CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Urbanization has come to occupy an important place in the socio-economic development of the country. Urbanization and urban growth is a matter of great significance in developing countries as most of these countries are still at a low level of urbanization. Most of the world's economic and population growth is taking place in cities and, increasingly, many of the world's major challenges and problems have their loci in cities. Poverty, environmental degradation, lack of infrastructural facilities, local government management and access to land are primary areas of concern (Flood, 1997). Increasingly, the major opportunities and challenges of the world reside in the transformation of cities and human settlements. In 1950, the world's urban population was 737 million or 29 per cent of the total population; by 1995, it had increased to 2603 million or 45 per cent of the total population. Around two-thirds of total population increase in developing countries are currently absorbed in cities. UNCHS (1996) predicts that during the period 1990-2030, the population of urban areas will grow by about 3.3 billion, of which over 90 per cent will be in human settlement in developing countries. Cities have become synonymous with growth, and they are increasingly subject to dramatic crises, especially in developing countries (Flood, 1997). India has a tradition of urban living and town planning which dates back to five thousand years. According to Wirth (1938) a city can be defined and understood through size, density and heterogeneity of the population and this increase in size, density and heterogeneity of population which essentially gave rise to the urban way of life. But the cities in India have produced limited changes in the nature of housing pattern, interpersonal relations and social institutions. Sociologists and psychologists question whether urban life is inherently alienating as stated by Simmel, Park and Wirth (Milgram, 1970; Fischer, 1976; Karp et al., 1977; Lofland, 1973; Baum et al., 1978), but life has not necessarily become insecure. Social integration and psychological well being sustained even in the larger cities (Gans, 1962; Lewis, 1965; Wellman, 1979). Vast differential functions have not

taken place and the way of life has not changed markedly for many of the population groups. The city is a place that isolates people or integrates them; as a home for rich versus poor; and, most generally, as a good or a bad place to live (Sternlieb and Hughes, 1983).

The economic and social significance of housing has been studied by many American and European writers, but in India, however, fewer studies are carried out in this regard. Residence is an important feature of urban life. Cities and towns comprise of a variety of houses ranging between spacious dwellings of the rich and miserable areas of the poor. Housing is planned and non-speculative and provides minimum amenities of life such as adequate privacy, sunlight, windows, ventilation, isolation in times like maternity and sickness and sufficient place for children's play etc for comfortable stay. Ownership of a house is usually a major goal not only for the middle or low-income families but also of the wealthy. Housing plays a fundamental role in determining the social and economic well being of families (Rosenbaum, 1996). Ownership of house provides long and short term economic benefits and is often the family's principle source of wealth (Levy and Michel, 1991; Oliver and Shapiro, 1995). The importance of housing is revealed through the fact that even in low-income families, after food, housing is typically the largest item of household expenditure. Housing comprises a complex bundle of considerations including privacy, location and environmental amenities, symbolic characteristics and investment. It comprises physical shelter, broader residential setting and built residential environment that are concerned with diverse factors such as health, security, privacy, neighbourhood, social relations, status, common facilities and services, and control over the environment (Guhl, 1965; Rapoport, 1969; Cooper 1974; Foley, 1980; Adams, 1987). The term housing applies not only to the dwelling unit but to the characteristics of the surrounding area as well. The characteristics include social factors (the socioeconomic status of the neighbourhood) as well as physical conditions (trash or litter in the street or the presence of boarded-up or abandoned buildings) (Foley, 1980).

Urban people are more conscious and selective in the choice of residential area. Studies of cities in the United States, Latin America, and Europe have shown that the patterns of residential distribution differ among various socio-economic groups, presumably because of difference in ability to afford housing amenities and surroundings, prestige-maintenance pressures, cultural preferences, and discrimination (Mehta, 1986). In these days of high competition and scarcity of space, the urban man has lot of problems in identifying a desirable housing area.

