

Student Work

3-1-1971

The Influence of Specific Physical Features on Leisure Time Patterns

Mary Jane Moran
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Moran, Mary Jane, "The Influence of Specific Physical Features on Leisure Time Patterns" (1971). *Student Work*. 1670.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/1670>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

THE INFLUENCE OF SPECIFIC
PHYSICAL FEATURES ON
LEISURE-TIME PATTERNS

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of Sociology
and the
Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies
University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Mary Jane Moran

March 1971

UMI Number: EP73510

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73510

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The data on which this study was based were compiled during the fall of 1970. I wish to thank the individuals who helped in so many ways in reaching this point.

I am grateful to Dr. George Barger, Chairman of the Sociology Department at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. He not only read each chapter and offered helpful suggestions, but provided the challenge that kept me going to complete this study. Dr. John Nye, also of the Sociology Department, with his knowledge of methodology and research, was supportive in the development of the differing levels of hypotheses.

I wish also to thank Kay Kanger, whose moral support and skills in typing were invaluable each step of the way. Appreciation is also extended to the residents of Cornish Heights and Westborough Arms apartments who were willing to be interviewed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER	
I THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	2
HYPOTHESES.....	14
II METHODOLOGY.....	18
III PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS.....	21
IV INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	40
APPENDIX.....	43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I DISTRIBUTION OF APARTMENTS WITHIN EACH UNIT	19
II NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY COMPLEX IN PERCENTAGES.	22
III MARITAL STATUS BY COMPLEX IN PERCENTAGES.	23
IV -AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY CATEGORY BY COMPLEX IN PERCENTAGES.	24
V INCOME OF RESPONDENTS BY CATEGORY BY COMPLEX IN PERCENTAGES.. . . .	25
VI OCCUPATIONS OF RESPONDENTS IN PERCENTAGES	26
VII SOCIOMETRIC STATUS OF SAMPLES ON LEISURE-TIME PATTERNS. .	29
VIII SOCIOMETRIC CHOICE IN LEISURE-TIME PATTERNS	30
IX DISTRIBUTION OF NEIGHBORING PRACTICES' RESPONSES BY COMPLEX	31

CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

Modern societies have commonly been defined by their technological advancements. These advancements have been blamed for the vice as well as the virtues that are exhibited in society. Indeed these advancements have changed life styles, modes of interaction, and patterns of behavior. As a corollary to this development, leisure patterns have also changed; not only in time allotted, but in terms of financial resources available, behavior exhibited, and values defined. Individuals perceive leisure as part of the day's events rather than as "time left over."

Coincidental to this development, sociology has begun to study leisure patterns and leisure planned activities. It has been deemed a viable area for research. It has been viewed from the perspectives of small group theory and as a sub-specialty of urban sociology.

The focus of this study is leisure-time activities of individuals in small groups. It attempts to investigate the behavior patterns of naturally occurring small groups. Of primary interest will be environmental settings and group behavior; specifically, the influence of a particular type of leisure-time facility upon the behavior of the individuals who make use of it. This thesis will focus upon an apartment complex clubhouse and the interaction of the tenants of that complex.

Personal interest on the part of the writer was generated through a prior acquaintance with the population. As an individual who lives in an apartment complex, it seems apparent to the writer that there is little informal social interaction among the tenants; yet, tenants in other complexes seem to have strong social ties and interact often with their apartment neighbors. This difference appears to be associated with the presence or absence of a clubhouse in the facility. The questions of particular interest are: what influence does a clubhouse have in initiating or strengthening social ties of the tenants? Are informal social ties weakened (or non-existent) when there is not a clubhouse within the apartment complex?

SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Most of man's activities are inexorably bound up with group life. This is particularly true of leisure activities. Most major forms of recreation are carried on in groups or in informal association with other people. Although some leisure time is spent in individual activities with no immediate social contact with others, many of the means of spending leisure time when alone come from a group nexus. The Neumeiers refer to the form and spread of recreational activities as conditioned by the social situation. They state:

Society conditions most of the forms of recreation, supplies the materials used during leisure, and gives general direction to the interests that stimulate individuals in their choices. (1958:19).

Social stimulation and cultural influence represent basic elements in leisure behavior in that they tend to condition the forms of leisure pursuits.

Research by Dubin (1956) in an urban industrial setting indicated that the workplace is not "the breeding ground of preferred informal human relationships." Informal groups and relationships are built in settings other than work situations. In his study, only 9 per cent of the workers reported that the workplace provided their preferred associations. Since leisure has commonly been defined as time away from work, this finding has implications for the present study. If leisure-time activities are the preferred situation for the establishment of informal relationships, what are the influential factors which bring these groups together?

Most of the studies which have been done in this area detail the types of activities individuals and groups participate in. Lundberg (1969) has posited a hypothetical question, asking that if two or more hours were added to each day, what would the respondent do with the time? Yet other studies, such as Ennis (1958), emphasize the social problems that arise with the increased amount of available leisure time.

While there are no studies that attempt to determine the factors that influence leisure-time activities, several propositions from related areas may shed light on the topic. In their study of the formation of small groups, Festinger et al. (1950) sought to discover the variety of factors which governed the selection process of group membership. In this study of Westgate and Westgate West, a student housing project at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the "most striking item was the dependence of friendship formation on the mere physical arrangement of the houses" (p. 10). By means of sociometric

techniques, Festinger et al. determined that friendship groups and the formation of such groups were dependent upon ecological factors. Cliques in Westgate centered around the courts, and in Westgate West particular paths to the staircase and the doorways one had to pass influenced the formation of friendship groups. After diagramming where the friendship groups were located, Festinger et al. sought to discover how this influenced the attitudes and behavior of the individuals who made up the groups. They found that the extent of spatial propinquity affects the formation of social relations, the type of social control, and the degree of involvement of members with the group.

This study has particular relevance to the present study in several ways. For example, we can postulate that individuals in our sample who are spatially close to each other in an apartment complex will also be socially close and interact with each other. The second point to be investigated as an outgrowth of the work of Festinger et al. is that of the influence on the leisure-time activities and behavior of the groups. In the Festinger et al. study, the population was a homogeneous group; they were all students attending M.I.T., and thus they could see each other at school. In the present study, the population does not all work or spend time together on an occupational basis. Thus, the majority of their interaction must be conducted during their leisure time.

Another point that was pointed out by Festinger et al. was that interaction and activity centered around the court. Physical features of the building determined the formation of friendship groups. Implications for the present study are that it is possible that the

relationships among apartment tenants are developed, strengthened, or supported by the physical layout of the complex. An apartment clubhouse could serve as the center of activities (similar to the courts and stairways in Westgate) where tenants develop relationships with other tenants.

