
155. I prefer to live near a playground to which my children can walk.	14C, 2AC
156. I would be very upset if someone read my personal correspondence without my permission.	13A, 1AB, 2None
157. I would prefer to have my really good friends live in my neighborhood rather than on the other side of the city.	6C, 1AB, 2AC, 5BC, 2A11
158. I don't enjoy spending evenings alone.	4A, 8B, 1AB, 2None 1?
159. I would prefer to have my children participate in activities close to home, to which they could walk.	14C, 1AB, 1AC
160. I would rather <u>not</u> have my close friends living next door to me.	1A, 1B, 1C, 1AB, 5AC, 4BC, 3A11
161. I prefer not to leave my curtains open as I don't like anyone seeing inside my home.	15A, 1AC
162. Although I occasionally enjoy talking to my neighbors, I prefer not to get involved with them.	5A, 4B, 2AB, 2AC, 2BC, 1A11
163. I would not want to live in a society that cut the roots that allowed meaningful relationships to continue between people.	1A, 8B, 2AB, 1AC, 2BC, 1A11, 1None
164. I prefer to live where I can do what I want without bothering other people.	9A, 1B, 5AC, 1None
165. If I could contain most of my activities within my neighborhood, I would rarely leave it.	14C, 1AC, 1A11
166. I often enjoy spending an evening with one other friend.	5A, 8B, 3AB
167. My responsibility for the welfare of others extends no further than the boundaries of my immediate circle of friends.	3A, 5B, 5AB, 1BC, 1None, 1?
168. I would prefer to live in an area where there is a neighborhood theatre.	16C

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
169. I don't care if I rarely see any of my friends.	7A, 6B, 2AB, 1BC
170. I would like to be a member of a group where everyone felt good being together.	14B, 1AB, 1None
171. It bothers me when I frequently have to travel across the city to buy something I need, rather than just walking to a store close by.	16C
172. I do not want to put on an act when I am with my friends.	6A, 7B, 2AB, 1None
173. I would not mind discussing with my fellow employees any life difficulties I might be having.	9A, 5B, 1AB, 1None
174. I would like to be a member of a group in which everyone will go out of his way to help someone else.	13B, 2AB, 1None
175. I need people around that I can count on.	1A, 12B, 3AB
176. I would like to live within easy walking distance of a shopping area.	16C
177. I would not want to be just out for myself and really care about anyone else.	2A, 12B, 1AB, 1?
178. I would prefer to walk to a neighborhood hairdresser (or barber) rather than drive to one farther away.	16C
179. It isn't important that my place of residence have a laundry and dry cleaning shop close by.	16C
180. I would definitely want to have adequate leisure facilities close to my home.	16C
181. I feel that people nowadays are much too secretive.	7A, 4B, 2AB, 2None 1?
182. I don't mind disclosing my yearly income to anyone who wants to know.	10A, 1B, 2AB, 3None
183. I would prefer to be a member of a small work team, and not just an employee in a large organization.	3A, 11B, 2AB
184. I dislike having to drive long distances to acquire the services I need.	15C, 1AC
185. It infuriates me to think that neighborhoods are rarely designed to include most of the residents' activities.	13C, 2AC, 1?

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
186. My neighborhood is important to me.	1A, 1B, 2C, 1AC, 6BC, 1A11, 4None
187. I enjoy helping others through meaningful relationships.	15B, 1AB
188. I prefer not to reveal too much of my personal life to my friends.	7A, 2B, 7AB
189. I am annoyed by people who try to get to know me better than I want.	11A, 1B, 4AB
190. I would prefer to live far enough away from my immediate family to allow me to visit them at my convenience.	6A, 2B, 1C, 6AB, 1A11
191. I would not be upset by a lack of privacy in my yard.	10A, 2B, 1AB, 3None
192. I dislike being completely alone.	7A, 6B, 1AB, 1?
193. I wouldn't be at all upset if someone read my personal correspondence without my permission.	14A, 1B, 1AB
194. I prefer to control the amount of social contact I have with others.	11A, 2B, 2AB, 1BC
195. When I think of the ways the government is invading our privacy nowadays, I get angry.	13A, 3None
196. I prefer to live in a place where meaningful relationships can develop between the residents.	5B, 4AB, 1AC, 4BC, 2A11
197. I feel I have the right to control how much other people know about my private life.	14A, 2AB
198. I would be willing to sacrifice part of my individuality in order to be a part of a meaningful group.	8B, 8AB
199. I would like to be open and honest with people so they will really know what kind of person I am.	9A, 2B, 4AB, 1None
200. I would like to have a restaurant within walking distance of my home.	16C
201. I want my friends to know the way I act in many different situations.	3A, 8B, 4AB, 1None
202. I want to be able to be alone when I want to be.	14A, 2AB
203. I do not like to share risks and hardships with others outside my immediate family.	4A, 9B, 2AB, 1None

