

UC Berkeley

IURD Reprint Series

Title

Neighboring and Urbanism: Commonality Versus Friendship

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1tc447bz>

Author

Silverman, Carol J

Publication Date

1986-12-01

Peer reviewed

Carol J. Silverman

Neighboring and Urbanism:
Commonality Versus Friendship

Reprint No. 226

Institute of Urban and Regional Development
University of California at Berkeley

Reprinted from *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 2, December 1986.

NEIGHBORING AND URBANISM

Commonality Versus Friendship

CAROL J. SILVERMAN

University of California, Berkeley

A large number of studies have found that there is a residual correlation between urbanism and neighboring even after relevant variables have been controlled. This article suggests that such correlation is an artifact of how neighboring is defined. When the more typically used model that defines the neighbor relationship as a subcategory of friendship is replaced by a more limited one that assumes only a sense of connection, the residual correlation disappears. Instead, neighboring is better explained by the local ecological factors of housing and population heterogeneity.

Early sociologists, interested in the presumed decline of community, investigated the effect of the city upon local ties. Although later generations showed that urbanism did not cause the severing of primary bonds, one empirical finding has been sustained: Urbanites are less involved with their neighbors than people in smaller places even when demographic characteristics are controlled (Fava, 1958; Greer, 1956; Tomeh, 1964; Nahara, 1968; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Fischer et al., 1977; Tsai and Sigelman, 1982; Fischer, 1982). However, in the latter research the definition of neighboring has been altered and some of Tönnies's initiating notion of *gemeinschaft* lost. In this article, the link between urbanism and local community is reexamined, defining neighboring as a sense of "we-ness," and showing that involvement with neighbors, when so defined, is correlated with aspects of the neighborhood rather than with urbanism itself.

AUTHOR'S NOTE: *I am grateful to Claude Fischer and Stephen Barton for their helpful comments and suggestions.*

URBAN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY, Vol. 22 No. 2, December 1986 312-328
© 1987 Sage Publications, Inc.

THEORIES OF NEIGHBORING

When Janowitz (1952) coined the term *neighborhood of limited liability*, he underscored a change in intellectual orientation. Once thought to be a primary group (Cooley, 1909), the neighborhood was recognized to be of secondary importance to most people's social lives; *gemeinschaft* could be and often was found elsewhere (Wellman, 1979; Fischer, 1984). Explanations for the absence of local community underwent a parallel evolution; where theorists initially had assumed local bonds to be a natural phenomenon and thus focused upon how urbanization and modernization weakened the moral order, most now treat local involvement as a variable to be explained by custom, individual preference, and the absence of alternatives. (Keller, 1968, provides one of the best summaries of explanations of neighboring; see also Olson, 1982.) But the current work also contains normative assumptions, albeit of a utilitarian nature. The indicators typically used to measure neighboring reveal that a model of friendship is assumed. The more closely the relationship resembles that of a friend, the higher the respondent's score on a neighboring index. Thus, for example, Tsai and Sigelman (1982) measure neighboring by the frequency respondents reported spending a social evening with neighbors, Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) by the number of friends in the neighborhood, and McGahan (1972) by whether the respondent had friends in the building, went to social events with neighbors, talked with neighbors about personal problems, and borrowed from neighbors. By this definition, those who are isolated or tied to the neighborhood by age, disability, or young children neighbor because they lack other alternatives. Those who live in homogeneous areas may become involved with neighbors as an easily available source of companionship. Neighboring becomes a matter of individual choice within constraints rather than a given among members of an interconnected group. Since it is usually assumed that nonlocal alternatives are more desirable (hence Wellman's, 1979, "community liberated"), it is only in those cases in which people cannot afford the cost of leaving the neighborhood or when local resources are sufficiently attractive that local resources are used.

Within this tradition, the residual negative effect of urbanism upon neighboring is explained by the greater availability of nonlocal alternatives and the greater heterogeneity of the urban population. Such an explanation undoubtedly is valid insofar as it assumes a definition of neighboring that focuses on friendship. It grows out of and contributes

to a theoretical tradition that is interested in whether the city severs primary bonds. However, a sensitivity to defining aspects of the neighbor role has been lost.