Thus, the focal point of this study will be the influence of the clubhouse upon leisure-time activities and upon the formation of friendship groups. This is particularly interesting at this point in time in that there is an increasing demand by workers for more leisure time; the current tight controls on homeownership resulting in the turn towards apartment dwelling; and the physical attractions offered by many of the recently constructed apartments. As builders are attempting to supply the demand for living quarters and compete for tenants, vast sums of money are being utilized to attract potential customers. This may account for the added attractions of a clubhouse and/or swimming pool. This study has a potential practical application in determining the desirability of providing these "extra attractions" to apartment living.

As the primary focus of this investigation is an attempt to determine the influence of physical features on interaction, several clarifications and concepts must be set forth. Festinger et al. (1950) discussed the formation of "informal groups" in a student housing project. The present study will also discuss the interaction within "groups." What then is an "informal group?" Festinger et al. (1950: 160-161) define an informal social group as a more or less cohesive pattern of friendship relations among a number of people.

Included among the studies that relate physical features to group interaction is Whyte's (1956) research in Park Forest, Illinois. Whyte traced the emergence of several micro-communities that developed their own social characteristics. These characteristics were based on the physical placement of homes by the designers of the housing development and on the patterns of relations established by the first residents. Also considered were the effects of the highly patterned and intense social life of the small communities on civic participation and the individual's personal autonomy and group loyalty.

The study of ecology reveals the critical influence of environment upon the course of life. The first and perhaps most influential factor regulating acquaintance patterns appears to be a simple matter of space. Whether interactions are studied at the level of the nation, the neighborhood, or the campus, it is apparent that physical location exerts a powerful influence over the people who meet, or do not meet, those who become friends, those who marry and do not marry.

The clearest support for the propinquity hypothesis comes from intensive studies of housing developments and university communities. In two housing projects for married students at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Festinger, Schachter and Back (1950) found overwhelming support for the influence of physical location upon communication. The span of acquaintance and extent of social interaction were clearly related to the placement and proximity of dwelling units. In the case of apartment buildings, friendship patterns were also influenced by the location of stairways and hallways. Caplow and Forman, (1950)

investigating the social structure of a housing area at the University of Minnesota, obtained almost identical data. Distinctions between "not knowing a name," "stopping and talking," and "mutual visiting and entertaining" were associated directly with the location of family units, but inconclusively related to such factors as age, sex, or family activities.

Merton (1948), in plotting the interaction patterns of Croftown, found the largest proportion of friendships consistently occurring among persons occupying the same apartment building, the next largest among those in adjacent buildings, and the smallest number among the distantly housed. A seeming discrepancy in his findings led to the discovery of the effect of even more subtle architectural features. While most residents reported about 18 per cent of the friendships to be with persons living across the street, one area reported no more than 4 per cent. When the contradiction was studied, "so slight a detail" as the placement of doorways was found to account for the discrepancy. Of the 82 cases of friendships among those in housing units on opposite sides of the street, Merton found that 74 per cent involved area in which both persons lived in street-oriented buildings (those facing each other), 22 per cent involved cases in which only one lived in a street-oriented building, and 4 per cent involved pairs in which neither lived in a street-oriented building. On the basis of his data, Merton repeats Winston Churchill's remark that "we shape our buildings and afterwards our buildings shape us."

The same relationship between physical features and interaction appears to hold inside the factory, the office, and the school. The placement of corridors and doorways has considerable interpersonal significance. Barracks with open and closed cubicles have been found by Blake et al. (1956) to affect the friendship patterns of military personnel, and in this way to influence individual morale and group cohesiveness. The seating plans of classrooms, according to Byrne (1961) and Maisonneuve et al. (1952) exert a powerful initial effect upon acquaintanceships in colleges and preparatory schools. Data obtained by Gullahorn (1952) from interviews and observations in an office indicate that the placement of desks and filing cabinets can control the flow of communication and interaction. The arrangement of chairs at a conference table has been found to facilitate or reduce interaction among participants.

Within the limits imposed by natural or architectural features, further spatial subdivisions have been suggested. The concept of "territory" is one of these. Scientific studies of animal life show that various species tend to mark off eating, mating, and nesting areas and to defend them against invasion. Human beings seem similarly inclined to identify with particular locations and to become defensive if others intrude on them. Thrasher (1927) and Whyte (1943) refer to the allegiance of adolescent gangs to their home territories. Similar proprietary attitudes are shown in the feeling of policemen for their beats, nurses for their wards, professors for their offices, and housewives for their kitchens. When territorial boundaries are

threatened or violated during interaction, communicative orientations are likely to change.

The term "region" has been used by Goffman (1963) to designate the interactional area bounded by "barriers to perception." In some cases these barriers are physical. Whyte (1949) comments on the improved morale resulting from placing protective counters between waitresses and cooks; thereby reducing status-damaging communication between them. In Park Forest, Whyte (1956:347) noted that low fences between houses "are as socially impervious as a giant brick wall." Zones of social activity may also be indicated in less substantial ways through the placement of screens or draperies that do not preclude verbal contact but reduce the ease of communication. Even in the absence of physical obstructions, psychic inattention may provide privacy. The butler who does not listen to the conversation of guests, the pedestrian who avoids staring at an embracing couple, or the person who becomes preoccupied with a magazine during another's private telephone conversation all show some awareness of communicative property rights.

Every individual, with guidelines from his culture, also develops a sense of "personal space," that is the distance at which he prefers to interact with others. Although this bears a superficial resemblance to the idea of territory, Sommer (1959) distinguishes them in this way: "The most important difference is that personal space is carried around while territory is relatively stationary. The animal or man will usually mark the boundaries of his territory so that they are visible to others,

but the boundaries of personal space are invisible. Personal space has the body at its center, while territory does not." The radius of this space varies from person to person and from occasion to occasion. Wide discrepancies have been found in the distance preferences of mental patients and normal individuals, and among representatives of various nationalities. Hall (1959:160) has described the dilemma of individuals of different cultures who want to converse but who cannot agree on the proper distance for their conversation. Marked differences in spatial styles may cause the same message uttered from various distances to be assigned different meanings and motives.