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
204. I would never tell anyone about the things in my past of which I am most ashamed.	11A, 2B, 2AB, 1None
205. I probably would not go house to house to distribute a weekly neighborhood news bulletin.	4A, 1B, 1C, 1AB, 1AC, 1BC, 5None, 1?
206. I want the people on my residential block to know me, and watch out for me as a member of the block.	1A, 5B, 1C, 1AC, 5BC, 1?
207. A good relationship with my family is very important to me.	1A, 13B, 2AB
208. I would like to have most of my friends within my immediate neighborhood.	6C, 1AB, 2AC, 6BC, 1A11
209. When I have a very important decision to make I prefer to make it alone.	10A, 1B, 3AB, 2None
210. I would like to live in a large city because people there would probably be less concerned about my private life.	6A, 1C, 4AB, 3AC, 1BC, 1A11
211. I would like to share meaningful risks and hardships with others outside of my immediate family.	3A, 10B, 3AB
212. I would like to be able to quickly get a group of friends together for social activities.	5A, 3B, 2C, 3AB, 3BC
213. I wouldn't want to spend most of my leisure time in my neighborhood area.	13C, 2AC, 1A11
214. It is important that my closest friend know the "real me".	4A, 9B, 3AB
215. In my opinion we would be a lot better off if we never have to do anything to help each other.	4A, 5B, 5AB, 1AC, 1None
216. I do not mind people probing into even my most personal and private matters.	15A, 1B
217. I would like to have a place where I could regularly meet my friends.	3A, 2B, 2C, 1AB, 2AC, 3BC, 3None
218. It would not bother me if people knew about my problems.	12A, 3B, 1AB
219. I believe that Robert Frost's statement "Good fences make good neighbors" contains a great deal of truth.	10A, 2B, 1AC, 1BC, 1A11, 1None
220. I have no secrets.	9A, 2B, 3None, 2?

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
221. It usually annoys me to have people come to my house without letting me know they are coming.	12A, 2B, 1AB, 1?
222. It isn't important for me to be around people who accept me as I am.	5A, 9B, 1AB, 1None
223. I would enjoy going out of my way to make a new neighbor feel at home.	6A, 4B, 1C, 2BC, 1A11, 2None
224. It doesn't annoy me to have people come to my home without letting me know when they are coming.	10A, 2B, 2AB, 2?
225. I don't like lending things to friends.	8A, 3B, 2AB, 3None
226. I would like to recognize most of the people who live in my residential area.	3A, 4B, 2C, 3AC, 2BC, 1A11, 1None
227. I would like to have regular places close by where I can go and people will know me.	1B, 7C, 4AC, 2BC 2A11
228. I would enjoy frequent trips away from my immediate neighborhood.	15C, 1AC
229. I want my life to contain many cooperative group endeavors.	3A, 10B, 1AB, 2None
230. I wouldn't want my job to be within walking distance of my home.	15C, 1AC
231. I prefer to control how much other people know about my private life.	14A, 2AB
232. Besides just knowing me, I would definitely want my close friends to know each other.	1A, 8B, 7AB
233. I often want to get away from everyone for a while, even my close friends.	9A, 1B, 5AB, 1A11
234. I find that I can't trust the friendship of anyone who hasn't seen the worst of me.	5A, 6B, 2AB, 1None, 2?
235. I am happiest when I am a secure member of a small close-knit group.	15B, 1AB
236. I would like to live near a high school or university where I could walk to evening classes.	16C
237. I prefer to spend most of my leisure time in my neighborhood area.	16C

<u>Item</u>	<u>Sorting Results</u>
238. I need to know that my confidences will be kept secret.	12A, 3B, 1AB
239. I am upset if other members of my family open my bedroom door and enter without first asking my permission.	14A, 1AB, 1None