The historical roots of housing preference lie deep all over the world and people of different social classes have different environmental need or preference. Studies related to housing preference in Australia, Britain, and United States, among people of all incomes and backgrounds, confirm this preference (Cooper, 1972). Michelson's (1968) study of apartment dwellers have discovered that they also tend to prefer private house as an ideal home setting. This kind of preference is not only that of middle-class persons but it is also the general acceptance of all people. A survey of urban people revealed that an overwhelming majority preferred to own single-family detached houses (Hinshaw & Allot, 1972). Life-cycle stage and life-style are the major factor in residential preference. Life-cycle stage, measured by both age and family status, life-style based on income, occupation, and education influence the quality of housing that a person will occupy. As an individual moves through the life cycle stage, frequent changes in residence type and location in accordance with changing needs is noted. According to Rossi (1955) an average family will move eight or nine times in lifetime. These moves are not predominantly income-related moves to houses in better environment, but five of the eight moves of the average family are related to the changing composition of the family. Urban residential location increasingly is chosen on the basis of identification with a life-style (Berry, 1973; Berry and Kasarda, 1977; Muller, 1981)

Lansing and Marans (1969) measured residents' satisfaction through three broad categories: physical appearance (e.g. housing style and condition, landscaping), social conditions (e.g. friendliness of neighbourhood, ethnic composition), and symbolic value (e.g. prestige and status of neighbourhood). Rooms per person is substitute for the feeling of pleasure and satisfaction a person gets from his housing (Campbell et al., 1976). Carp et al., (1976) identified degree and source of noise in the area, feelings of safety and convenience of transportation as factors in addition to Lansing and Marans method of evaluating their residential areas.

Housing is not only physical provision of a house for a family but also proper planning of houses in such a way that people residing as neighbours are able to build good and healthy neighbourhood ties. The people of a given area should be able to feel a sense of community life by establishing neighbourhood relations. Physical facilities which do not facilitate such neighbourhood relations or which hinder the emergence of neighbourhood community feelings may only develop houses without a sense of homeliness, and sense of belonging among the neighbours. People's impression of a prospective neighbourhood is important in their search for housing. Neighbourhood within a city achieves their compactness and isolation often because of different language, race or ethnic characteristics and sometimes occupational features and income. According to Fischer (1973) people tend to express more dissatisfaction with their communities if the community is larger. Most people expressed a desire to live outside of a metropolis but within community distance of it (Zuiches and Fuguilt, 1971).

Neighbourhood has been defined as a small community, common sharing of certain services and amenities and sufficient physical proximity to develop personal face-to-face relations. It refers to housing at the collective level. At its simplest, one's neighbourhood is the geographic space in which one feels at home. In other contexts, reference to one's neighbourhood may mean little more than the vicinity of one's house

that encompasses housing and persons of similar styles and life-styles. The operational use of this concept is closer to that of Glass (1950) and involves not simply a grouping of people in a unit convenient for certain services and amenities, but also as a unit small enough to encourage a neighbourhood spirit and at the same time large enough to be relatively self-contained. Neighbourhood is a physically well-defined entity, with a selection of lower-order amenities sufficient to satisfy the inhabitants whose interrelationships ensure social control and community feeling. Residential mobility is a key barrier to community level social organization (Shaw and McKay, 1942; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Kornhauser, 1978) and it increases institutional instability to find fewer opportunities for organizational contact (Kornhauser, 1978). Locality-based social networks and collective identity constitute the core social fabric of human communities (Hawley, 1950; Hunter, 1974).

Hunter (1979) refers to the neighbourhood as "a social or spatial unit of social organization...larger than a household and smaller than a city". A neighbourhood is basically a small, recognizable sub-unit of the city, existing between the individual house and the city as a whole. Milgram (1977) defined neighbourhood as an area of comfortable familiarity, noting that the farther you move from your home and toward the edges of your neighbourhood, the less familiar and certain the people and places become. Early works on neighbourhood as social entities began with Park and Burgess (1925) and McKenzie (1926) in their selection and study of "natural areas", parts of the city. According Lyon (1987) community is study of people living in and identifying with a particular place and to give special attention to the type, quality and basis of their interaction. According to John et al., (1986) neighbourhood is intermediate between the local community and the block as a frame of reference and is most likely to be the object of urban residents attention. The urban neighbourhoods and rural or suburban villages are really not greatly different. Urban neighbourhood is a place where comfort, closeness and security can be found (Gans, 1962b).