WHAT IS THE NEIGHBOR TIE?

Much of the relationship between neighbors lies outside of discretionary choice. An analytic scheme that assumes that neighbor ties are solely matters of individual choices within constraint is insensitive to this. Modern neighborhoods, of course, do not resemble the rural villages described by Tönnies (1887): Land is not held in common, kinship ties are few, and much of day-to-day existence occurs elsewhere. Hence the structural sources of connection are weaker, but they persist nonetheless. Neighbors are those, by definition, who live close to the private space of the home. Because of the joint locale, common fate is still an issue, if not to the same extent it was when villagers shared agricultural fortunes; factors such as a relocated bus line, gentrification, or a good local school will affect all. Furthermore, neighbors share residential boundaries. American culture places a high value upon the home, both as a vehicle for the display of achieved status and as the symbolic and real location of private life. Neighbors share in this life because of their proximity. They may construct a common history involving the private aspects of their lives that overlap. Children may go to the same schools, a neighborhood organization may form the basis of common experiences, or residents may simply remember a drought's destruction of carefully tended lawns.

However, American culture also places a high value on privacy, from both the public world and social relations in general, and the home is the site where individuals are accorded, at least theoretically, most control over whom they will see and what they will hear. Yet because neighbors share residential boundaries, they are in a continuing position of potential violation and pose the most immediate threat to the household's ability to control the use of space. Intrusions need not be deliberate: Sound may travel through thin walls, leaves blow, or children and pets wander freely. Furthermore, due to their proximity, neighbors may know a good deal more about a person's life than he or she would deem desirable.

Tönnies (1887) writes of how in *gemeinschaft* neighbors feel themselves to be connected despite all that separates them. The shared

environment and accompanying interpenetration of activities form the basis of the symbolic recognition of shared identity. While connections still exist, they need not result in neighbors feeling a sense of "we-ness." Connections may not be recognized or may be dismissed as less important than the potential or actual intrusion of neighbors upon the privacy of the home. Indeed, neighbors may come to see their interests as opposing each other.

One need not assume, as Tönnies does, that neighbors' recognition of their interconnectedness is natural to ask about the conditions under which modern residents feel themselves to be "we" rather than you and I (or you versus me). This is a logically distinct question from whether residents possess localized social networks or befriend their neighbors. Friendships may grow out of a general sense of attachment, but need not do so. Yet it is an important question. People's need for companionship and attachment can be satisfied by a wide variety of individuals, but residence within a particular area promotes needs and interests best satisfied by neighbors. When residents feel they share something based simply on the fact that they are neighbors, they extend their sense of home into the neighborhood at large. As a result, they gain the benefits of living among those with whom they are, however weakly, communally involved. They possess the psychological security of thinking themselves surrounded by people they can trust and the real benefits of being able to draw upon neighbor ties in times of trouble or emergency. Further, they are better able to mobilize when local issues demand group action.

Empirical investigation of neighboring, when defined as a sense of we-ness, augments work within the literature that seeks to isolate the many dimensions of neighborhood involvement (see, e.g., Keller, 1968; Hunter 1975; Warren, 1977; Connerly, 1985). It is directly related to Hunter's (1975: 538) discussion of community as a "cultural-symbolic unit of collective identity." However, whereas Hunter focuses upon identification with a spatial area, this research looks at relationships with people in that area.

WHY NEIGHBORS PERCEIVE THEIR COMMONALITIES

A large number of factors, some of them idiosyncratic to the particular individual or neighborhood of interest, should be expected to affect residents' recognition of their attachments to neighbors. When,