The feature of personal space most thoroughly tested relates to regularities in seating patterns. In the study of a geriatrics ward, Sommer and Ross (1958) noted that attractive renovation brought physical improvements but introduced psychological disadvantages. Furniture placed along walls for the convenience of nurses and janitors made strangers out of patients. "Therapeutic" regrouping of chairs around small tables and the introduction of other inducements to interaction increased the number of both brief and sustained conversations among patients. Even for psychotic patients, Smith et al. (1965) found that environment could be structured physically and socially to promote greater interaction and thus contribute to rehabilitation.

In what was to become the first of a series of studies on the geography of seating, Steinzor (1950) noted that persons located opposite each other in a discussion consistently interact more often than those seated beside each other. He concluded that the communicative

potential of participants and the stimulus value of their messages was a function of visibility, which decreased when they were seated side by side.

From observations made in a hospital dining room, Sommer (1959) noted that persons sitting across the corners of rectangular tables interacted more frequently than those sitting beside or opposite one another. When given the option of choosing a seat for discussion with a decoy person, the end-corner pattern was preferred 80 per cent of the time.

Slight re-arrangements of furniture, according to White (1953), may produce significant changes in personal interaction. Noting that cardiac patients, upon entering the consultation room, sat down either "at ease" or "ill at ease," he decided to test whether or not the desk between doctor and patient was a barrier to interaction. Removing the desk on alternate days showed that when it did not intervene, 55 per cent of his patients seemed at ease in contrast to approximately 11 per cent when the desk was present. All the "obstacles" to communication are not semantic, some are simply physical.

The powerful, almost mechanical effect of propinquity on interaction patterns is consistently documented. A variety of opinions support the notion that environmental settings, whether natural or man-made, affect the character of interaction. However, as Sommer states (1959:251) "as long as man must live in a world of walls, furniture, doors and fences, there is good reason to study how they influence his behavior." Evidence has suggested that interpersonal engagements are marked off physically by participants, and within these boundaries, physical features may predict the flow of interaction.

An area of research not integrally a part of interaction and yet related is the concept of social isolation. "Social isolation" is the second major concept to be considered in the present review of the literature. Thus far, this review has been concerned with the influence of physical features on interaction. The remaining portion of this review will consider the influence of isolation, or the lack of outside variables, upon interaction.

Much of the research that has been done in the area of social isolation has been conducted in a natural setting. Recent technological developments, particularly in the military, have focused on the problems of adaptation to a restricted and unusual environment. These developments are the coming of the space craft, nuclear submarines, and isolated radar and missile stations. These environments provide the setting where small groups are forced to operate in isolation for extended periods of time.

The research that follows deals with a form of isolation in which the chief restriction imposed is that of limited or no social contact with people other than those making up the unit being investigated. Even in situations where a small group of people are confined together, the social stimulation provided by the others in the group may offer little variation because of the length of confinement.

Ormiston (1958) conducted a study of individual social isolation, confining ten Air Force officer volunteers in an aircraft cockpit capsule for forty-eight hours. The subjects were required to work intermittently on a variety of tasks. A group of ten control subjects

were confined in a capsule only while performing the tasks. Observation of the subjects confined for the full duration revealed a tendency to become increasingly irritable and to exhibit undesirable behavior normally kept under control.

Walters, Callagan, and Newman (1963) investigated the effects of a ninety-six hour period of social isolation using twenty volunteer long-term prisoners as subjects. Another group of twenty volunteers served as a control group. Each of the subjects was given a number of tests before and after isolation.

The results indicated that significantly more confined persons reported an increase in anxiety during the isolation period.

Another study reported by Gunderson and Nelson (1963) discussed the development of a set of attitude measures dealing with individual reactions to and satisfaction with antarctic life. It also served to measure the group's affective and work relationships. These measures revealed a general decline in work satisfaction, social relationships and group accomplishments as a function of prolonged isolation.

Mullin (1960) reported a study based on interviews of some eighty-five scientific and naval personnel conducted at American Antarctic stations. The interviewing was conducted at the end of the winter at several small isolated stations. It appears that the physical danger, hardships, and extreme cold did not represent important stresses. The major stresses appeared to center around individual adjustment to the group and the "sameness" of the environment.

The previous discussion on confinement provides some data on the effect of social isolation. Unfortunately, social deprivation has not been the subject of as much systematic research as has sensory and perceptual deprivation. An overview of the work that has been done results in the supported conclusions that there is a decline in the frequency and quality of social relationships, behavioral changes take place and satisfaction in work declines as a function of isolation.

Social isolation and propinquity were discussed as means of restricting interaction. The tendency of physical features to structure and channel interaction to particular participants was also discussed. It is within this latter framework, the influence of physical features on interaction, that the following hypotheses were developed.

HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses were formulated from the Festinger et al. (1950) theoretical framework and research conducted at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. They represent an attempt to predict a correlation between physical features and interaction. From the review of the literature it would appear that the general hypothesis has been successfully tested, yet it has not been tested to determine its relationship in terms of specific physical features relating to leisure time activities. The procedures used to operationalize the concepts and to test the hypotheses are in part a replication of those employed by Festinger et al. (1950) in their study of two student housing projects.

The general hypothesis from which the others are derived is: certain physical features contribute to sociality. This hypothesis will not be tested directly, but support for the hypotheses derived from it should, at least theoretically, support the general hypothesis.

"Physical features" will be defined for present purposes as the presence or absence of a clubhouse and/or swimming pool. It will serve as the independent variable. "Sociality," the dependent variable, will be determined by the amount of informal social contact occurring among tenants. From this general hypothesis, a specific hypothesis has been formulated. It is:

in an apartment complex where there is a clubhouse, the tenants will interact more frequently with other tenants than in an apartment complex where there is not a clubhouse.

An "apartment complex" will be defined as a series of independent structures designed as living units, yet all bearing the same commercial name. "Tenants" are those individuals who currently live in a designated apartment complex. Interaction will be measured by means of a socio-metric question adapted from the study by Festinger et al. (1950):
What three people do you see most of socially? Each respondent will also be asked where these individuals live, and where they met them.

Based on the proposition that certain physical features lead to increased interaction, two operational hypotheses have been developed.

Operational Hypothesis 1: In an apartment complex where there is a clubhouse, tenants will engage in leisure-time activity with other tenants within the complex more than will tenants in an apartment complex where there is not a clubhouse.

Leisure activity is the dependent variable, and it will be operationally defined here as who respondents do things with during that time they define as leisure. (Appendix, question 4 and 5). The amount of interaction occurring among tenants of each complex will be calculated on the basis of at least two of their three choices living within or outside the complex. A Chi-square test of significance will be made to determine whether a significant difference exists between the samples as to who a tenant interacts with during leisure-time. In the event of the existence of such a relationship, the contingency coefficient will be utilized to measure the strength of the association.

