

Recent decades have witnessed the growth of urban America and the transformation of the neighborhood, its smallest form of community. This article is an assessment of the literature on urban neighborhoods that explores (1) the principal themes in the literature, (2) the problems and limitations posed by this literature, and (3) the major contributions of these studies and their bearing on an agenda for future research. This assessment points up the processes of change and differentiation occurring in the local community and its underlying persistence. As a more open system than in the past, the neighborhood mirrors the fluidity, growth, and social class differentiation wrought by the larger society. Generalizations of urban neighborhood conditions are no longer possible, and the newer typologies reflect this diversity. The key issues are the understanding of the persistence of the local community and the factors contributing to its differentiation.

# URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD RESEARCH Its Development and Current Focus

PHILIP OLSON

University of Missouri—Kansas City

**The present century** has seen both the growth and dismantling of the urban community, beginning with the rapid growth from European immigrants in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and followed by the simultaneous post-World War II exodus to the suburbs of white families and immigration to the city of rural blacks and Chicanos. During this span, the central city flourished and sociologists were understandably fascinated with its diversity, complexity, and extremes. The paramount

---

*AUTHOR'S NOTE: A somewhat different version of this article was presented at the 75th annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 27-31, 1980, in New York City. I would like to acknowledge advice and comments from Wendell Bell, Albert Hunter, Morris Janowitz, Lyn Lofland, Gerald Suttles, and Edward Shils on an earlier version of this article.*

URBAN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY, Vol. 17 No. 4, June 1982 491-518  
© 1982 Sage Publications, Inc.

example was, of course, Robert Park and his students in the 1920s and 1930s. A rich legacy of urban ethnography of Chicago remains, augmented by subsequent generations of his students, who spread themselves out to other metropolitan areas. During this time, the city grew in size and complexity, increasing the diversity and presence of residential communities and aggravating disorder through the inevitable conflicts arising from the entry of diverse cultural groups into a physical and economic system where they faced severe competition and threats to their new and old culture. But the city continued to grow in its multiple communities and neighborhoods, new replacing old, segregating those who were wealthy from those who were poor.

Prompted by the incivilities of the city—crime, litter, noise, congestion, and deterioration of older structures—and fueled by increased incomes, autos, and larger families, urbanites began abandoning the central city after World War II in extraordinary numbers. This was not by itself a new phenomenon, dating back at least to the 1890s (in 1925, Harlan Douglass wrote *The Suburban Trend* and, in 1928, Christine Frederick challenged the ideology of suburban life in “Is Suburban Living a Delusion?” published in the New York weekly, *The Outlook*), but its effect on the structure and demography of central cities was not evident until the postwar years.

The aftermath of the suburban exodus was a further restructuring of social life, leading toward increased segregation along both ethnic and class lines, as the upwardly mobile, white educated families moved to the suburbs, leaving behind a large, deteriorating housing stock, some of which became crowded apartments and rooms for poorer ethnics and some of which became idle. Community forms changed; urban neighborhoods changed. Perhaps it is accurate to say there was a decline in the number of neighborhoods and in their strength as objects of community attachment. The small corner grocery and other retail outlets gave way to supermarkets and shopping centers in many cities, thus diminishing the networks of local information and interaction fostered by such local establishments. Dramatic and frequent cases of vandalism, arson, street crime, and other forms of anarchistic behavior further aggravated the disaffection with city life and the abandonment of neighborhoods.

We seem now to have entered yet another stage in metropolitan growth: the beginning of revitalization of the central city, that is, the renewal of neighborhoods and the housing stock, prompted by a slowing of the exodus to the suburbs, the choice of many young,

childless couples and singles to remain in the central city, and the movement back to the city of suburbanites whose children are grown. Together these and other factors have prompted a renewed interest in the urban neighborhood, especially, as the smallest unit within which to mount a social and physical renewal of the central city (Guttman and Popenoe, 1970; Cunningham, 1965; Hunter, 1979; Neighborhood Diversity, 1977). The 1970s witnessed a tide of social activism at the neighborhood level and federal urban policy has become tied to the concept of community (including neighborhood) development, although school busing has undermined this attempt at restrengthening the neighborhood.

It is, thus, important and appropriate to undertake an assessment of what is known about neighborhoods in American metropolises and, from this assessment, to examine both the limitations and contributions for understanding urban processes and social integration in American society. (Although there are several good studies of urban neighborhoods outside the United States that offer insights into local communal processes (Dore, 1958; Lee, 1968; Bott, 1957; Carlson, 1978, Durant, 1968; Pfeil, 1968; Timms, 1971), it is not possible to integrate them into a general statement about urban neighborhoods. Thus, this article will focus only on American society.) This article, which attempts such an assessment, is organized into three sections: (1) the principal themes of the urban neighborhood literature; (2) the problems and limitations posed by this literature; and (3) the major contributions these studies have made, from which an agenda for future research, understanding, and public policy can be built. Underlying this review and analysis is a basic sociological matter—the search for sources of social integration in the large-scale society (Shils, 1975; Landecker, 1951). This assessment leads to the conclusion that, despite extraordinary social change in the society, the local community persists and its residents identify alternative ways to relate to the larger society. Neighborhood differentiation is the adaptive mechanism which leads to these alternative responses and thus helps explain the residents' integration into the larger society.