for example, neighbors *have* to depend on each other for needed services or when a natural or other common threat portends, neighbors will often see themselves as a group with common interests. However, these kinds of situations will be found less often in reasonably affluent Western neighborhoods. Perhaps the most widely found determinant of neighbors' perceptions of commonality is the strength of their claim to the home and the perceptions of their neighbors as threats to that claim. A number of researchers have noted the statistical importance of housing in predicting neighboring behavior but typically have not developed a full theoretical model to account for it (Lauman, 1966; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Fischer and Jackson, 1976).¹ When neighboring is defined in terms of recognition of connections, then the explanation is straightforward; several factors combine to encourage or discourage recognition. People will feel a greater commonality with neighbors when they feel some attachment to the neighborhood. Since neighbors also live there, they are linked through their common residence. People who own their homes typically have a greater commitment to the neighborhood and, by extension, to their neighbors. However, whether owners or renters, they must also be ensured that neighbors will not violate the implicit trust involved in sharing property boundaries, that neighbors can be counted upon not to intrude upon the privacy of the home. Furthermore, they will want this guarantee prior to establishing any particular relationship. Otherwise, neighbors might take advantage of the tie and intrude too much. In the absence of any particular knowledge about a neighbor, residents must rely upon easily visible cues. If neighbors are perceived as like oneself, then they can be counted upon to possess similar standards of acceptable behavior. One obvious cue is homeownership. Given our culture's equation of ownership with responsibility (Perin, 1977), residents can assume that their neighbors will be the right sorts of people.

Housing density should also be expected to affect neighboring. Even when residents possess similar standards, construction may create problems of passive infringement. People who live in single-family detached dwellings will have fewer problems with boundary control; they will be less likely to hear their neighbors or to be bothered by other problems such as trash in shared areas.

Therefore, Hypothesis 1 assumes that people who own their homes should feel a greater attachment to a neighborhood. To the extent they live in an area of other homeowners, they also should be more likely to feel that they are similar to their neighbors and, thus, can trust them.

People who live in single-family detached housing should have fewer problems with boundary control. All factors should result in increased feelings of commonality.

A number of researchers have noted the importance of heterogeneity in predicting neighboring (Deutschberger, 1946; Caplow and Forman, 1950; Tomeh, 1964; Smith, 1975; Fischer and Jackson, 1976). We would expect people to be more likely to befriend those who are like themselves. Heterogeneity is also important for the less restricted definition of neighboring used in this study. People rely not only upon the cues furnished by housing, but also upon obvious characteristics of the population in predicting trustworthiness. To the extent that people are prejudiced against those who are not like them, people who live in ethnically homogeneous neighborhoods will be more likely to trust their neighbors and to feel something in common with them. Hypothesis 2, then, assumes that people who live in ethnically homogeneous areas should be more likely to trust their neighbors and feel that they are similar to them and thus should be more likely to feel attachments to neighbors.

The model outlined in this article looks only at *neighborhood* factors in predicting which people will feel connections to neighbors. Furthermore, the identified factors, housing and neighborhood ethnic composition, are correlated with urbanism. The argument is that there is nothing inherent in large cities per se that decreases people's sense of connection to neighbors. An alienation model need not be evoked, as used by the early Chicago school, nor a substitution model, as used by later writers, to account for the lesser amount of urban neighboring. Instead, when neighboring is defined as a sense of connectedness and interdependence based upon common residence, these urban differences can be accounted for in terms of the local variables that discourage such feelings. The residual correlation between urbanism and lower neighboring is an artifact of the fact that cities tend to have certain types of local environments. Hypothesis 3 assumes that the association between urbanism and neighboring should be completely accounted for by differences in the composition of urban and nonurban neighborhoods.

METHODS

The data to be analyzed come from the Northern California Community Survey, a 1050-person survey conducted in 1977-1978. Fifty

localities were randomly selected and then two neighborhoods in each sampled (see Fischer, 1982, for details of the sample). Because the study oversampled residents of small towns, a compensatory weighting scheme was applied to the data.²

An argument presented in this study is that when residents feel a sense of "we-ness" with neighbors, they can draw upon it in times of need. There are difficulties in selecting an appropriate measure of this. Asking about the past history of favors performed for or by neighbors is troublesome because it depends upon circumstance and, in the case of borrowing, a person's general attitude toward asking for temporary loans of items. Furthermore, questions that ask for specific activities with neighbors are probably biased insofar as people may overreport so as not to appear misanthropic. However, the Northern California Community Survey contains one item admirably suited to measure the identified dimension of neighboring. Respondents were asked which people they could call upon if they needed someone to take care of their homes if they went away. They were then asked how they were related to each person named—friend, coworker, neighbor, and so on (multiple identifications were possible).