Operational Hypothesis 2: In an apartment complex where there is a clubhouse, tenants will be more sociable with their neighbors than in an apartment complex where there is not a clubhouse.

This will be tested through the use of Bernard's Neighboring Practices Schedule.¹ This instrument measures the relative amount of neighboring by different kinds of people. The scale consists of a number of questions that can be answered either by "yes" or "no" or by simple phrases. Some questions refer directly to neighborhood practices, while others have to do with matters which are associated with leisure. "Sociable" is the dependent variable and is operationally defined in terms of those respondents who answer in a positive way to a majority of the questions concerning neighboring practices. A Chi-square test will be employed to determine if there is a relationship between the

¹Some of the questions and a description are published in Stuart A. Queen & Lester F. Thomas, The City, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939, pp. 308-10. The original is an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation by Jesse S. Bernard called "An Instrument for the Measurement of Neighborhood with Experimental Application."

variables.

In each of the operational hypotheses, the dependent variable (frequency of engaging in leisure-time activity and greater sociability) can be conceptually subsumed under the dependent variable in the specific hypothesis. As defined and measured, each is directly related and a part of the concept of interaction. On all three conceptual levels, the independent variable, the presence or absence of a certain physical feature (clubhouse) remains the same.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The population for this study was composed of the residents of two apartment complexes. The residence rules do not have any restrictive limitations in terms of marital status, age, or income. The population is characterized by a variety of ages and income levels; it consists of both college students and retired individuals and others. Thus, it could not be assumed that this was a homogeneous population, although it could be demonstrated that the residents within each complex have similarities.

There are eleven units in one complex with a total of 133 apartments. This complex has a swimming pool/clubhouse combination. The other complex has ten units with 120 apartments. It does not have a clubhouse or a swimming pool.

Cluster sampling was utilized, with a cluster being a single unit of each complex. In the complex with the clubhouse, the eleven units do not all have the same number of apartments. They range from ten apartments to sixteen. The resulting distribution can be found in Table I. The other complex has ten units with twelve apartments in each unit. The sample was randomly drawn from within each complex. Each apartment was given a number and a table of random numbers was used to select two apartments from each unit. Approximately, a 15 per cent sample

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF APARTMENTS WITHIN EACH UNIT

Number of Apartments	Frequency
10	1
11	5
12	3
16	2

was drawn from each complex. Forty-two persons were included in the original sample. One additional apartment from each unit was selected at the same time in order to provide substitution for subjects in the sample who could not be interviewed. Three attempts were made to contact respondents.

An orally administered interview schedule was utilized to gather data. It consisted of twenty closed-ended questions and thirteen informational items. The twenty questions were adopted from BERNARD'S NEIGHBORING PRACTICES SCHEDULE, as discussed in the previous chapter. Since it has been used in previous studies, the instrument was not pretested. In order to minimize contamination, interviews were completed in as short a time as possible. Each complex took from a week to ten days time to complete. The schedule was administered by the researcher, a graduate student in sociology. Respondents were told the study was concerned with their leisure-time practices; they were not notified ahead of time that they would be interviewed.

The original sample included 42 individuals. There were seven refusals but all were contacted. There were five substitutes added to the original sample; of these, all did respond. Total interviews completed were thirty-five, which represented fourteen per cent of the total population, and seventy-five per cent of the designed sample.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Data gathered in this study were tabulated by hand with the aid of an office calculator. The total response for each question and informational item can be found in the Appendix to this study.

In analyzing the data, it should be cautioned that the results cannot be generalized beyond the population under study. The social data gathered from the informational items indicate the specialized characteristics of individual respondents. The sample was heavily represented by certain age groups, income levels, and number of children, as will be noted below in detail. This is possibly an inherent factor characteristic of apartment-dwelling. As with any study, information is "lost" when responses are forced into categories. Some respondents showed evidence of being unsure as to what category they belonged in. When told that the topic of the study was concerned with leisure-time, many prefaced their responses with "I don't have any leisure-time," yet all the interview schedules were completed. In general, respondents were quite willing to be interviewed after they were satisfied that it would not be lengthy, although seven (15 per cent) of the original sample clearly did not want to be interviewed.

Social characteristics of the sample indicate that the original assumption that these were not homogeneous groupings was justified. Of

the seventeen respondents in the complex without a clubhouse/swimming pool (which hereafter will be referred to as CO), eleven (65 per cent) did not have any children and six (35 per cent) did have children. At the complex that does have a clubhouse/swimming pool (which hereafter will be referred to as WA), half (9) had children and half did not. In the CO complex, the six respondents that have children, four (67 per cent) have only one; of the nine interviewed at WA, four (44 per cent) have only one. Thus, at WA complex, not only do more respondents have children, but they have more children. The number of children by apartment complex is shown in Table II.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY COMPLEX IN
PERCENTAGES

Number of Children	CO Per Cent	WA Per Cent
0	65 (11)	50 (9)
1	23 (4)	22 (4)
2	6 (1)	11 (2)
3	6 (1)	11 (2)
4		6 (1)

A vast majority of the subjects were male in each sample. This is not generally true of most populations, nor is it true in the larger total population of the United States. Males represented 65 per cent of the CO sample and 61 per cent of the WA sample.

The marital status of the respondents was similar between the two samples; married individuals were more represented than unmarrieds in each sample. In the WA sample, thirteen (72 per cent) were married, three (17 per cent) were single, and two (11 per cent) were divorced. While in the CO sample married individuals did not hold that much of an edge, they represented 53 per cent (nine), five (29 per cent) were single, and three (18 per cent) divorced. This breakdown is illustrated in Table III.

TABLE III

MARITAL STATUS BY COMPLEX IN PERCENTAGES

Marital Status	CO Per Cent	WA Per Cent
Single	29 (5)	17 (3)
Married	53 (9)	72 (13)
Widowed		
Divorced	18 (3)	11 (2)

Possibly the two most significant factors of the social characteristics measured were age and income. Approximately 65 per cent of each sample falls within the twenty to twenty-nine age category. The significance is the fact that at CO the other 35 per cent ranged from thirty years of age to over sixty, while at WA the remaining individuals were all in their thirties. Table IV indicates this.

Vernon Davies (1962) has developed a method and sets of tables to determine whether the difference between two percentages is statistically significant at a given level. Using Davies method, the category of 30 to 39 years of age was tested to see if there was a significant difference between the samples. There were 21 percentage points between the two samples in this category, although it would have had to reach 22.7 percentage points difference for it to be significant at the 10 per cent level of significance with $P=23$. Since there was no one over 39 years of age at WA, the remaining categories could not be tested.