Appendix 5

Instructions for the Preliminary Desired PCA Inventory

This questionnaire contains a series of statements regarding the way you behave and act. Read each one, decide how you feel about it, and then place a check in the appropriate box. Where you place your check will indicate how much you agree or disagree with a statement. For example, a statement might read:

I enjoy going to the movies.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly	
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree	

The example check would indicate that you Moderately Agree with this statement. Please place your check on the basis of how you feel about each statement. Some statements may not apply to your present situation. Answer on the basis of how you think you would react or feel if you were in that situation. There are no right or wrong answers. This is simply a questionnaire regarding your preferences for certain activities and behaviors. Work quickly and don't take too much time on any one statement; the whole questionnaire should take only a few minutes.

Before beginning, please provide the following information:

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Age: ☐ 15-21

☐ 22-30

☐ 31-50

☐ 51-75

Type of residence: ☐ Detached house
☐ Semi-detached house
☐ Apartment
☐ Highrise Condominium
☐ Other (Specify)

Appendix 6

Preliminary Desired PCA Scale Items From
Which the Final Items For the Brief Desired
PCA Scale Were Chosen.

1. I would like to have a private retreat which no one could enter without asking me.
2. I like to form sincere friendships with others.
3. I would like to live in an area where there are facilities available close by, such as public barbecues, pools, parks, and playgrounds.
4. I would discuss my private thoughts and feelings with most anyone.
5. I rarely want to participate in social activities with others.
6. I want my job to be within walking distance of my home.
7. I don't mind others meddling in my affairs.
8. Even if my neighborhood could contain most of my activities, I would leave it often.
9. I would get depressed if I did not see my close friends often.
10. I don't care if I can't be alone when I wish.
11. I like to gossip at times.
12. When I go on vacations, I prefer to go to a secluded place.
13. I don't need a corner store near my place of residence.
14. I would like to have a close group of friends with whom I do things regularly.
15. A concern for privacy would not be a consideration in my choosing a place to live.
16. It is not important to me that the members of my family really know each other well.
17. I prefer to live near a playground to which my children can walk.

18. I would enjoy frequently traveling across the city to buy something I need.
19. I don't want my friends to know me too well.
20. When working with friends, I wouldn't do more than my share of a task.
21. I often worry about the loss of my individual privacy.
22. I prefer to have a few close friends who all know each other well.
23. It wouldn't upset me if I could not easily walk from my home to a high school.
24. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
25. I often enjoy not talking with anyone for a day or so.
26. It is important to me to remember my loyalties to my friends.
27. The availability of daycare centres and nurseries within walking distance of my home would be an important consideration in choosing a place of residence.
28. I want to have control over when I see other people.
29. I would like being a member of a family that does things together often.
30. Unsolicited telephone calls attempting to sell me something are an invasion of my privacy.
31. I don't care whether I live within easy walking distance of a shopping area.
32. I dislike performing unpleasant duties sometimes required by my family.
33. If I could perform most of my activities within my neighborhood, I would rarely leave it.
34. I dislike being apart from other people for a long time.
35. I don't need to have a close-knit group of friends in order to be happy.
36. I feel that today the individual's right to privacy is over-emphasized.

37. I need to be around people who accept me as I am.
38. I would want to have adequate leisure facilities close to my home.
39. To insure privacy, I would want to live in a house with a high hedge or wood fence around my backyard.
40. I prefer to know a few individuals well rather than many individuals casually.
41. It's O.K. if my confidences to others are not kept secret.
42. It is important that I have a grocery store near my place of residence.
43. I would dislike having a patio or balcony into which passersby could see.
44. I would like to be a member of a close-knit group.
45. I would like to live within easy walking distance of a shopping area.
46. I would prefer to live where there is a movie-house close by.
47. I don't mind people knowing alot about my activities.
48. I don't need to see my close friends everyday.
49. It upsets me when I have to travel across the city to buy something rather than just walking to a stroe close by.
50. It isn't necessary that my place of residence have a neighborhood meeting place close by.
51. If forced to choose, I would rather have just one close friend than many casual acquaintances.
52. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
53. I would disclose my yearly income to anyone who wanted to know.
54. I would prefer meaningful friendships that last a lifetime.
55. I dislike having to drive, frequently to obtain the things I need.
56. I rarely enjoy the companionship found through a social group.