Taylor (1982) and Popenoe (1973) have described the urban neighbourhood as serving some functions and needs:

- Social interaction: as a place to find friendship and support.
- Social control: as a place in which residents see that others adhere to locally accepted norms.
- A sense of security and ease: as place where fear and threat are minimised.
- Organisational ties: as a place for shared participation, both formally and informally.
- A sense of collective identity: as a place of symbolic attachment.
- Socialization: as a focus for parent-child and child-to-child interaction.

The neighbourhood has been seen as distinct entity consisting of a variable number of residential units and a selection of low-order facilities such as grocery stores, post offices, schools, and parks. Local residents make use of these day-to-day shopping, educational and leisure facilities, although for less frequent higher-order services such as department stores, cinema halls, and play grounds, they must go beyond the neighbourhood. The ethnic, cultural, and social characteristics of the neighbourhood are such that the inhabitants share a common set of standards. This, together with their use of local facilities promotes a psychological unity whereby neighbourhood inhabitants feel they belong together and to the area. This socially and psychologically united group inhabits an area that is marked off from the rest of the city by distinct, clearly recognized boundaries. The neighbourhood is thus both a formal entity (a physical unit) and a functional entity (a social unit).

The neighbourhood is the general area in which neighbouring take place between resident neighbours. Neighbourliness implies an actor, or role (the neighbour), an activity (neighbouring), and a geographic space (neighbourhood). Neighbours are persons who live in close spatial proximity to one's housing. They must be distinguished from both kin and friends. Considerable research on neighbourhoods has pointed out that neighbours

may often include kin. Neighbours may also be friends, and in general friends may be distinguished from neighbours. With kin the individual has a relationship prescribed by society and the relationship is through blood or marriage. Friendship involves a chosen relationship. The relationship with neighbours is neither prescribed nor chosen but occurs because of spatial proximity and moving away terminates it (Young and Willmot, 1962). The neighbouring role may necessitate close interpersonal association (Keller, 1968), but it is a mistake to ignore the physical proximity of neighbourhood residents as a factor that facilitates their incorporation into a friendship group. Selecting a friend is among the most personal of human choices and thus it is not surprising that friendship groups tend toward social class homogeneity (Huckfeldt, 1983). According to Fischer (1982) urban friendships were more spatially dispersed, but they did not seem to be lacking in quality. Franck (1980) pointed out that the process of friendship formation in the city took longer duration and involved more difficulty than the same process in the small town.

Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) gave evidence that urban friendships were somewhat more extensive and the urbanites' memberships in formal organizations seemed to foster greater numbers of friends and acquaintances while Huckfeldt (1983) suggests that urban neighbourhoods are place for neighbourly relations but not as a place for forming friendships. According to Sutcliffe and Crabbe (1963), when degrees of friendship are distinguished, one finds difference in the incidence of `best friends', but the latter is alternatively low and high as one moves from area to area from the center of a city to its rural environs. Number or qualities of friendships or other relations have generally shown no difference between urban people (Reiss, 1959; Key, 1968; Swedner, 1960, Crow, 1978). Social homogeneity of the respondent's friendship groups and physical proximity are important to establish friendship group construction. Social class content of friendship group is influenced by associational opportunities and constraints imposed by the neighbourhood social context (Huckfeldt, 1983). It is generally assumed that the quality of interpersonal relationships varies with different forms of social

organization found in rural and urban communities. Social context is likely to affect other interactions as well (Sprague, 1982). Social content of social networks is not solely a function of either the social context or individual choice; it is the complexity of individual preferences operating within the boundaries of a social context (Huckfeldt, 1983).