Respondents who had asked a neighbor at some time in the past for this service undoubtedly would be likely to mention that neighbor's name. But those who had never needed someone in this capacity or who had asked a nonlocal tie for the service *could* mention a neighbor because the question was hypothetical, and the interviewers probed for the total list of all possible people who could be called upon. Since respondents were first asked for a total set of names and then questioned about the source of each relationship, the normative bias of giving extra neighbor names was diminished; respondents could easily name non-local ties. However, taking care of the home is a service most easily performed by a neighbor and one that is culturally acceptable to request. It is to be expected, then, that people would think of neighbors for it. Further, it is service that implies an ongoing, although not necessarily social, relationship. To ask a neighbor to take care of the home, the respondent need not be a friend but must feel a sufficient connection to the neighbor to ask the service and trust the neighbor not to take advantage of the situation. The variable further computes the number of neighbors who can be called upon, thus approximating a measure of the extent to which the respondent felt attachment to a neighborhood rather than to one specific individual.³

VARIABLES TO BE CONSIDERED

DEPENDENT

Neighboring. Neighboring was measured by the number of neighbors who were not kin respondents could call upon to take care of the home. (Given that the emphasis of this analysis is upon factors that encourage and discourage people feeling a sense of connection with neighbors, it was decided to eliminate those relationships known to exist prior to the neighboring one. The most obvious of these, and the only one known from the survey information, was that of kinship. However, people identified as neighbors were rarely also identified as one of the other possibilities, such as coworker, so the results should not be appreciably influenced by the absence of knowledge of any other origins of the tie.) Respondents clearly varied on this measure: 37% would call on no neighbors to take care of their homes, 24% on one neighbor, and the remaining 39% on two or more neighbors (the highest number named was eight). Because the variable was highly skewed, 1 was added to all scores, which were then logged.

INDEPENDENT

Ownership of single-family detached dwelling. Ownership status and the density of the dwelling units would be expected to operate independently; however, there is a high degree of collinearity between the two variables, making it impossible to parcel out their independent contributions. The two variables are each strongly correlated with the dependent one—indeed, they show the highest simple r 's of all the independent variables (own? $r = .21$ and single-family detached? $r = .20$). A test of the separate components of Hypothesis 1 thus must await quasi-experimental data. Here the hypothesis is tested as a whole. Since there is no theoretical reason to prefer one variable over the other, a composite measure is constructed that measures whether or not the respondent owned a single-family detached home.⁴

Ethnic match. Based upon a questionnaire distributed to knowledgeable informants, the survey coded whether the respondent lived in a neighborhood where there were blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. The

respondent's ethnicity was also coded. From this, respondents could be classified by whether they live in a neighborhood where the other residents were of the same ethnicity as themselves or whether they lived in a neighborhood where there was any ethnic variation. Since the survey did not sample any neighborhoods that were predominantly nonwhite, all respondents in the "no-variation" neighborhoods were whites. It should be noted that this limits the findings; they cannot be generalized to nonwhites who lived in neighborhoods primarily of their own ethnicity.

Degree of urbanism. The question of how to measure urbanism is a complicated one that has been answered in different ways by the various researchers who have studied neighboring. Although most studies use some variation of population size, this violates the intuitive sense that smaller places in proximity to larger ones are more urban than they would be if located at a distance. The Northern Californian Community Survey contains a measure that takes account of this difficulty. It combines the population of a municipality with its population potential (i.e., proximity to other areas of population).⁵

INTERVENING VARIABLES

Extent to which neighbors are perceived to be similar to self. Respondents were asked if they perceived neighbors to be similar or dissimilar to themselves. Based upon examination of the bivariate cross-classification between this variable and neighboring, two dummy variables were created: The first isolated those who said they were like their neighbors or like some and dissimilar to others; the second isolated those who felt themselves insufficiently informed to be able to tell (the omitted category included those who said that they were different from their neighbors).

Trust neighbors. This variable compared those who said they trusted their neighbors to the others.

THE CONTROLS

Presence of children. Perhaps the most consistent finding from the literature is the importance of children in the development of neighbor

ties (Sweetzer, 1941; Bopegamage, 1957; Tomeh, 1964; Athanasiou and Yoshioka, 1973; Zito, 1974; Michaelson, 1977). People whose children play together may form friendships based on that fact. Thus, as a control, a variable was included that measured whether there were any children in the household under age 16.