57. Acquaintances often ask questions that I consider rude and personal.
58. I prefer to leave my curtains closed as I don't like anyone seeing inside my home.
59. It wouldn't bother me if I didn't get to visit my friends often.
60. I would be very upset if someone read my personal correspondence without my permission.
61. I would enjoy frequent trips away from my neighborhood area.
62. I would not be fulfilling my human potential unless I were involved deeply in some group.
63. I want to be able to be alone when I wish.
64. I get upset when people pry into matters that I consider personal and private.
65. I like to have someone to whom I can tell everything about myself, even my deepest and most personal thoughts and feelings.
66. When I think of the ways the government is invading my privacy nowadays, I get angry.
67. I would like to be a member of a group where everyone felt good being together.
68. I would like to have a restaurant within walking distance of my home.
69. I am annoyed by people who try to get to know me better than I wish.
70. If forced to choose, I would rather have many casual acquaintances, than just one close friend.
71. I can grow and develop without identifying myself with others.
72. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
73. For me, sincere kindness among persons gives significance to life.
74. It's not crucial that I control the amount of social contact I have with others.

75. I wouldn't mind if someone read my personal correspondence without my permission.
76. I enjoy helping others when I can.
77. Privacy in my backyard is not an important concern to me.
78. I wouldn't want to be closely identified with a group of friends.
79. I would prefer to be a member of a small, integrated work team.
80. Maintaining a good relationship with my family is important to me.
81. I want to control how much other people know about my private life.
82. It would annoy me if people came to my house without letting me know they were coming.
83. I prefer to spend most of my leisure time outside my neighborhood.
84. I don't mind people probing into even my most personal and private matters.
85. I am upset if members of my family open my bedroom door and enter without first asking my permission.
86. I would like to be a member of a group in which members often go out of their way to help another member.
87. It infuriates me to think that neighborhoods are rarely designed to include most of the residents' activities.
88. Control over how much others know about my private life is unimportant to me.
89. I would like to be able to survive just by myself without relying on anyone else.
90. I want to know that my confidences will be kept secret.
91. I would like to share risks and hardships with others outside of my immediate family.
92. I am happiest when I am a member of a small, intimate group.
93. I want most of my friends to live within my immediate neighborhood.

94. I like having people drop by my home without calling me beforehand.
95. I like to engage in cooperative endeavors with others.

3 3

OF/DE

Appendix 7.

Final Desired PCA Inventory

This questionnaire contains a series of statements regarding the way you behave and act. Read each one, decide how you feel about it, and then place the number that most closely reflects your agreement or disagreement in the space preceding the statement. The number you place will indicate how much you agree or disagree with a statement. For example, a statement might read:

5 I enjoy going to the movies.

/	1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/
	Strongly		Moderately		Slightly		Slightly		Moderately		Strongly	
	Disagree		Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Agree		Agree	

A 5 would indicate that you Moderately Agree with this statement. Please place your number on the basis of how you feel about each statement. Some statements may not apply to your present situation. Answer on the basis of how you think you would react or feel if you were in that situation. There are no right or wrong answers. This is simply a questionnaire regarding your preferences for certain activities and behaviors. Work quickly and don't take too much time on any one statement; the whole questionnaire should take only a few minutes.

Before beginning, please provide the following information:

Sex: Male Female

Age: 17-21

 22-30

 31-50

 51-80

Type of residence: Detached house

 Semi-detached house

 Apartment/ Condominium

 Other (Specify)

/	1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/
Strongly		Moderately		Slightly		Slightly		Moderately		Strongly		
Disagree		Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Agree		Agree		

- _____ 1. I prefer a neighbor who minds his own business.
- _____ 2. It is important that a grocery store be near my residence.
- _____ 3. I would rather work alone than as a member of a small work team.
- _____ 4. When I go on vacations, I prefer to go to a secluded spot.
- _____ 5. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
- _____ 6. I need to be around people who accept me as I am.
- _____ 7. To ensure privacy, I would want to live with a high hedge or wooden fence around my backyard.
- _____ 8. I would enjoy frequent trips away from my neighborhood.
- _____ 9. I don't need to see my close friends everyday.
- _____ 10. I try to avoid becoming involved deeply with others.
- _____ 11. I would like to have a restaurant within walking distance of my home.
- _____ 12. I would disclose my yearly income to anyone who wanted to know.
- _____ 13. I would like to have a private retreat which no one could enter without asking me.
- _____ 14. I would like to have a close group of friends with whom I do things regularly.
- _____ 15. I don't care whether I live within walking distance of a shopping area.
- _____ 16. I want my friends to understand the "real me."
- _____ 17. I like to gossip at times.
- _____ 18. I like having people drop by my home without calling me beforehand.
- _____ 19. I would like being a member of a family that does things together often.
- _____ 20. I want my job to be within walking distance of my home.
- _____ 21. I don't mind people knowing a lot about my activities.