Neighbouring is an activity in the neighbourhood. In many residential areas it may consist of greeting to neighbours and this has the effect of maintaining privacy when there is a neighbour. Extreme concentration of disadvantage in some neighbourhoods creates a distinctly different social-structural milieu i.e., high degree of social isolation from mainstream society (Wilson, 1987). In high activity neighbourhoods neighbours exchange information and help, including borrowing things or sharing dishes etc. Neighbouring activity is frequently high at times of crisis, such as death, a fire, or the need for collective action. According to Thompson (1954),"neighbours take care of the children and sick people ...or offer to lend or give anything they possessed". O'Neil (1979) found that different types of people are more likely to be involved in neighbours and neighbouring. Neighbours play a significant role in childcare among single parents and are more important to low-income than high-income families (Lewis, 1978; Korte, 1983). According to Fischer (1982) in non-urban areas, marriage, parental responsibility and ownership of house serve to tie people to their communities, resulting in greater contact between neighbours. Sutcliffe and Crabbe (1963) gave evidence on the quality of urban contacts by number of contacts, various kinds of relationships to give some hint on their meaning and function. City residents are not likely to volunteer help unless asked. The motto for many urbanites seems to be "Nothing ventured, nothing lost" (Goffman, 1971). Research on Hong Kong apartment dwellers found that household crowding led to less entertaining of neighbours (Mitchell, 1971) and Baum and Epstein (1978) reported that residential group size was negatively related to social interaction. On the other hand, results of micro-studies and the speculations of urban theorists highlight that high residential density would be associated with fewer and less intimate local ties and less

friendliness toward strangers (Baldassare, 1979). He also suggests that socio-demographic factors are more important determinants of neighbourhood attitudes and local ties. Lack of community ties in dense areas will have fewer people desiring to improve their neighbourhood relationships and feel crowded and want more open space (Baldassare, 1979). According to Kandel (1978) similarity is an important predictor of likability for interpersonal attraction.

Keller's (1968) study implies that the neighbouring activity can be measured with the following dimensions.

⊃ Content: Neighbouring may involve help in crisis situations, from borrowing a utensil to helping fight a fire. Information is also exchanged, especially regarding common problems such as garbage disposal, bus facility etc.

⊃ Priority: In rural areas neighbours appear to be less important than relatives, but more important than friends. With urbanization kinship remains important, but friends replace neighbours as sources of help and information.

⊃ Formality: With increasing urbanization, the formality of the relationship declines.

⊃ Range and depth: Most urban dwellers do not know many neighbours, and rarely know these intimately.

⊃ Contact frequency: The frequency of contact is less in urban settings than in rural areas.

⊃ Locale: Contact may take place in the home, in the street, or in some community facility such as a school or neighbourhood association.

According to Wirth (1938) city is characterised by segmental division of human relationships. It consists of so many diverse people living together, it is impossible to know others as `whole persons'. Therefore relationships with faceless people become superficial, anonymous, transitory and city people come to look on others as means to their own ends, rather than as individuals. The forces of urbanism weaken community

kinship and friendship bonds, social participation in local affairs and affectional ties for the community (Wirth, 1938; Fischer, 1977; 1982). Fischer (1981a) found that urbanism does not impair personal relations. In contrast to the arguments of the Wirthian school, urbanism does not produce estrangement from close associates, or from familiar groups such as neighbours (Fischer, 1981b). It is demonstrated that although the reactions of city people to strangers in public are clearly indicative of a desire to avoid contact, relations among acquaintances and friends are highly similar in city and town (McCauley and Taylor, 1976; McCauley et al., 1978). Krupat (1985) proposes that urbanites' relationships are casual, transitory and superficial, that true friendships are not to be found in the city. Lyn (1973) pointed out that the urban world is full of strangers. Almost all of the people we meet every day on the street are not known to us, and generally we make no effort to enter into relationships with them or even to acknowledge them as people rather than objects.

William's (1968) study indicates that there is a consistent and significant decrease in contact with neighbours and a similar increase in contact with people at work as community size increases. According to Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) increased size and density are the primary factors that influence social behaviour and length of residence is the key factor that influences attitudes and behaviour toward community. In Fischer's (1984) view, the urban scene emphasizes the similarities among groups of people rather than their differences. He points out that in the city people with whole range of characteristics, interests, values and skills are far more likely than country dwellers to find other who are similar to themselves. He further explains that the person is more of a support seeker than an information processor and happiness is measured by networks of others who provide support and comfort. Zweig (1962) in his study graded the intensity of neighbouring in Britain from highest in villages, through moderate levels in old-established working-class areas in cities, to lowest in new subdivisions, especially where the houses were owner occupied. There is no significant influence on contacts with

relatives, neighbours and non-local friends due to size of community. Moreover, age, education and size of community of origin tended to be slightly better predictors than size of current community of residence for all the contact types (Glenn and Hill, 1977). There is no overall pattern of differences in contact between rural and urban people (Reiss, 1959).