### **THE PRINCIPAL THEMES OF URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD RESEARCH**

The study of neighborhoods has preoccupied sociologists as far back as the turn of the century when four studies directed attention to this

form of territorially organized social life: Jones (1904), Woolston (1909), Cooley (1909), and Galpin (1915). Both Jones and Woolston were students of Franklin Giddings at Columbia University and did community-type studies in Manhattan. Although their works remain obscure, they nevertheless mirror the theme of later (and more well-known) studies: the presence of neighborhoods, a sense of community, and, at the same time, a sense of isolation and detachment among the immigrant members of these neighborhoods who compared their American urban experiences with their past community attachments in their rural homelands (see also Woolston, 1938; Pratt 1911). Although Cooley did not do empirical research on neighborhoods, as had Jones and Woolston, he considered the neighborhood as one of the three (the other two were family and local children's groups) principal forms of social organization exemplifying the "primary group" in society. This conception of the smallest of local units has remained a significant influence on subsequent research on the neighborhood. Galpin (1915), in his empirical study of rural communities in Wisconsin, identified the spatial communities that transformed the countryside from uncharted terrain into meaningful social networks. He thus laid the groundwork for the theoretical and empirical connections between locality and social organization. Indeed, rural sociologists, since Galpin's work, have been heavily preoccupied with the form and characteristics of neighborhoods (e.g., Terpenning, 1931; Zimmerman and Sorokin, 1929; Brunner, 1927). As later sociologists moved to clarify the nature of urban neighborhoods, they often used these early rural studies as their point of departure.

The principal intellectual influence on the study of urban community forms—including neighborhoods—was Robert E. Park, who, building on the work of W. I. Thomas (1966), wrote:

In the course of time every section and quarter of the city takes on something of the character and qualities of its inhabitants. Each separate part of the city is inevitably stained with the peculiar sentiments of its population. The effect of this is to convert what was at first a mere geographical expression into a neighborhood, that is to say, a locality with sentiments, traditions, and a history of its own. . . . Proximity and neighborly contact are the basis of the simplest and most elementary form of association with which we have to do in the organization of city life. . . . In the social and political organization of the city it is the smallest local unit [1915: 579-580].

This classic essay set the agenda for two decades of urban research and directly spawned such neighborhood studies as those by Elmer (1914),

Kennedy (1914), Young (1918), McKenzie (1923), Conway (1926), Wirth (1928), Zorbaugh (1929), and Roper (1935). In addition, the collection of essays by Park and Burgess (1925) touched frequently on the urban community and its smallest urban social form, the neighborhood. Indeed, they viewed the neighborhood as a form of community and were, in a larger sense, interested in the variety of forms the human community took in the metropolis. As their students fanned out in the city, their research explored the wide range of community types located there. Clearly, Park and his colleague, Burgess, were influenced in their conceptualization of the neighborhood and community by the early work of both Cooley (1909) and Galpin (1915). In fact, Martindale (1958), in his introduction to Weber's essay, "The City," identifies the probable influence of Galpin's work on Park's conception of the community. This strand of influence appears in Park's (1952) ecological portrayal of community as a symbiotic system of spatial patterning governed by unconscious impersonal forces. This purely ecological perspective, characteristic of Park's earlier work, gave way to a more fully developed conception of community as having a social organization and thus allowed for his conception of neighborhood as a social, not ecological, unit.

This distinction—between ecological factors and dimensions of social organization—is important in clarifying the differences between the urban community and the urban neighborhood. Whereas the urban community represents ecological considerations of human life, particularly the social space involved in the daily transactions of sustenance, the urban neighborhood represents the patterns of social organization (located in residential areas) focused on day-to-day activities.

From the work of Park and Burgess, and subsequently their students, came a flow of studies on urban neighborhoods encompassing ultimately much more than their early focus. Five themes can be identified in the literature, spanning the period 1915 to 1978; each corresponds approximately to a time period and, as they are presented here in chronological sequence, provide both a history of the development of the study of urban neighborhoods and an inventory of the major theoretical and empirical contributions to our understanding of this dimension of urban community. These themes are: the neighborhood as (1) a form of social organization, (2) an ideology, (3) a determinant of behavior, (4) a consequence of social organization, and (5) a social network.

A recent body of literature has attempted to synthesize knowledge about the urban neighborhood and, by constructing typologies, con-

stitutes an important contribution to our understanding. This literature, although not equatable to the five themes, needs to be considered in this assessment of the literature and will be addressed in this section.