Length of time in the neighborhood. Research shows that the amount of time respondents have lived in the neighborhood affects their neighboring (Caplow and Forman, 1950; Fellin and Litwak, 1963; Marshall, 1973). One would expect that it would also influence neighboring as defined here. People who perceive themselves as permanent rather than temporary residents in an area should feel a greater commitment to it and, in turn, to their neighbors. Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) further show that the effect diminishes after one year. The cross-tabulation between time in neighborhood and neighboring revealed this to be the case for this data set as well. Whether or not a person feels him- or herself to be a permanent resident in the neighborhood should matter more than the actual time spent there. People who have lived in an area for more than one year will be likely to consider themselves to be more than temporary residents. Therefore, all respondents were coded for whether or not they had lived in the neighborhood for more than one year.

Background characteristics. The literature shows contradictory results of the effect of background characteristics on neighboring. The general pattern seems to be for higher-class people to be more involved with neighbors (Fellin and Litwak, 1963). However, there are exceptions—some find no association (Nahara, 1968; Saha, 1975; Warren, 1977; Mayo, 1979). Additionally, the correlations, even when significant, often are weak. Philliber (1976), for example, found an R^2 of .03 between socioeconomic variables and neighboring. The findings about the effects of marital status upon neighboring are also inconsistent. Some have found that the unmarried tend to be more involved with neighbors than the married (McGahan, 1972); others have found the reverse (Tomeh, 1964; Nahara, 1968). Since these sorts of variables are not theoretically important to this argument and are included only as controls, only those variables that were themselves significant predictors or that appreciably affected the correlations between significant predictors and the dependent variable were retained. Gender, age, occupation, income, and marital status proved to be unassociated with

neighboring behavior and not to affect the regression equation when entered as controls. Thus only education was considered in the final model.

Labor force status. The literature suggests that people who are home during the day should be more likely to be involved with neighbors than those who are not (Sweetzer, 1941; Zito, 1974; Mayo, 1979). Since relations with neighbors are established by households as well as individuals, a measure was computed that ascertained whether either the respondent or, if married, his or her spouse was at home during the day (i.e., worked part-time or did not work outside the home).

Attitude toward being interviewed. Respondents varied in their enthusiasm for the interview process and hence in their willingness to give names to the interviewer. Based upon the interviewers' evaluation, a variable was created that measured whether or not the respondent limited the number of elicited names.

ANALYSIS

Table 1 provides information about means and standard deviations for the variables analyzed in the study. Table 2 shows the bivariate correlation matrix.⁶ When only the simple correlation coefficients are considered, there is a significant correlation between urbanism and neighboring ($r = -.09$). Examination of partial coefficients shows that this association understates the relationships; it is attenuated by the strong association between neighboring and education and the relatively lower education of those in the smaller places. The association between urbanism and neighboring is thus strengthened when the partial correlation coefficient is computed controlling for education ($r = -.14$). This correlation is similar to that found in other studies. Fischer and Jackson (1976), for example, using NORC data, found a correlation of .11 between their measure of neighbor involvement and urbanism.

Hypothesis 3 predicts that this observed association should disappear when local factors are entered into the model. A regression model was computed that included urbanism, the housing and ethnic variables, and, since it increased the strength of the association between urbanism and neighboring, education. Additionally, attitude toward being inter-

TABLE 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Analyzed Variables

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Own Single Family House (OSF)	.52	.50
Same Ethnicity as Respondent (Ethnic)	.38	.49
In Neighborhood More than One Year (Time)	.86	.35
Education of Respondent (Ed)	13.04	2.58
Resistant to Being Interviewed? (Resis)	.07	.25
Children Under 16? (Kids)	.15	.36
Someone Home Days? (Home)	.64	.48
Trusts Neighbors (Trust)	.86	.34
Perceives Neighbors as Like Self (Like)	.61	.49
Does Not Know If Neighbors Like Self (Notk)	.05	.22
Urban	281.00	160.00
Log of N of Neighbors to Take Care of Home (Care)	.30	.26

TABLE 2
Correlation Matrix (1040 < n < 1051)