Urbanites are less involved with their neighbours than people in smaller places (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Fischer et al., 1977; Tsai and Sigelman, 1982; Fischer, 1982). City dwellers tend to be less helpful than small-town residents (Korte, 1978) and small town people are friendlier than city people (Louis Harris Associates, 1978). Milgram (1970) argues that size affects relationship through a very different mechanism. In contrast Fischer (1984) argues that presence of greater number of people in the city and equated numbers with similarities, possibilities and opportunities develop relationships. According to Duncan (1957) population characteristics associated with size should have implication for the style of life and the nature of interactions. Residents of various types of neighbourhoods, including suburban localities and inner cities adapt to their environment and develop ties with the neighbourhood (Gans, 1967; Suttles, 1968). Tsai and Sigelman (1982) measured neighbouring by the frequency of spending a social evening with neighbours while Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) measured by the number of friends in the neighbourhood. McGahan (1972) measured neighbouring by whether the respondent had friends in the building, went for social events with neighbours, talked with neighbours about personal problems and borrowed from neighbours. According to Silverman (1986) people living in homogeneous areas may become involved with neighbours as an easily available source of companionship, as a result neighbouring becomes a matter of individual choice with constraints rather than given members of an interconnected group. According to him neighbours are those who live close to the private space of the home, share residential boundaries and know a good deal about a person's life. Krupat (1985) suggest that city people desire contact with others so that they may share feelings, provide and receive support and engage in joint activities. Urban

17

people do not seem to have any fewer or any less satisfying attachments than people who live elsewhere, they continue to rely strongly on members of the immediate family, although extended family ties seem to be weakened in the city, largely because of spatial separation and the existence of alternative kinds of bonding material and they rely on neighbours for friendship and support (Krupat, 1985).

Home ownership and length of residence are important positive predictors of the level of social participation. Race, length of residence, social networks and ownership of house influence social participation in the locality which in turn influences attachment to the neighbourhood (Hunter, 1974; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Newman and Duncan, 1979; Sampson, 1988; Austin and Baba, 1990). Fear of crime appears to have negative consequences for community collective attachment and community residential stability have significant effects on social participation (Sampson, 1988). While social participation varies by individual, it also varies across space and time (Hawley, 1950; Choldin, 1984). Goud's (1977) study depicts that friends and other residents of the community are the strong predictors of community attachment. Those who live longer in the neighbourhood are more likely to participate in informal social activities. Social participation, satisfaction with neighbourhood environment quality and satisfaction with safety and security influences neighbourhood attachment (Berry and Kasarda, 1977; Austin and Baba, 1990). According to Sampson (1988), important social forces that undermine an individuals integration into the local community are not urbanization or the compositional factors (social class) but systemic factors such as residential mobility and sparse friendship ties and anticipated other factors (Fischer, 1982; Skogan, 1986) and attenuated collective attachment (Hunter, 1974; Christenson, 1983). Age, race, home ownership, housing satisfaction and sociable neighbourhood influences neighbourhood satisfaction (Marans and Rodgers, 1975; Ladewig and McCann, 1980; Goudy, 1982; Barresi et al., 1984; Cook, 1988; Austin and Baba, 1990). According to Lee and Guest (1983), greater the proportion of residents dissatisfied with their own house; or