/	1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/
	Strongly		Moderately		Slightly		Slightly		Moderately		Strongly	
	Disagree		Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Agree		Agree	

- _____ 22. I prefer to shop at stores where I am known by the personnel.
- _____ 23. I would like to be a member of a close-knit group.
- _____ 24. I want most of my friends to live outside my neighborhood.
- _____ 25. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
- _____ 26. I want to have control over when I see other people.
- _____ 27. I would prefer to live where there is a movie-house near by.
- _____ 28. I need places where I can go everyday and be sure of seeing familiar faces.
- _____ 29. I don't care if I can't be alone when I wish.
- _____ 30. If I could do everything I wanted within my neighborhood, I would rarely leave it.
- _____ 31. I like to engage in cooperative endeavors with others.
- _____ 32. I dislike having to take the car to obtain the things I need.
- _____ 33. I think that too much emphasis is given to the individual's right to privacy.
- _____ 34. I like to have small parties with just my close friends attending.
- _____ 35. I can be the person I want to be without being a member of a group.
- _____ 36. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
- _____ 37. I could go a long time without socializing with other people.
- _____ 38. I prefer to spend most of my leisure time outside my neighborhood.
- _____ 39. I am annoyed by people who try to get to know me better than I wish.
- _____ 40. I am not very interested in what goes on in my neighborhood.
- _____ 41. I would like to have a few close friends who all know each other well.

Appendix 8

Final Achieved PCA Inventory

This questionnaire contains a series of statements concerning various activities in our lives. Read each one, decide whether it is true for you or not, and then place the number that most closely reflects your decision in the space preceding the statement. The number you place will indicate the degree to which you believe the statement to be true in terms of your life at the moment. For example, a statement might read:

4 I go to the movies once a week.

/	1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/
	Very		Moderately		Slightly		Slightly		Moderately		Very	
	Inaccurate		Inaccurate		Inaccurate		Accurate		Accurate		Accurate	

A 4 would indicate that you believe this statement to be Slightly Accurate in describing your activities; perhaps you go to the movies once every two weeks on the average. Some statements may not apply to your present situation. For those statements you may enter a "0" in the space preceding the statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Work quickly and don't take too much time on any one statement; the whole questionnaire should take only a few minutes.

PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE AND BEGIN

/	1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/
	Very		Moderately		Slightly		Slightly		Moderately		Very	
	Inaccurate.		Inaccurate		Inaccurate		Accurate		Accurate		Accurate	

- _____ 1. A grocery store is located near my residence.
- _____ 2. Most people know a lot about my activities.
- _____ 3. I have a close group of friends with whom I do things regularly.
- _____ 4. My job is within walking distance of my home.
- _____ 5. I disclose my yearly income to anyone who asks.
- _____ 6. On my job I work alone.
- _____ 7. During my recent vacations I have been to secluded spots.
- _____ 8. The people around me accept me as I am.
- _____ 9. There is a high fence or hedge around my backyard.
- _____ 10. I take frequent trips away from my neighborhood.
- _____ 11. I don't see my close friends everyday.
- _____ 12. A restaurant is within walking distance of my home.
- _____ 13. I have a private retreat which no one can enter without asking me.
- _____ 14. I don't live within walking distance of a shopping area.
- _____ 15. People often drop by my home without calling beforehand.
- _____ 16. My family and I do things together often.
- _____ 17. I am a member of a close-knit group.
- _____ 18. Most of my friends live outside my neighborhood.
- _____ 19. I have control over when I see other people.
- _____ 20. A movie-house is near my place of residence.
- _____ 21. I am often intruded upon when I want to be alone.
- _____ 22. I perform most of my activities within my neighborhood.