	OSF	Ethnic	Time	Kids	Ed	Home	Resis	Like	Notk	Trust	Urban	Care
OSF	1.00	.29***	.27***	-.00	-.01	.21***	.02	.16***	-.07*	.16***	-.32***	.22***
Ethnic		1.00	.09**	.03	.04	.09**	-.02	.15***	-.09**	.12***	-.17***	.14***
Time			1.00	-.01	-.05	.12***	.03	.10***	-.09***	.15***	-.01	.17***
Kids				1.00	.04	.11***	-.04	-.05*	.01	-.04	-.06*	.05*
Ed					1.00	-.17***	-.09**	-.09***	-.07**	.10***	.33***	.11***
Home						1.00	-.01	.12***	-.09***	.03	-.18***	.09**
Resis							1.00	-.01	.08**	-.00	.04	-.09**
Like								1.00	-.29***	.16***	-.06*	.18***
Notk									1.00	-.12***	.06*	-.15***
Trust										1.00	-.03	.16***
Urban											1.00	-.09***
Care												1.00

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

viewed was included to improve the reliability of the dependent variable, neighboring. The first regression model presented in Table 3 supports Hypothesis 3: Urbanism does not significantly predict neighboring when the local factors are included.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 make separate sets of predictions about the ethnic and housing variables. Housing should affect neighboring in part indirectly by influencing perceptions of neighbors' trustworthiness and in part directly by determining the extent of boundary control problems. The effect of ethnicity, however, should work completely through perceptions. To test these two hypotheses, two further regression equations were computed, one including housing and ethnicity as well as the complete set of controls, the other also including the intervening

TABLE 3
Regression Models for Logged Number of Neighbors
to Take Care of Home

	standardized coefficients (n equals 1041)		
Own Single Family Detached Dwelling	.18***	.14***	.12***
Ethnic Match	.08*	.07*	.05
Urbanism	-.06	-.06	-.06
Education	.11***	.12***	.12***
Resistance to Being Interviewed	-.07*	-.07*	-.06*
In Neighborhood More than One Year		.13***	.11***
Children		.04	.05
Someone Home Days		.04	.03
Trusts Neighbors			.07*
Neighbors Like Self			.12***
Not Know If Neighbors Like Self			-.06*
R ²	.07***	.09***	.12***

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

perceptual variables ("neighbors like self" and "trustworthy"). Again, both hypotheses were supported.

There is no further significant association between urbanism and neighboring when the local variables are entered in the model. Instead, the single strongest predictor of the logged number of neighbors who can be called upon to take care of the home was the housing variable. Those who own a single-family detached dwelling could call upon more neighbors. Length of time in the neighborhood and the education of the respondent were also important. While the ethnic similarity variable and the housing variable were both significant predictors before the intervening perceptual variables were entered into the model, when these factors were included, the ethnic term proved to be an insignificant predictor while the housing term maintained its significance. Thus the simple effect of ethnic heterogeneity seems to be mediated through the perception of similarity and trustworthiness. However, housing has an inhibiting effect upon neighboring above and beyond perceptions. In implicit support of the proposed measure of neighboring, neither the

presence of children nor of someone home during the day was significantly associated with neighboring.

DISCUSSION

This study looks at a dimension of neighboring that need not assume friendship as the model for the role. Thus it is not surprising that two variables that have previously proved to be significant predictors of neighboring, children and the presence of someone in the home during the day, should prove to be unimportant. Instead, issues concerning privacy and private property arise. The analysis implies that people use their ability to defend and control the private space of the home as the basis for perceiving attachments to neighbors. The argument has been presented elsewhere (Silverman, 1986) that these bases of connection are fragile; they are based in part on prejudice and are easily dissolved when there is neighborhood mobility or real disagreements between residents. Thus these results should be taken as descriptive, not prescriptive.