TABLE IV

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY CATEGORY
BY COMPLEX IN PERCENTAGES

Age	CO Per Cent	WA Per Cent
Under 20	0	0
20 - 29	65 (11)	67 (12)
30 - 39	12 (2)	33 (6)
40 - 49	17 (3)	
50 - 59	0	
60 - Over	6 (1)	

This difference could be of greater importance if individuals consider age and income groupings in choosing an apartment complex.

There were more respondents in higher income brackets at WA than at the CO complex. At WA, thirteen (72 per cent) made over \$7,000 annually while, at CO, nine (52 per cent) went over that figure. Eleven per cent of each sample composed the \$7,000 to \$9,000 bracket and, approximately, seventeen per cent of each sample made over \$15,000 a year. Thus, the difference lies below the \$7,000 boundary and between \$9,000 and \$15,000 figures. This is illustrated in Table V below.

Yet, when tested for a significant difference with $p=.63$, the necessary percentage point difference was not attained. Thirty-three points were needed between those below \$7,000 in each complex, and there were only nineteen points; those between \$9,000 and \$15,000 differed by twenty-one points. Thus, while there appears to be a great difference, the difference in percentage points was not statistically significant at the .05 level or at the .10 level of significance.

TABLE V

INCOME OF RESPONDENTS BY CATEGORY
BY COMPLEX IN PERCENTAGES

Income	CO Per Cent	WA Per Cent
Less than 5,000	6 (1)	0 (0)
5,001 / 7,000	41 (7)	28 (5)
7,001 / 9,000	12 (2)	11 (2)
9,001 /11,000	0 (0)	28 (5)
11,001 /13,000	18 (3)	5 (1)
13,001 /15,000	5 (1)	11 (2)
15,001 and over	18 (3)	17 (3)

Light might be shed on these facts when considering data gathered on occupational status. Occupations in which respondents were engaged ranged from that of student to that of attorney. The greatest portion in each sample was the "service workers" category; nearly half of each sample was doing some type of work that provides a service to the populus. Distribution of the respondents in the various occupational areas is given in Table VI.

TABLE VI
OCCUPATIONS OF RESPONDENTS
IN PERCENTAGES

Occupation	CO Per Cent	WA Per Cent
Professional	23 (4)	17 (3)
Proprietor	6 (1)	0 (0)
Service Worker	47 (8)	49 (9)
Laborer	6 (1)	6 (1)
Domestic	6 (1)	17 (3)
Student	6 (1)	11 (2)
Retired	6 (1)	0 (0)

This does not clearly illustrate the differential income levels. An in-depth look does reveal some interesting findings. Examples of two professional positions demonstrate the salary differences. There was one teacher and one nurse in each sample. Each was two income levels below at CO as opposed to WA.

The foregoing descriptive findings confirm the assumption that a population of apartment dwellers is not homogeneous. Because they have one factor in common (apartment dwelling), they may be anything from students, to attorneys, to retired; they also span the age and income levels.

Two sociometric questions designed to measure interaction in the form of leisure-time produced some interesting results. In each complex, the results of the two questions were identical. Responses to the question: "What three people do you see the most of socially (Appendix, Question 1)?" and "During your leisure-time, who do you usually do things with (Appendix, Question 4)?" were the same. Either the respondents see these as the same questions, or the individuals they do things with are the same that they see socially. This, then, equates the general hypothesis concerned with interaction and the first operational hypothesis discussing leisure-time. Thus, they will be treated as one.

They were:

General Hypothesis: In an apartment complex where there is a clubhouse, the tenants will interact more with other tenants than in an apartment complex where there is not a clubhouse.

Operational Hypothesis I: In an apartment complex where there is a clubhouse, tenants will engage in leisure-time activity with other tenants within the complex more than will tenants in an apartment complex where there is not a clubhouse.

At the complex without a clubhouse/swimming pool (CO), only two (12 per cent) indicated they do things with other tenants in the complex. At the complex having a clubhouse/swimming pool (WA), seven (39 per cent) responded in a positive way about doing things together in their leisure-time. These proportions support the hypothesis that in an apartment complex where there is a clubhouse/swimming pool, tenants will engage in leisure-time activity with other tenants within the clubhouse more than will tenants in an apartment complex where there is not a clubhouse.

There were other indications that the samples differed in regard to this question. A general question was asked: "About how many of the people who live in your neighborhood would you recognize by sight, if you saw them in a large crowd (Appendix, Question 6)?"

In CO, twelve (71 per cent) said "few" or "none," while at WA, only seven (38 per cent) indicated the same. Eleven (65 per cent) at CO responded that they never, or rarely, chat or "visit with" their neighbors (Appendix, Question 7); while at WA, only three (16 per cent) said they rarely did, no one said they never did so. Also, in a question concerned with going shopping together (Appendix, Question 11), everyone at CO (100 per cent) said that they had never gone with another tenant; while at WA, only half (9 respondents) indicated they did not. Although these are indicators, they do not test the hypothesis. A chi-square test of significance was run on the basis of at least two of their three choices living within their respective complex. To reject the null hypothesis that there was no difference between the samples, a chi-square value of 3.84 would be needed with $P=.05$. The

chi-square value attained was .36, as illustrated in Table VII.

TABLE VII

SOCIOMETRIC STATUS OF SAMPLES
ON LEISURE-TIME PATTERNS

	Two or More Choices	Less Than Two Choices	Total
CO (no clubhouse)	1	16	17
WA (clubhouse)	2	16	18
TOTALS	3	32	35

Chi-square = .36 (not significant)

Hence, the null hypothesis was not rejected. When the respondents were classified into categories of selecting at least one choice from within their complex, the chi-square value was higher, as Table VIII shows. With one degree of freedom, a chi-square value of 3.84 is required to reject the null hypothesis with $P=.05$.

TABLE VIII

SOCIOMETRIC CHOICE IN LEISURE-TIME PATTERNS

	One or More Choices	No Choices	Total
CO (no clubhouse)	2	15	17
WA (clubhouse)	7	11	18
TOTALS	9	26	35

Chi-square = 2.42 (not significant)

When chi-squares are computed for data where any expected frequency drops below five, the resulting value becomes inflated. Two cells of TableVII and one cell of TableVIII dropped below, even with this inflation; the chi-square value was not high enough to reject the null hypothesis. The hypothesis under consideration was not supported by statistical evidence. Having a clubhouse/swimming pool in a complex does not appear to influence who one spends his leisure-time with. Specific physical features do not significantly differ as Festinger et al. (1950) found physical features to influence and differ among MIT students.