/	1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/	6	/
	Very		Moderately		Slightly		Slightly		Moderately		Very	
	Inaccurate		Inaccurate		Inaccurate		Accurate		Accurate		Accurate	

- _____ 23. I am presently joining in cooperative endeavors with others.
- _____ 24. I rarely take the car to obtain the things I need. .
- _____ 25. My friends overemphasize their right to privacy.
- _____ 26. I do not belong to any groups or organizations.
- _____ 27. I have not socialized with others for a long time.
- _____ 28. I spend most of my leisure time outside my neighborhood.
- _____ 29. Many people try to get to know me better than I wish.
- _____ 30. My close friends all know each other well.

Appendix 9

Cantril Ladder Instructions

Now I would like to ask you some questions about your life in general.

- A. All of us want certain things out of life. When you think about what really matters in your life, what are your wishes and hopes for the future? In other words, if you imagine your future in the best possible light, what would your life look like then, if you are to be happy? Take your time in thinking about this. Now, taking the other side of the picture, what are your fears and worries about the future? In other words, if you imagine your future in the worst possible light, what would your life look like then. Again, take your time in thinking about this. Probe: Have you had time to think about these two questions? Fine. Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say the top of the ladder (pointing) represents the best possible life for you and the bottom (pointing) represents the worst possible life for you. Where on the ladder (moving finger rapidly up and down ladder) do you feel you personally stand at the present time? (Enter step number on respondent's questionnaire).
- B. Where on the ladder would you say you stood five years ago?
- C. And where do you think you will be on the ladder five years from now?

Glebe Interview Schedule

Section I. Background Information

Name (optional) _____ Interview Number _____

Address _____ Telephone _____

1. Sex _____ 2. Age _____ 3. Occupation _____

4. Single _____ Married _____ Cohabiting _____ Other _____

5. Who lives with you in your House/apartment?

6. Renting _____ Own/Buying _____ Other _____

7. Type of dwelling _____

8. Average income per year over the last two years (approximately) _____

If married or cohabiting, partner's average income per year _____

***** NOW ADMINISTER THE PCA(1) AND ERI SCALES *****

Section II. Place of Residence

NOW, I HAVE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR HOUSE/APARTMENT.

9. How long have you lived in your present house/apartment? _____

10. How long do you plan to stay in this house/apartment? _____

_____ months

_____ years

_____ indefinitely

_____ don't know

11. Reasons for staying? Reasons for moving?

12. Would you say that as a place to live for you (and your family), this house/apartment is

_____ very good

_____ fairly good

_____ neither good nor bad

_____ not very good

_____ not at all good

13. How important do you feel it is to lock your doors when you are going out of the house for just an hour or two?

_____ important

_____ somewhat important

_____ not important

NOW, SOME GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD.

14. How long have you lived in Ottawa? _____

15. When you were growing up did you live in a:

Large City _____

Suburb _____

Small City _____

Small Town _____

Country _____

Other _____

16. Does the neighborhood in which you now live have a particular name? _____

17. How long have you lived in the Glebe? _____

18. How long do you plan to stay in the Glebe?

_____ months

_____ years

_____ indefinitely

_____ don't know

19. Reasons for staying? _____ Reasons for moving? _____

** Do you usually read the Glebe Report (the community newspaper)? Yes _____ No _____ ?

20. Do you think of the Glebe as a small community in the city? Yes _____ No _____ ?

21. Does the Glebe claim greater loyalty than the city as a whole? Yes _____ No _____ ?

22. Does the Glebe have particular activities solely for the residents? Yes _____ No _____

23. What are the boundaries of the Glebe?

North _____

East _____

South _____

West _____

24. Please think of your neighborhood as you presently see it. How satisfied are you with: (USE SATISFACTION RESPONSE CARD)

_____ Your neighbors

_____ Location within city

_____ Convenience to shops

_____ Appearance

_____ Amount of privacy afforded

_____ Community spirit

_____ Other (Specify) _____

Section III. Personal and Social Activities.

25. About how many hours do you work on your job during the average week? _____
26. How do you typically travel to and from your job? _____
27. Do you have the regular use of a car? Yes _____ No _____ ? _____
28. How many times a month do you usually go out for entertainment? _____
29. How many times a month do you have friend/relatives over to spend an evening at your house/apartment? _____
30. How interested would you say you are in meeting new people and making new friends
 Very interested _____ Somewhat interested _____ Not Interested _____

31. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your friendships + with the time you can spend with your friends, the things you do together, the number of friends you have, as well as the particular people who are your friends - in other words, in general how satisfied are you with your friendships?