### THE NEIGHBORHOOD AS A FORM OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

The very earliest of urban neighborhood studies focused on the patterns of social life and characteristics of residents living within bounded territories in the city (Young, 1918; McKenzie, 1923; Wirth, 1928; Zorbaugh, 1929; McClenahan, 1929; Roper, 1935). It was a central theme of such studies that patterns of interaction arose from propinquity and commonality of life style, ethnic culture, religion, and social class. In some cases, a conceptual distinction was made between those who interact with others in the same locale (neighbors) and those who do not (nigh-dwellers). (McClenahan, 1929, uses these terms specifically, but others identify the same distinction—Zorbaugh, 1929; Heberle, 1969; Queen and Thomas, 1939.)

The concept, natural area, was used by Park and Burgess (1925) to categorize sections of the city having common lifestyles, cultural types, and identifiable boundaries. Park conceived of the natural area as the result of rapid growth of the urban center: "One of the incidents of the growth of the community is the social selection and segregation of the population, and the creation, on the one hand, of natural social groups, and on the other, of natural areas. . . . Natural areas are the habitats of natural groups" (Park, 1926: 8, 11).

Burgess (1925), particularly, was interested in the role of neighborhoods as ameliorative and saw them functioning to provide a means of social control—that is, a common culture, a public opinion, and a set of norms—within the heterogeneous complex of the city. The basis for such control resided in the commonality of values among residents and the patterns of social interaction. Together with Park, he conceived of the urban neighborhood as representing the reconstruction of social groups emerging out of a very rapidly changing metropolitan milieu characterized by high rates of mobility. Samuel Kincheloe (1938), a student of Burgess, in his book on the urban church, identified what he called "the new local community." He meant the locality unit that was being debased by the forces of urbanism. But unlike Burgess, Kincheloe envisioned the church as being the ameliorative agent in reconstructing the neighborhood.

Other studies, such as McKenzie's (1923), attempted to determine the extent to which territories within the city did, in fact, exhibit neighborhood characteristics. By defining the neighborhood as, "a patch of common life within the larger community" (1923: 352), he found that some areas did have a common life while others did not. The major factors accounting for the formation of a territory as a neighborhood were common economic conditions, lifestyle, values, and institutions such as schools, churches, clubs, stores, and taverns. Implicitly, all the early studies focused on these variables as the central elements of community. In fact, the neighborhood was viewed as a constituent subcommunity within the city, lacking only the economic functions normally associated with a community.

Taken as a whole, these early studies offer little systematic knowledge about the generic properties of the urban neighborhood as a form of social organization, although they do provide historical and ethnographic data about the city. They were, however, a point of departure for later work which focused more rigorously on the social properties of this form of urban community. More recent works have combined subsequent knowledge of social organization, ecology, small group dynamics, and social structure with urban ethnography (Whyte, 1943; Gans, 1962; Liebow, 1967; Suttles, 1968; Kornblum, 1974; Guterbock, 1980) and have treated territorially bounded cultural groups as communities.

### THE NEIGHBORHOOD AS AN IDEOLOGY

Tangential to the mainstream of American urban sociology, but influential in the development of the importance of the neighborhood as a social unit, were social reformers of the early part of this century, and somewhat later, urban planners.

The social reformers were both journalists and social activists—they envisioned the urban neighborhood as a vital link in the chain of political units, extending from the individual to the larger society, characteristic of democracy. Such works as John Daniels's (1920) *America Via the Neighborhood* and Robert Woods's (1923) *The Neighborhood in Nation Building* epitomized the view that strong neighborhoods were central to a strong democracy and, in turn, constructive to social reform, especially in aiding the poor. Said Woods, "The specific and determined attack—on the basis of accurate, point-

by-point neighborhood acquaintance with facts—upon the sources of physical and moral degeneracy is today one of the new and poignant interests of the settlement [house]” (1923: 119). Mary Follett (1918) in *The New State* discusses at length the role of the neighborhood in mobilizing citizens for involvement in the national political system. Small wonder these ideologies spilled over into schools of social work and became a focal point of training and practice. In Chicago, Jane Addams’s Hull House and Sophonisba Breckinridge and Edith Abbott’s Chicago School of Civics & Philanthropy (later the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration) both practiced and studied the neighborhood process. Indeed, the first field studies of neighborhoods in Chicago came out of these two organizations before Park arrived in Chicago. However, their strongly ideological underpinnings and their attempt to focus on practical uses of information for settlement house workers made the studies of little sociological value and they remain artifacts of social history. The journal *Neighborhood: A Settlement Quarterly*, official organ of the National Federation of Settlements, epitomized the blending of the social welfare and political orientation. Published for only five years, it served as the vehicle for promulgating the positive value of strong neighborhoods and the important role settlement houses played in them. Thus, an editorial in one issue states in part, “We must stand by our neighborhoods until the neighbors, together with the politicians and the office holders, have learned how to achieve the good life” (“Editorial,” 1928: 35).