To test the last hypothesis:

Operational Hypothesis II: In an apartment complex where there is a clubhouse, tenants will be more sociable with their neighbors than in an apartment complex where there is not a clubhouse.

Each complex was dichotomized into those who answered in a positive way to a majority of the questions, and those who answered in a negative way. For purposes of computation, response categories were collapsed. "None," "few," and "some," were seen as a negative response, while "many," "most," and "all" were positive. Also, in questions where "never" or "rarely" were given, this was counted as a negative response, and "sometimes" and "often" were positive responses. Only those questions pertaining to neighboring practices were considered. Questions 6 through 14 and Question 20 were used as indicators of neighboring

practices (Appendix). Table IX shows the distribution of the positive and negative responses by apartment complex.

TABLE IX
DISTRIBUTION OF NEIGHBORING PRACTICES
RESPONSES BY COMPLEX

	Positive	Negative	Total
CO (no clubhouse)	15	155	170
WA (clubhouse)	74	106	180
TOTALS	89	261	350

Chi-square = 47.3 (significant)

With one degree of freedom, a chi-square value of 3.84 is needed with $P=.05$, and 10.83 is needed with $P=.001$. Since chi-square illustrates a difference between the two distributions that did not occur from an error in the sample or from chance, it must be concluded that there is an association between the two variables. The contingency coefficient was utilized to measure the strength of the association. The primary advantage of this measure of association is that it may be computed for any data which can be categorized. The major disadvantage of the contingency coefficient is that it really has no precise interpretation; it is an index number that is always less than 1.00. The contingency coefficient, with the chi-square value of 47.3 and $N=350$, reached a value of .35. A correction factor was utilized to make a more systematic

appraisal of the strength of the association between the variables in relation to 1.00. The corrected C yielded a value of .50. This served to increase the numerical measure of the strength of the relationship between neighboring practices and certain physical features. The maximum value C may achieve with a 2 X 2 table is .71. Therefore, it may be concluded that there is a strong relationship between the two variables.

In concluding this chapter, a brief summary of the findings presented above, along with other data that was generated from the interview schedule, is called for. The general characteristics supported the assumption that these samples were not homogeneous, either within or between samples. On level of income, marital status, age, and number of children, there were clusters in a few categories, while the other sample had one cluster, and the remaining spread amongst the other categories.

The two hypothesis produced results requiring, in the first place, to retain the null hypothesis and, in the second, to strongly reject the null hypothesis. The first hypothesis stated:

"In an apartment complex where there is a clubhouse, tenants will engage in leisure-time activity with other tenants within the complex more frequently than will tenants in an apartment complex where there is not a clubhouse."

At least two of their three responses to the question: "During your leisure-time, who do you usually do things with?" had to be from within the complex before they were counted as "engaging in leisure-time activity

with other tenants." Chi square was .36 for the relationship between "choice" and "presence/absence" of a clubhouse/swimming pool. When the dichotomy was lowered to one out of three choices, the chi-square value was still only 2.42. Neither gave indication of a significant difference at the .05 level.

The second hypothesis was:

"In an apartment complex where there is a clubhouse, tenants will be more sociable with their neighbors than in an apartment complex where there is not a clubhouse."

"Sociable with their neighbors" was measured by use of ten items of BERNARD'S NEIGHBORING PRACTICES SCHEDULE, as discussed in previous chapters. Chi-square yielded a value of 47.3; this was significant at the .001 level. It should be noted that chi-square was utilized for several reasons, one being that Festinger et al. (1950) used it in their study, and this is directly related to their work. Another reason is that it is a most flexible statistical technique for determining whether one's observations differ from what would be expected according to chance. Since there was an association between "neighboring practices" and "presence/absence of a clubhouse/swimming pool," a corrected contingency coefficient was employed to ascertain the strength of the association. This yielded a .50, indicating a somewhat strong association in that the maximum value that could be obtained was .71.

Other questions were asked which were not utilized in the testing of specific hypotheses. However, they did show some interesting results. When asked if they belonged to a club, association, or an organization

(Appendix, Questions 16, 17, 19), the majority in each sample responded negatively. Yet, when asked: "Do you belong to any social club or group, such as a bridge club, gymnasium class, dancing club, sewing club, or any similar organization in your neighborhood (Appendix, Question 18)?" Seventeen (100 per cent) at CO again responded negatively. When the same question was asked to the respondents at WA, ten (56 per cent) responded affirmatively. When the club focused upon a particular activity, tenants at WA seemed more likely to belong. One such question that was included did not discriminate between the samples. Responding to: "Do you belong to a local improvement association (Appendix, Question 19)?" everyone in each sample said he did not.

At CO where they do not have a clubhouse/swimming pool, six (35 per cent) related that they would prefer living in another neighborhood; this was opposed to three (16 per cent) at WA. This was possibly influenced by the fact that at WA, most had not lived in their complex as long as at CO. The range at CO was from one month to six years, the median being 18 months. At WA, the median was seven months, and the range was from one month to two-and-a-half years. Twenty-two per cent at CO had been at CO longer than the longest resident at WA.

A question was asked to try to perceive whether individuals at CO would utilize a clubhouse/swimming pool, if they had one available; ten (59 per cent) indicated they would use it often, three (18 per cent) said they would never use it. Only one (6 per cent) at WA stated he never used the facilities available.

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

The general question asked in this study was whether certain physical features contribute to sociality. From this general question a specific hypothesis was formulated. The specific hypothesis was not tested directly, although it was less abstract than the general hypothesis. It pertained to whether specific physical features contribute to interaction. In order to determine whether any relationship between these variables existed, operational hypotheses were developed. The operational hypotheses were aimed at determining whether or not there was a significant difference between an apartment complex without a clubhouse/swimming pool and an apartment complex with a clubhouse/swimming pool. These specific physical features were correlated with two types of interaction. The two types of interaction were defined as engaging in leisure-time activity with other tenants and sociability with the neighbors. The first was tested by asking each respondent, "During your leisure-time, who do you usually do things with?" The latter was tested through the use of Bernard's Neighboring Practices Schedule.