(USE SATISFACTION RESPONSE CARD) _____

32. Thinking about your spare time; overall, how satisfied are you with the ways you spend your spare time?

(USE SATISFACTION RESPONSE CARD) _____

33. When you want to be alone in your house/apartment, can you find a place to go?

(USE FREQUENCY RESPONSE CARD) _____

34. How often do you eat a meal alone?

(USE FREQUENCY RESPONSE CARD) _____

35. Do you ever feel lonely?

(USE FREQUENCY RESPONSE CARD) _____

36. Do you feel, all in all, that you have the amount of privacy you desire in your house/apartment?

(USE FREQUENCY RESPONSE CARD) _____

NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT SOME ACTIVITIES YOU MAY ENGAGE IN WITH YOUR NEIGHBORS

In general, how often do you: (USE FREQUENCY RESPONSE CARD)

- _____ chat with neighbors
- _____ exchange favors
- _____ exchange things (tools, recipes, etc.)
- _____ visit informally in each others house
- _____ ask your neighbors' advice
- _____ have picnics, parties with neighbors

NOW, I AM GOING TO READ A LIST OF SOME OF THE THINGS WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT. MOST OF THESE THINGS ARE IMPORTANT TO ALL OF US, BUT EACH PERSON FEELS THAT SOME OF THESE THINGS ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN OTHERS, AND WHAT ONE PERSON CONSIDERS IMPORTANT, SOMEONE ELSE MAY THINK IS UNIMPORTANT. PLEASE LOOK AT THE CARD IN FRONT OF YOU AND AS I READ EACH ITEM, GIVE ME THE NUMBER THAT MOST CLOSELY REPRESENTS YOUR FEELINGS.

(USE IMPORTANCE RESPONSE CARD)

- _____ House or apartment that you live in
- _____ A city or place where you like to live
- _____ A good country to live in: A country with a good government
- _____ An interesting job
- _____ Enough money in the bank so that you do not have to worry
- _____ Things you like to do when you are not working (hobbies, etc)
- _____ Organizations you want to belong to
- _____ A happy marriage
- _____ A good family life - enjoying being with your family members
- _____ Having good friends, and the right number of friends
- _____ Being in good health and in good physical condition
- _____ Having a strong religious faith

Section IV. Cantril Responses :

A.	_____	PRESENT
B.	_____	PAST
C.	_____	FUTURE

SOCIAL NETWORK MAPPING

☒ Residence

A Work

B School

C Place of worship (church, synagogue, etc.)

D Doctor (most frequently seen)

E Corner store (Mac's Milk, etc)

F Major Shopping (clothes, household good, etc): Most often frequented _____

G Supermarket (most often frequented)

H Movie

I Sports/Athletics

J Bank

K Community Center

L Gas station

M Bar/Pub

N Restaurant (frequented often)

O Barber shop/Beauty Parlor

P Organization

Meets in Glebe _____ Meets in City _____

Q

"

Meets in Glebe _____ Meets in City _____

R

"

Meets in Glebe _____ Meets in City _____

S

"

Meets in Glebe _____ Meets in City _____

T

"

Meets in Glebe _____ Meets in City _____

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

Relatives

Who does ___ know and how well?
(USE FRIENDSHIP RESPONSE CARD)

U Parents

V Grandparents

W Brothers

X Sisters

Y Uncles/Aunts

Z Other relatives seen frequently

Friends

1*

2*

3*

4*

5*

6*

7*

8*

9*

10*

NOW ADMINISTER THE PCA(2) SCALE: THEN ADMINISTER THE EPI SCALE

PLEASE PROBE THE RESPONDENT FOR ANY COMMENTS THEY MIGHT HAVE CONCERNING ANY SECTION OF THE INTERVIEW OR THE QUESTIONNAIRES. WRITE THE MAIN POINTS OF THEIR COMMENTS ON THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS PAGE.

Appendix 11

Response Scales Used in the Glebe Interview

A. Satisfaction:

1	2	3	4	5
Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied

B. Importance:

1	2	3	4	5
Very Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Very Important

C. Frequency:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

D. Friendship:

1	2	3	4
Met Once or Twice	Acquaintance	Friend	Very Close Friend

END

6 08 78

FIN