Greatly inspired by the poetic appeals and tangible efforts of social reformers, Clarence Perry (1929) proposed a physical scheme for an ideal neighborhood. Attributing only qualitative significance to the term *neighborhood*, due to its lack of physical boundaries, he based his idea of community on economic, cultural, and racial factors. He advocated the neighborhood’s role in society as ameliorative in two ways. First, the neighborhood serves as an aid in facilitating age transactions throughout the life of citizens. As he explains, “It is one of the outstanding advantages of modern civilization that people can now find a type of home especially adapted to that stage in life in which they happen to be” (Perry, 1929: 25). Second, the neighborhood plays a critical role in maintaining a stability and moral fiber among societal members, especially the youth. In order to have the proper values and morals internalized within a child, the primary group with which he interacts must display and reinforce such ideals. According to Perry, the neighborhood was the essential arena for this socialization.

The urban planners’ interest in the neighborhood first appeared in the literature in the 1940s (Isaacs, 1948, 1948a; Bauer, 1945). It was an

outcry from those planners who pointed to the fact that planned neighborhoods were becoming economically and racially segregated. As stated by Bauer (1945: 105), "for the past generation practically every effort in the field of city planning and housing, whether profit-minded or welfare-minded, has been pushing us toward enormous one-class dormitory developments as completely separated from one another, and from work places, as possible." Isaacs (1948a: 21), in a somewhat more direct attack on the traditional planning approach and its view that homogeneous neighborhoods provide a sound base for political participation, states, "It is quite apparent, however, that the efforts to develop neighborhood cells within the city structure results, psychologically, only in causing people to look and think introvertedly within the relatively narrow confines of their neighborhood and not to the purposes and well-being of the town or metropolitan area."

The ideologies of these planners kept them from understanding some of the social realities of the urban neighborhood. For example, the working classes have nearly always lived near their places of work whereas the middle and upper-middle classes have usually lived apart from their employment. Attempts to offset the misinformation of planners about social organization have been made by Dewey (1950) and more recently by Bacon (1968) and Keller (1966, 1968) by bringing sociological knowledge into the planning process, into social work practice (Fellin and Litwak, 1968), and into the Great Society era (Davies, 1966; Frederickson, 1973; Litwak and Meyer, 1974; Morris and Hess, 1975; O'Brien, 1972; Philippi and Luenberger, 1977; Yates, 1973).

There are two senses in which this ideological theme is intertwined with the sociology of urban neighborhoods. First, the literature on the neighborhood as a determinant of behavior (discussed below) touches on the issue of the neighborhood as a unit of social control, that is, as an instrumentality in regulating the behavior of its residents. To the extent that the residential collectivity functions to maintain social order and normative standards among its members, it can be conceptualized as a type of social organization that manages the social welfare of its members and ensures their collective voice in the politics of the larger community (Maccoby et al., 1958; Janowitz and Suttles, 1978). We can, of course, recognize that the neighborhood simply provides satisfaction to those who live there, quite apart from any links to the larger community.<sup>1</sup>

Second, a fundamental sociological issue emerges as a result of aggregating the urban neighborhood studies—the consequences of societal change for the survival of the locality group. This issue implicitly deals with the deteriorating quality of life in cities and

especially as that deterioration accrues from the breakdown of social attachments located in neighborhoods. The discussion of this theme, in the concluding section of this article, will examine the changing nature of the neighborhood and its relation to the more theoretical problem of social integration.

### THE NEIGHBORHOOD AS A DETERMINANT OF BEHAVIOR

Beginning in the post-World War II period, neighborhood studies took on the character of the then-new sociological approach—quantitative data analysis, hypothesis testing, and middle-range theorizing in contrast to the earlier ethnographic studies, which were interested in descriptive analysis and conceptual clarification. In the postwar era, the neighborhood became an independent variable in hypotheses linking a wide range of behavior to the locality unit. Social area analysis (Shevky and Bell, 1955) was the dominant example of this new approach. Using urban census tracts as an approximation of neighborhoods, one could easily construct indices of neighborhood types and then explore how each type correlates with formal social participation, crime rates, informal social participation (neighboring), and youth behavior (e.g., Bell and Boat, 1957; Bell and Force, 1956; Greer, 1956). Other studies not using social area analysis have examined the neighborhood as a variable affecting social deviance (Maccoby et al., 1958; Riemer, 1951; Reiss and Rhodes, 1961; Kobrin, 1958; Alissi, 1970), educational aspirations (Wilson, 1959; Turner, 1964; Smith et al., 1954; Sewell and Armer, 1966; Axelrod, 1956; Tomeh, 1964), social identity (Useem et al., 1960), and social stratification (Hesslink, 1970). Another stream of literature has explored how neighborhoods, crowding, and other spatial arrangements affect attitudes, perception, and behavior of residents (Choldin, et al., 1975; McKay, 1949; R. Moore, 1974; Sanoff, 1970; W. Moore, 1969; Coleman, 1978; Marshall, 1972; Mauer and Baxter, 1972). And the neighborhood contributes to political participation and membership in voluntary organizations (Babchuck and Edwards, 1965; Kornblum, 1974; Janowitz and Suttles, 1978). Because the neighborhood is but one in the matrix of variables making up the research design of these studies, it is difficult to distill from the literature generalizable conclusions about the nature of the urban neighborhood. We can conclude, however, that such locality units do indeed exist and do contribute to our understanding of urban behavior. By the nature of

such studies, it is not to be expected that they can be aggregated to provide a composite of the urban neighborhood.