perception of environmental conditions, inadequacy of local safety or availability of public school, lower the level of neighbourhood satisfaction. Upkeep of dwellings and other environmental concerns, such as crowding and the existence of trees, appear to have an impact on satisfaction with the environment of the neighbourhood (Miller, Tsemberis and Malia, 1980). Socioeconomic status have positive relationship with satisfaction of the neighbourhood security and safety which in turn influences the neighbourhood sentiment (John and Clark, 1984b). Many researchers found that community satisfaction can be predicted by looking at concrete matters such as the evaluation of specific municipal services, as well as at more abstractly defined issues, such as optimism about the community. It is inappropriate to use objective criteria applicable to all environments as indicators of neighbourhood satisfaction (Marans and Rodgers, 1975; Campbell, Converse and Rodgers, 1976; Adrews and Withey, 1976; Campbell, 1981). Neighbourhood satisfaction is based on subjective perception and it is possible for satisfaction to vary among people in similar residential environment and for people in dissimilar environments to have similar levels of satisfaction (Marans and Rodgers, 1975; Campbell, 1981). Attachment to friends and relatives in the neighbourhood is the major source for neighbourhood satisfaction (Fried and Gleicher, 1961; Gans, 1962; Suttles, 1968; Young and Wilmott, 1957). Middle-income people with children are believed to value residential environment that facilitates childrearing (neighbourhood school quality, property upkeep and racial homogeneity) while upper-income people are concerned with the exclusiveness of the physical environment, as these characteristics are symbols of socioeconomic status (Muller, 1981). John and Clark (1986) found that satisfaction depends upon the neighbourhood quality (child-oriented characteristics of neighbourhood and local orientation of the neighbourhood).

Resident's perception of neighbourhood quality varies greatly according to conditions in both the physical and the social environment. Satisfaction also depends upon perception at both individual level and group level value-systems. Perceptions of good neighbours are related to satisfaction with the neighbourhood (Michelson, 1970).

Several studies have linked neighbourhood satisfaction to environmental variables. Neighbourhood satisfaction also varies in relation to service provision. Sanoff and Sawhney (1972) found that good services and fire protection are more important attributes of neighbourhood quality than architectural features such as play areas, landscaping, and design for physical privacy. Satisfaction can be predicted by looking at concrete matters such as the evaluation of specific municipal services, as well as at more abstract optimism about the community. Most persons preferred housing arrangements involving single-family dwellings and individual satisfaction with dwelling was associated with level of satisfaction with neighbourhood. Satisfaction with the neighbourhood also includes ethnic, income, and house type. It also includes the perceived friendliness of neighbours, safety, attractiveness, and suitability for rearing children. Lee (1968) suggests that the length of residence, age, house-type, location of work, and number of children determine an individual's involvement in the neighbourhood. People with young children are likely to have strong commitments to the appearance and the safety of the neighbourhood because it affects opportunities for sociability (Krupat, 1985). The quality of local facilities for recreation and education is likely to be of great interest, enough to lead these people into active involvement and community-based political activity (Krupat, 1985).

According to John and Clark (1986) preference of neighbourhood resulted in preference for the availability of a wide range of social and instrumental activities in the neighbourhood, preference for a safe and secure living environment and preference for the availability of activities for children. Individual preference and actions are influenced through social interaction and it is structured by the social composition of the relevant environment (Huckfeldt, 1983).

Although traditional neighbourhoods were a normal element of urban structure, social, technological and political changes have brought about the decline of the neighbourhood as a vital force in the life of the individual. Since the time, urban values,

notably with both spatial and social mobility, absorbed not only urban dwellers but also residents of rural areas. Increased literacy, television, and transportation have promoted this trend. Riemer (1950) stated that the development of mass automobile use has liberated urban man from the local area and made possible the existence of many other settings for face-to-face contacts. Moreover traditional life-styles associated with occupational, ethnic and racial groups have been greatly broken down. The traditional occupational hierarchy has been blurred with the disappearance of a strong relationship between income and type of work.

Social and institutional changes have also removed the activity of the neighbourhood. Increasing independence among young people and the related decline in importance of the joint/extended family as a primary group have brought changes in the neighbourhood activity. At the institutional level, the spread of service industries and public welfare facilities has reduced the need for neighbouring activities. It is possible to conclude that the traditional neighbourhood with high levels of mutual help and information sharing remains today only in certain circumstances and places. Hence the present study attempts to find the housing pattern and neighbourhood activity in the urban setting which portrays the urbanism.