Unlike the results presented here, most studies have found that there is a residual effect of urbanism even when individual characteristics and contextual variables are controlled. Why the difference? It may be that this effect is an artifact of the particular study or of the specific measure of urbanism used. However, again based upon the case study materials, a different explanation is suggested. Several scholars have noted that there are different neighboring styles (for example, see Keller, 1968; Kuper, 1953). In particular, some—called *sociable neighbors*—prefer to befriend neighbors; others—the *reserved*—prefer to be left alone. In a qualitative study an analogous distinction was found (Silverman, 1983). Some residents defined neighboring in terms of friendship. If they were involved with neighbors at all, it was expressed by common activities such as camping out or playing bridge together. Other residents, who felt themselves to be no less close to their neighbors, saw neighboring as distinct from friendship. It was a relationship of distanced care. Neighbors were those they could count upon to help out in times of crisis, who were connected to them by virtue of shared residence, but were not the people with whom they socialized. Indeed, many saw neighbors only rarely. Virtually all of those in the latter category lived in a city; the former category lived in a suburb. If, in fact, these findings generalize beyond the city and suburb where the interviews took place, they could

well account for the differences found here. As previously noted, most researchers use some measure of neighboring that assumes a model of friendship. Indeed, when neighboring is so defined, using the data gathered in the survey analyzed here, there is a residual effect of place (Fischer, 1982: chap. 9). Since this is the suburban, not the urban, style of involvement, its association with place is not surprising. This analysis uses a different measure without the assumption and therefore finds no further association when relevant population and ecological differences are controlled.

NOTES

1. Mowrer (1958) suggests a "visibility" theory. He argues that people who live in houses are more likely to see their neighbors when outdoors (and perhaps gardening) and thus to be able to interact easily with them. This hypothesis has not been tested directly and cannot account for the initiating question of this work: why people would feel sufficiently connected to neighbors to wish to interact with them. Furthermore, it seems insufficient to account for the relatively strong importance of housing compared to other variables.

2. The weighting scheme was developed by William Nicholls, Survey Research Center, University of California at Berkeley. It adjusted the data for the oversampling of certain strata, differential response rate by strata, several counties that were inadvertently omitted from the sampling frame, and the distribution of single-person households. See Fischer (1982: 282-284) for further details.

3. Tönnies (1887) discusses *gemeinschaft* as occurring among members of an interconnected *group*. This survey, by its design, cannot ascertain the extent to which respondents felt attachment to a neighborhood versus to specific individuals who lived in that neighborhood.

4. In fact, the homeownership status of neighbors should also be considered in the model. However, respondents who own their homes typically live among other homeowners. Thus, to avoid problems of multicollinearity, the housing variable is also used as a proxy for whether or not neighbors own their homes.

5. Urbanism was computed according to the following equation:

$$100(V_z + P_z) + 300$$

where *P* refers to the population of the municipality expressed in standard scores and *V* refers to the standardized population potential of the sampling unit. Population potential was calculated by

$$V_{ij} = P_j^\alpha \kappa / D_{ij}^\beta$$

P_j is the population of area *j*, *D_{ij}* is the distance between point *i* and area *j*, and α , β , and κ are constants. The equation is summed over all areas *j* for the total population potential. See Fischer (1982) for further details.

6. The absence of a significant correlation among time in neighborhood, trust, and urbanism requires some explanation because it is counterintuitive. When time in neighborhood is left uncollapsed and correlated with a dummy variable that compares people in the smallest places with the others, the correlation coefficient is significant ($r = .07$). While people in the larger places were no less trusting of neighbors, they were less likely to trust the others who lived in their city.