### **THE NEIGHBORHOOD AS A CONSEQUENCE OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION**

There has been substantial interest in understanding the nature of the neighborhood as a form of social organization and its relation to the larger metropolitan community. From this view, the neighborhood becomes the dependent variable, and these studies have sought to explain the presence or persistence of neighborhoods or to explore the social processes that constitute neighborhoods, such as neighboring or the presence of locality attachments. Mobility (Festinger, et al., 1950; Caplow and Forman, 1950), city size (Key, 1965), length of residence and prior socialization (Philliber, 1976), the ecology of housing (Zito, 1974), local versus cosmopolitan orientation of residents (Hesslink, 1970), highway construction (Burkhardt, 1971; Hill and Frankland, 1967; McLein and Adkins, 1971), social interaction (Deutcheberger, 1946; Deveraux, 1960; Fried and Gleicher, 1961; MacDonald, 1974; Reed, 1974; Shuval, 1956; Key, 1965; Warren and Warren, 1976), and presence of local facilities (Foley, 1950, 1952; Litwak and Szelenyi, 1969; Nohara, 1968; Hunter, 1975; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974) have been isolated as variables contributing to neighborhood persistence and change.

The theme of the urban neighborhood as a form of community within the larger city recurs in this period, as does the interest in social integration and local attachments. A number of full ethnographies attest to the complexities of social life in the smallest form of urban social organization (Gans, 1962; Suttles, 1968; Liebow, 1967; Warren, 1975; Whyte, 1945). And, in the tradition of the earlier Chicago School focus on urban social organization, Janowitz's (1952) study of the local press and Hunter's (1974) restudy of the 75 communities of Chicago delineated by Burgess in the 1920s reaffirmed the viability of the small locality unit when much of the urban literature was pointing to the decline of the urban community.

### **THE NEIGHBORHOOD AS SOCIAL NETWORK**

The social network perspective begun in England by Barnes (1954) and by Bott (1957) found its way into the analysis of urban life in the late

1960s and early 1970s. In a collection of studies focusing on the "decline of community" thesis from a social network perspective, Fischer and associates (1977) examine (1) how the characteristics of the places in which people live (neighborhoods) affect their social ties and (2) how the people are tied socially to their neighborhoods. Laumann's (1966, 1973) work recognizes the variability in networks and identifies "radial" networks as more flexible and more adaptive to changes in social relationships than close-knit (interlocking) networks and thus are more characteristic of the urban neighborhood. Duff and Liu (1972) and Granovetter (1973), in separate and almost simultaneously published articles, recognized "weak ties," and the former state, "Weak ties of neighborliness between some members of different socioeconomic classes allow new ideas to enter the network of homophilous relationships, where such ideas and information were hitherto unavailable" (Duff and Liu, 1972: 366).

In a similar vein, Warren (1977), cataloging the major types of networks in urban communities, expands the list with a type he calls the "proximity anchored helping networks," characterized by a common territory as well as interaction: It has a spatial referent and is not portable.

In a much more dramatic break from the perspective of the neighborhood as a territorial-based social unit, Wellman asserts, "a network perspective does not take as its starting point territorially-mapped local community units. . . . It is initially concerned with specific structures of relationships and not with specific territorial areas" (1976: 6). Thus, urbanites are "more likely to be organized into far-flung networks than into local communities" (1976: 6).

An associate of Wellman characterizes the urbanite as having "portable personal communities" made up of social networks and detached from any locality unit (Crump, 1977). Thus, community in the urban setting, according to Crump, Wellman, and other "network"-oriented sociologists, no longer is a territorial unit, but consists of a variety of linkages among persons sharing common interests or activities; in this view, the neighborhood exists only as one variety of social network and, indeed, may not even be present (see also MacDonald (1974), Wellman (1976), and Wellman and Leighton (1979).

## TYPOLOGIES OF THE URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD

As knowledge began to accumulate about urban neighborhoods, it became apparent there were many variables that characterized this form of community: the degree of sociability; its relation to the larger community; social characteristics of the population; its internal ecology; the cultural symbols distinguishing one neighborhood from another; and the presence of formal/informal organizations. Social area analysis was the earliest effort to create a typology, although there remain serious questions about the extent to which census tracts (albeit homogeneous in social characteristics) represent neighborhoods (Bell, 1959, 1969). Most notably the works of Donald Warren and of Gerald Suttles deal with neighborhood typologies. Warren's (1975) six types (integrated, parochial, diffuse, stepping stone, transitory, and anomic) and Suttles's (1972) four (defended, defeated, limited liability, and contrived) are creative attempts to codify the crucial variables that distinguish one neighborhood from another.