Research by Dubin (1956) in an urban industrial setting indicated that the workplace was not "the breeding ground of preferred informal human relationships." In his study, only nine per cent of the workers

reported that the workplace provided their preferred associations. However, the findings of the present investigation indicate that fourteen (40 per cent) met at least one of the individuals whom they see most in social settings at or through work. Ten (29 per cent) said they had met as neighbors. Throughout this study leisure-time has been defined as time away from work. Many individuals did meet through their work and thereafter spend some leisure-time together. Thus, the present study would indicate that both work and residence bring people together.

Festinger et al. (1950) sought to discover the variety of factors which governed the selection process of a group membership. They concluded that friendship formation was dependent upon the physical arrangements of the apartments. Courtyards and stairways in Westgate and Westgate West had a positive influence on the forming of relationships. They felt that relationships among apartment tenants could be developed, strengthened or supported by the physical layout of the complex.

In the present study under investigation some of the conclusions drawn by Festinger et al. (1950) were confirmed, some remained ambiguous and some were contradicted. Festinger had focused on the relationship between physical features and friendship formation and how courtyards and stairways influence relationships. Results of the present study indicate this to be an ambiguous criterion. As defined in the current study, results did not differ significantly between the presence and absence of the specific physical features when the focus was on with whom one spent his leisure-time. This was not true, however, when the variable of neighborliness was employed as an indicator of friendship

relationships. In the latter situation, there was a very significant difference existing between the two groups. In the present study, the difference, significant at .001 level, confirms Festinger's et al. (1950) statement that physical features do influence relationships. The support in the present study becomes ambiguous in that it must be concluded that specific physical features (the presence or absence of a clubhouse/swimming pool) do influence relationships and practices in the neighborhood; however, it does not appear to influence the choice of those with whom one spends his leisure-time.

In the discussion of "social isolation," the second major concept that was considered in the selected review of the literature, isolation was defined as the lack of outside variables upon interaction. An overview of the work in this area resulted in the conclusion that there is a decline in the frequency and quality of social relationships due to social isolation. It can be demonstrated from the present study that the lack of an outside variable does result in a decline in the frequency if not the quality of social relationships. Utilizing the clubhouse/swimming pool as an outside variable, the present investigation indicates that in a complex where such a facility is absent, social relationships do, in fact, decline or do not even exist with other tenants. This was measured by their neighboring practices and a significant difference was indicated.

While the general hypothesis was not tested directly, support for the hypotheses derived from it do, at least theoretically, support and provide some answers to the question of the relationships between physical features and sociality.

Perhaps the fundamental value of this study lies in the area of definition of concepts. On the one hand, more specific terminology must be generated for definitions of physical features and for leisure-time. Perhaps, on the other hand, broadening the scope of the definition of "neighborhood" is in order.

As a result of this study, it has become apparent to the writer that more attention needs to be given to two areas of concern. They are: the whole question of leisure-time and the conceptualization of related research. While social scientists know a great deal about labor and work-related questions, little is known about leisure-time. In an industrialized society, leisure-time will become more of a significant social problem as the work-week becomes shorter, and as years of employment become shorter due to a delay in starting a career and earlier termination of a career.

The second area that needs to be discussed is how variables are conceptualized and how they are thought to be related. To be able to assess the influence of a given variable, or understand its role in the arena of human behavior, one must understand its complete dimensions as it influences other variables and as it is influenced by other variables. When sets of variables are viewed as systems, one can begin to see component parts to that system, and more easily understand how each relates to other variables. Since practicality does not often permit massive research, mini-analysis of systems must be utilized. That is, an attempt to delineate the types of relationships that can be expected when considering two or more variables. Aside from practicality, another problem that would

arise is in terms of the boundaries of a system: when are items relating to a given variable included and excluded as parts of the system. The value in this kind of a technique would be in its analytical approach to each system and relationships between variables involved in human behavior, be they interrelated or interdependent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1956 Blake, R., C. Rhead, B. Wedge, and J. Mouton. "Housing Architecture and Social Interaction," *Sociometry* 15: 133-139.
- 1961 Byrne, D., "The Influence of Propinquity and Opportunities for Interaction on Classroom Relationships," *Human Relations* 14: 63-70.
- 1950 Caplow, T. and R. Forman. "Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community," *American Sociology Review* 15: 357-366.
- 1970 Champion, Dean J. Basic Statistics for Social Research. Scranton: Chandler.
- 1962 Davies, Vernon. A Rapid Method for Determining the Significance of the Difference Between Two Percentages. Washington State University: Washington Agricultural Experiment Stations.
- 1956 Dubin, Robert. "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," *Social Problems* 3: 131-141.
- 1950 Festinger, Leon, Stanley Schachter and Kurt Back. Social Pressures in Informal Groups. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- 1963 Goffman, Erving. Behavior in Public Places. Glencoe: Free Press.
- 1952 Gullahorn, John. "Distance and Friendship as Factors in the Gross Interaction Matrix," *Sociometry* 15: 123-134.
- 1963 Gunderson, E. K. and P. D. Nelson. "Adaptation of Small Groups to Extreme Environments." *Aerospace Medicine* 34: 1111-1115.
- 1959 Hall, Edward T. The Silent Language. Garden City: Doubleday.
- 1969 Lundberg, George, Mirra Komarovsky, and Mary Alice McInerney. Leisure: A Suburban Study. New York: Agathon Press.
- 1952 Maisonneuve, J., G. Palmade, and C. Fourment. "Selective Choices and Propinquity," *Sociometry* 15: 135-140.
- 1948 Merton, Robert. "The Social Psychology of Housing," in Current Trends in Social Psychology. Wayne Dennis (ed.), Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 163-217.
- 1960 Mullin, C. S. "Some Psychological Aspects of Isolated Antarctic Living," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 117: 323-325.
- 1958 Neumeyer, Martin H. and Esther S. Neumeyer. Leisure and Recreation. New York: Ronald Press.

- 1958 Ormiston, D. W. "The Effects of Sensory Deprivation and Sensory Bombardment on Apparent Movement Thresholds," *American Psychologist* 13:389 (abstract).
- 1939 Queen, Stuart A. and Lester F. Thomas. The City. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 1965 Smith, R., R. Sanders, A. Smith, and B. Weinman. "Effect of Socioenvironmental Therapy on Awareness of Others In Chronic Psychosis," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2: 282-287.
- 1958 Sommer, R. and H. Ross. "Social Interaction on a Geriatrics Ward," *International Journal of Social Psychiatry* 4: 128-133.
- 1959 Sommer, R. "Studies in Personal Space," *Sociometry* 22: 247-260.
- 1950 Steinzor, Bernard. "The Spatial Factor in Face-To-Face Discussion Groups," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 45: 552-555.
- 1927 Thrasher, F. The Gang. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1963 Walters, R. H., J. E. Callagan, and A. F. Newman. "Effect of Solitary Confinement on Prisoners," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 119: 771-773.
- 1953 White, A. "The Patient Sits Down," *Psychosomatic Medicine* 15: 256-257.
- 1956 Whyte, William H. The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- 1943 Whyte, William F. Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1949 _____, "The Social Structure of a Restaurant," *American Journal of Sociology* 54: 302-310.