REFERENCES

- ATHANASIOU, A. and G. A. YOSHIOKA (1973) "The spatial character of friendship formation." *Environment and Behavior* 5 (March): 43-65.
- BOPEGAMAGE, A. (1957) "Neighborhood relations in an Indian city." *Soc. Bull.* 6 (March): 34-42.
- CAPLOW, T. and R. FORMAN (1950) "Neighborhood integration in a homogeneous community." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 15 (June): 357-366.
- CONNERLY, C. E. (1985) "The community question: an extension of Wellman and Leighton." *Urban Affairs Q.* 20 (June): 537-566.
- COOLEY, C. (1909) *Social Organization and Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Free Press.
- DEUTSCHBERGER, P. (1946) "Interaction patterns in changing neighborhoods." *Sociometry* 9 (November): 303-315.
- FAVA, S. (1958) "Contrasts in neighboring: New York City and a suburban community," pp. 122-131 in W. Dobriner (ed.) *The Suburban Community*. New York: G. P. Putnam.
- FELLIN, P. and E. LITWAK (1963) "Neighborhood cohesion under conditions of mobility." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 28 (June): 364-376.
- FISCHER, C. S. (1982) *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in City and Town*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- FISCHER, C. S. (1984) *The Urban Experience*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- FISCHER, C. S. and R. M. JACKSON (1976) "Suburbs, networks and attitudes," pp. 279-308 in B. Schwartz (ed.) *The Changing Face of the Suburb*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- FISCHER, C. S., A. STEUVE, K. GERSON, and L. M. JONES, with M. BALDASSARE (1977) *Networks and Places*. New York: Free Press.
- GREER, S. (1956) "Urbanism reconsidered: a comparative study of local areas in the metropolis." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 21 (February): 19-25.
- HUNTER, A. (1975) "The loss of community: an empirical test through replication." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 40 (October): 537-552.
- JANOWITZ, M. (1952) *The Community Press in an Urban Setting*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- KASARDA, J. D. and M. JANOWITZ (1974) "Community attachment in mass society." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 39 (June): 322-339.
- KELLER, S. (1968) *The Urban Neighborhood*. New York: Random House.
- KUPER, L. (1953) *Living in Towns*. London: Cresset.

- LAUMAN, E. O. (1966) *Prestige and Association in an Urban Community*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- MARSHALL H. (1973) "Suburban life styles: a contribution to the debate," pp. 123-148 in C. H. Masotti and J. K. Hadden (eds.) *The Urbanization of the Suburbs*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- MAYO, J., Jr. (1979) "The effect of street form on suburban neighboring behavior." *Environment and Behavior* 10 (September): 375-397.
- McGAHAN, P. (1972) "The neighbor role and neighboring in a highly urban area." *Soc. Q.* 13 (Summer): 397-408.
- MICHAELSON, W. (1977) *Environmental Choice, Human Behavior and Residential Satisfaction*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- MOWRER, E. (1958) "The family in suburbia," pp. 147-164 in W. Dobriner (ed.) *The Suburban Community*. New York: G. P. Putnam.
- NAHARA, S. (1968) "Social context and neighborliness: the Negro in St. Louis," pp. 179-188 in S. Greer et al. (eds.) *The New Urbanization*. New York: Free Press.
- OLSON, P. (1982) "Urban neighborhood research: its development and current focus." *Urban Affairs Q.* 17 (June): 491-518.
- PERIN, C. (1977) *Everything in Its Place*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- PHILLIBER, W. (1976) "Prior training opportunity and vested interests as factors influencing neighborhood integration." *Pacific Soc. Rev.* 19 (April): 143-180.
- SAHA, L. (1975) "Primary kin support in crisis situations: friends and kin in Canberra suburbs." *Australian and New Zealand J. of Sociology* 11 (October): 18-24.
- SILVERMAN, C. J. (1983) "Neighbors and neighbors." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- SILVERMAN, C. J. (1986) "Neighboring: private lives and public roles." (unpublished)
- SMITH, R. (1975) "Measuring neighborhood cohesiveness: a review and some suggestions." *Human Ecology* 13: 143-160.
- SWEETZER, F. (1941) "Neighborhood acquaintance and association." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- TOMEH, A. (1964) "Informal group participation and residential patterns." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 70 (July): 28-35.
- TÖNNIES, F. (1887) *Community and Society* (C. P. Loomes, trans.). New York: Harper & Row.
- TSAI, Y. and L. SIGELMAN (1982) "The community question: a perspective from national survey data—the case of the U.S.A." *British J. of Sociology* 33 (December): 578-588.
- WARREN, D. I. (1977) "The functional diversity of urban neighborhoods." *Urban Affairs Q.* 13 (December): 151-179.
- WELLMAN, B. (1979) "The community question: the intimate networks of East Yorkers." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 84 (March): 1201-1231.
- ZITO, J. (1974) "Anonymity and neighboring in an urban high rise complex." *Urban Life and Culture* 3 (October): 243-263.

Carol J. Silverman is a Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley. She is currently studying condominium governance, looking especially at the importance of changing forms of property ownership upon local community.