Warren's typology is based on two factors: the degree of internal organization and of external linkage of the neighborhood. The possible combinations of these two variables lead to six possible types. Most of Warren's research has used the typology to explore patterns of social life, use of social services, population turnover, and social class (Warren, 1975, 1978; Warren and Warren, 1975, 1977). This approach is reminiscent of the early social area typology in terms of its analytic focus.

Suttles's typology is also based on external links, especially as they affect the safety and survival of the neighborhood (defended and defeated). The neighborhood of limited liability is an extension of an idea suggested by Janowitz (1952) in his study of the urban press. He identified an urban type who, when the community fails to serve his needs, withdraws. This lack of commitment to the others who live there makes the collectivity less a neighborhood and more a residential area.

Both typologies do, however, focus on the neighborhood as a community and thus return to both Park's and Burgess's earlier conceptions of the city as a constellation of smaller communities (neighborhoods) where residents visit; lend assistance when asked; greet one another on the street; shop in local familiar shops; and gather in

clubs, taverns, or churches and talk of local issues or wider political matters. Among the important functions of these community forms, in addition to their sociability, is their ameliorativeness (Park and Burgess, 1925), recently recognized by Hunter (1974) in his restudy of the 75 neighborhoods identified 50 years earlier by Burgess, and their function as political links to the larger community (Janowitz and Suttles, 1978).

## **THE PROBLEMS AND LIMITATIONS OF URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD RESEARCH**

In the three quarters of a century that sociologists have studied urban neighborhoods, at least five major problems have appeared; each reveals the limitations posed by the literature when taken as a whole. First, the conceptualization of neighborhoods is perhaps the single most recurring problem. Nearly every study began with an attempt to clarify what it meant by the term *neighborhood*. Second, measurement of the concept also preoccupied these researchers. Third, Wirth's (1938) thesis on the decline of primary relationships (including neighborhoods) in his now-classic essay, "Urbanism as a Way of Life" is another preoccupation. Fourth, the research, however, did not build directly on previous research. Consequently, fifth, it failed to develop a body of systematic knowledge, of tested propositions, and of theory of urban community forms. In this section, the nature of these problems is examined.

### **THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD**

Fundamental to research on urban neighborhoods is conceptualization. To Cooley (1909), it was one of three intimate social arenas fostering human nature, whereas to Park (1915), it was the smallest form of community embracing the total cultural heritage of a residential group. Some researchers defined the neighborhood merely as a territory with fixed boundaries (McKenzie, 1923; Wallin, 1953), or "those people who lived within easy 'halloing' distance or walking distance" (Snedden, 1926: 231). Some defined it in terms of recognition by residents of a common name and boundaries (Foley, 1952; Ross, 1962). Others distinguished between the residential area (neighborhood) and those who interacted (neighboring; McClenahan, 1929; Sweetser, 1941; Riemer, 1951; Snedden, 1926; Mann, 1954; Keller, 1968). Useem (1960) distinguished the immediate from the larger neighborhood, and Heberle

(1969) distinguished between normative and obligatory (sentiment) behavior of neighbors.

The typologies of Warren and Warren (1975) and Suttles (1972) are more sophisticated efforts to identify the crucial variables that distinguish one type of neighborhood from another, essentially eschewing the idea that the neighborhood is a unitary social form. They link the idea of neighborhood to the broader concept of community and thereby anchor it in a theoretical tradition lacking in much of the other literature (see also Wellman and Leighton, 1979).

### **THE MEASUREMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD**

Integral to a definition of community is its measurement. The studies that focus on methodological problems number less than a dozen. A few focus on measures of neighboring (Bernard, 1937; Wallin, 1953) and one (Lee, 1968) builds on phenomenology, seeking a "sociospatial schema" residents construct in their day-to-day behavior.

Social area analysis (Shevky and Bell, 1955; Bell, 1959, 1969) was the most serious attempt to refine the measurement of urban neighborhoods and has been modified more recently by factorial ecology (Sweetser, 1965 1978a, 1978b; Berry, 1971). Both approaches depend primarily on census data and deal with demographic and structural aspects of behavior, rather than with social structure.

Three studies focus on measurement of social cohesion in neighborhoods (Fessler, 1952; Foley, 1952; Smith, 1975) although only Fessler and Foley provide research instruments, which include items on use of local facilities, interaction among residents, and feelings of attachment.