APPENDIX

Now I have several questions about you and your neighbors.

6. About how many of the people who live in your neighborhood would you recognize by sight if you saw them in a large crowd?

ANSWER: 2 10 4 0 0 1
None Few Some Many Most All

7. About how often do you chat or "visit with" your neighbors?

ANSWER: 7 4 6 0
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

8. Do you and your neighbors exchange things, such as books, magazines, patterns, recipes, jellies, jams, preserves, suggestions, tools, dishes, seeds, plant clippings, or any similar things?

ANSWER: 15 0 2 0
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

9. Do you and your neighbors exchange favors or services, such as receiving parcels, telephone messages, or similar favors?

ANSWER: 0 3 3 11
Often Sometimes Rarely Never

10. Do you and your neighbors ever go to the movies together?

ANSWER: 15 2 0 0
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

11. Do you and your neighbors ever go shopping together?

ANSWER: 17 0 0 0
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

12. Do your neighbors ever talk over their problems with you when they are worried, or ask you for advice or help?

ANSWER: 0 2 0 15
Often Sometimes Rarely Never

13. Do you and your neighbors ever take care of each other's children when the other one is sick or busy?

ANSWER: 17 0 0 0
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

14. Do you and your neighbors ever have picnics or outings or parties together?

ANSWER: 17 0 0 0
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

15. Is the church you usually attend in your present neighborhood?

ANSWER: 6 10 1
Yes No Do not attend church usually

16. Do you belong to a church club, such as Ladies' Aid, or sewing club, or a mothers' club, or a church men's club of any kind in your neighborhood?

ANSWER: 2 15
Yes No

17. Do you belong to a school club, such as a Parent-Teacher Association, or a mothers' club, or some other school organization in your neighborhood?

ANSWER: 3 14
Yes No

18. Do you belong to any social club or group, such as a bridge club, gymnasium class, dancing club, sewing club, or any similar organization in your neighborhood?

ANSWER: 0 17
 Yes No

19. Do you belong to a local improvement association?

ANSWER: 0 17
 Yes No

20. Do your best friends live in your present neighborhood?

ANSWER: 14 2 1 0
 None Few Some Many

21. Would you rather live in some other neighborhood?

ANSWER: 6 10 1
 Yes No Do not know

22. Are your neighbors of the same nationality as you?

ANSWER: 1 0 2 0 3 3 8
 None Few Some Many Most All Do not know

23. How many years have you lived in your present neighborhood? _____

24. Do you own your home?

ANSWER: 0 17
 Yes No

25. Would you ever use the clubhouse and/or swimming pool, if one were here?

ANSWER: 3 0 4 10
 Never Rarely Sometimes Often

LEISURE-TIME PRACTICES

Westborough Arms		18			
Name of Apartment		No. of Occupants		No. of Children	
Sex	Occupation	3	13	0	2
		Single	Married	Widowed	Divorced
Marital Status					
0	12	6	0	0	0
Under 20	20 - 29	30 - 39	40 - 49	50 - 59	60 & over
AGE					
0	5	2	5	1	2
Under 5,000	5,001-7,000	7,001-9,000	9,001-11,000	11,001-13,000	13,001-15,000
FAMILY INCOME				3	Over 15,000

I am interested in who you do things with during your leisure time.

1. Names of three people you see most of socially:

2. And where do they live?

3. Where did you formally meet them?

4. During your leisure time, who do you usually do things with?

5. And where do they live?

Now I have several questions about you and your neighbors.

6. About how many of the people who live in your neighborhood would you recognize by sight if you saw them in a large crowd?

ANSWER: 0 7 9 1 0 1
None Few Some Many Most All

7. About how often do you chat or "visit with" your neighbors?

ANSWER: 0 3 10 5
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

8. Do you and your neighbors exchange things, such as books, magazines, patterns, recipes, jellies, jams, preserves, suggestions, tools, dishes, seeds, plant clippings, or any similar things?

ANSWER: 3 5 7 3
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

9. Do you and your neighbors exchange favors or services, such as receiving parcels, telephone messages, or similar favors?

ANSWER: 2 8 6 2
Often Sometimes Rarely Never

10. Do you and your neighbors ever go to the movies together?

ANSWER: 9 2 7 0
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

11. Do you and your neighbors ever go shopping together?

ANSWER: 9 4 5 0
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

12. Do your neighbors ever talk over their problems with you when they are worried, or ask you for advice or help?

ANSWER: 0 3 10 5
Often Sometimes Rarely Never

13. Do you and your neighbors ever take care of each other's children when the other one is sick or busy?

ANSWER: 6 4 6 2
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

14. Do you and your neighbors ever have picnics or outings or parties together?

ANSWER: 7 2 8 1
Never Rarely Sometimes Often

15. Is the church you usually attend in your present neighborhood?

ANSWER: 10 4 4
Yes No Do not attend church usually

16. Do you belong to a church club, such as Ladies' Aid, or sewing club, or a mothers' club, or a church men's club of any kind in your neighborhood?

ANSWER: 1 17
Yes No

17. Do you belong to a school club, such as a Parent-Teacher Association, or a mothers' club, or some other school organization in your neighborhood?

ANSWER: 8 10
Yes No

18. Do you belong to any social club or group, such as a bridge club, gymnasium class, dancing club, sewing club, or any similar organization in your neighborhood?

ANSWER: 10 8
 Yes No

19. Do you belong to a local improvement association?

ANSWER: 0 18
 Yes No

20. Do your best friends live in your present neighborhood?

ANSWER: 4 9 3 2
 None Few Some Many

21. Would you rather live in some other neighborhood?

ANSWER: 3 12 3
 Yes No Do not know

22. Are your neighbors of the same nationality as you?

ANSWER: 1 1 3 3 6 2 2
 None Few Some Many Most All Do not know

23. How many years have you lived in your present neighborhood? _____

24. Do you own your home?

ANSWER: 3 15
 Yes No

25. Do you ever use the clubhouse and/or swimming pool?

ANSWER: 1 1 11 5
 Never Rarely Sometimes Often