### **THE TRANSFORMATION OF URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS**

Among the most persistent questions characterizing research in urban neighborhoods has been, "Are they becoming impersonal arenas devoid of intimate social life and do they no longer function as local communities?" Since Cooley and Park, who called attention to the possibility of the erosion of the human community in an urbanized setting, nearly every urban sociologist has addressed this question (see especially Snedden, 1926; Anderson and Lindeman, 1928; McClenahan, 1929; Carpenter, 1932; Ogburn and Nimkoff, 1934; Roper, 1935; Bernard, 1937; Queen and Thomas, 1939). The first edition of *The*

Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences summarizes nicely the predominant view of urban sociologists under the heading, *Neighborhood*:

The characteristic processes of urbanization are, however, hostile to the preservation of neighborhood life in that it promotes a high degree of population density, a low rate of permanency of residency and considerable heterogeneity of population. The existence in the city of an intricate network of secondary group associations also tends to break down the primary group spirit, which is the fulcrum of neighborhood life [1934: 356-357].

The publication in 1938 of Louis Wirth's essay, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," heralded an era of urban research bent on testing the above thesis. Although Wirth was a student of Park, he went far beyond Park's conception of the city as a disorganizing process. Influenced heavily by Ferdinand Toennies, Wirth saw the city as the locus of the mass society in which primary attachments gave way to the isolation of the urban person. Since 1938, nearly all neighborhood research has explored whether the urban neighborhood was waning, had vanished, or had survived the onslaught of urbanization. Although some studies presented evidence tending to affirm Wirth's thesis (Bernard, 1937; Riemer, 1951; Heberle, 1969; Foley, 1952; Key, 1965; Tomeh, 1964), most have challenged it and demonstrated the persistence of meaningful social ties—neighboring, informal social participation, social cohesion, and a structure fostering a sense of community within the metropolis (Janowitz, 1952; Bell and Boat, 1957; Smith et al., 1954; Ross, 1962; Litwak, 1961, 1963; Suttles, 1968; Warren, 1969; Greer, 1956; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974). So intense was the quest to discover the urban neighborhood that theoretical issues, such as social integration, were ignored—as Smith (1975) points out in his attempt to construct measures of social integration. This preoccupation with the discovery of neighborhoods, although warranted in terms of the backlog of allusions to its disappearance, contributed to the lack of continuities in neighborhood research and inhibited the development of theorizing about the neighborhood. (For a contrasting view, see Guterman, 1969.)

#### **DISCONTINUITIES IN URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD RESEARCH**

Urban neighborhood research, although plentiful, has not been obviously cumulative. A chronological reading of the literature leads one to the conclusion that it was very empirical, specific to the locales

studied, and conceptually and theoretically weak. Notable exceptions are the works of Bell (1959, 1969), Bell and Boat (1957), Bell and Force (1956), Greer (1956), Greer and Kube (1959), Litwak (1960, 1961), Litwak and Szelenyi (1969), Fellin and Litwak (1963), and Hunter (1974, 1975). Community studies, because they were done in different locales and in different eras (Stein, 1960), have suffered the same fate as neighborhood studies, which, when taken as a whole, represent a wide assemblage of data from different times and places, collected through different methodologies, and based upon different definitions.

### **SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND THE URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD**

One test of a body of research is its contribution to theory: Is theory informed, extended, modified, rejected, or otherwise influenced by empirical findings? The four problems outlined above—problems of definition, measurement, neighborhood change, and research continuities—are suggested here as major factors contributing to the lack of theorizing about neighborhoods. The failure to link neighborhood studies to community theory has surely weakened the research, and the mixing of metaphors characterizing the neighborhood—from spatial to social interactive to sentiment to structural—has not been conducive to theorizing. At least four different theoretical perspectives can be found in the neighborhood literature: the neighborhood as (1) community (Park, 1925; Suttles, 1968; Hunter, 1974), (2) social interaction (neighboring, (Keller, 1968), (3) an ecological system (Greer, 1956), and (4) a component of social integration (Janowitz and Suttles, 1978; Smith, 1975; Janowitz, 1975; Tomeh, 1969).

### **THE LEGACY OF URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD RESEARCH**

Despite the limitations in the literature outlined in the previous section of this article, several contributions can be identified.

The problem of definitions, although not solved, has been greatly reduced by the sophisticated clarification of typologies. These typologies recognize the variant forms and content of local communities; thus, for example, the face block, integral neighborhood, defended neighborhood, or community of limited liability represent specific types of local communities and enhance the precision of neighborhood research. The

old question, "What is meant by neighborhood?" is replaced with, "What kind of neighborhood is this?"

The discontinuities found in the literature are not problematic enough to lead us to discard the findings. Certainly there have been discontinuities, but the problem of cumulative knowledge is complex and remains only partially solved in other areas of social research. As indicated earlier, there is some cumulative knowledge, but the major issue is that as each contribution has been made, its supporters often propose it as a "replacement" for previous contributions. This is most apparent in the recent "social network" perspective, which attempts to define "out" the territorial dimension of neighborhoods and to define "in" the networks of neighbors.

The most chronic problem—the debate over whether the urban neighborhood is disappearing—has now virtually been resolved. Once the conceptualization of the local community expanded to account for *types* of neighborhoods, it became possible to identify certain residential areas as nonneighborhoods without suggesting the decline of the urban local community. We have learned in the resolution of this problem that more fruitful directions for urban neighborhood research are (1) to return to Park's original question (although modified) and examine how and under what conditions the local community is changing in relation to changes in the larger society and (2) to sharpen the theoretical issue that underlies this question: How and under what conditions is the local community related to social integration at the societal level.

A substantial effort to examine these issues has been undertaken by Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) and by Janowitz and Suttles (1978). And a recent article by Smith (1975) has focused on the issue of social integration at the neighborhood level.

Kasarda and Janowitz argue that local community research has been misguided by what they call a "linear development" model based on the Tonnies *Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft* dichotomy. This model suggests the evolution of society in which the small group and the community were central to the large-scale society in which the small community disappears. This model was a basis for Wirth's theory of urbanism in which he postulates the decline of the local community. In its place, Janowitz and Kasarda propose the view of urbanism of Robert Park and W. I. Thomas, which they label the "systemic" model. In this view, the local community is a long-term viable social structure that, although it varies in form and content, is not an anachronism in industrial, urbanized society. The literature on local community studies strongly

supports this latter view that the urban neighborhood continues to persist under widely varying social, economic, historic, and ecological conditions (see especially Hunter, 1974, 1975; Warren and Warren, 1977; Suttles, 1968).

This persistence, however, does not mean the urban neighborhood has not undergone differentiation, change, and, in some cases, dissolution. Indeed, this is the one powerful summary to be derived from the literature and is the backdrop for pushing toward a synthesis and a new set of questions to guide future research.

The persistence and differentiation of urban neighborhoods are complex issues. The aggregation of data from the literature points to the transformation of the neighborhood into a much more open system, mirroring the growth, fluidity, and social class and ethnic differentiations wrought by the changing occupational structure of the society. This, of course, makes meaningless any attempt to generalize across all urban neighborhoods, but it does allow us to explore some of the bases of differentiation. In so doing, an underlying theoretical issue surfaces: the idea of cohesion (highlighted by Smith, 1975). The data from our earlier review of the literature suggest that despite the changes in the form, membership, or social life in the local community, there remains a sense of social cohesion and stability. (However, for a contrary view, see Taub et al., 1977.) It is not understood if and how this cohesion is translated into integration into the larger society.

Janowitz and Suttles (1978) propose a generalized model for approaching these issues. It is a modern and more sophisticated version of the earlier ideological views of Daniels, Woods, Follett, and Perry, who saw the neighborhood as the basis for both self-regulation (social control) and as the platform for political participation in the large society. "Properly perceived, the local community is a staging area in which diverse interests are mobilized and joined in an aggregative political process that can shape, and strengthen, and legitimize the actions of political and administrative hierarchies" (Janowitz and Suttles, 1978). The local community is conceptualized as part of a three-level tier containing (1) the social bloc, (2) the organizational community, and (3) the aggregated metropolitan community, with each tier forming part of the next larger one. Local issues are aggregated until they touch upon a political unit that is capable of responding to the local unit. In this way, local values become articulated with the larger policies and practices of the society and thereby some level of social integration is achieved. This vertical integration is paralleled by the horizontal

integration (this distinction is mine, not Janowitz and Suttles's) within the local community which occurs when residents coalesce on common issues. Thus some local communities focus on school busing, others on integrated housing, and yet others on low-income housing, tourism, or crime reduction. Those consensual concerns—together with such identified factors as length of residence, neighboring, established boundaries, and social networks—contribute to social control and cohesion at the local level and become the “staging area” for being joined in the aggregative political process.

Yet, the increasing “openness” of the society—the rapidity and ease with which new ideas are disseminated throughout all areas of the society—subjects the neighborhood (as it does all social units) to threats on its unique identity and cohesion. This process has given grist for the “mass society” theorists who postulate the decline of community. But the detailed analysis of data from the local community, which this article has undertaken, argues for a tough persistence of its social fabric. The evidence suggests the local community is selectively incorporating organizational features, social issues, and collective responses that are widespread in the society. At the same time, they are differentially incorporating elements from the larger society, which leads to the differentiation and specialization of neighborhoods, thus, the typologies which reflect these variations and thus the heterogeneity of neighborhoods.

A full understanding of this differentiation is yet to be achieved, as are the processes that contribute to the endurance of the local community in the large-scale and rapidly changing society. The tasks ahead are to identify the major principles that account for the differentiation of local communities and to develop a set of testable propositions dealing with the integration of local communities into the larger society. Clearly, the groundwork has been done over the last decade, through the work on community typologies, networks, and social control. If the current decade yields as much, we shall have come very close to understanding the persistence of the local community under most unusual conditions of social change.

## NOTE

1. According to Shils (1980):

To live in a district in which one feels “at home,” to have neighbors, even if they are not friends, who greet one and offer a friendly smile is good. It may not appear to be

a massive fact of social structure but it does have something to do with the satisfaction which a human being gets out of life. It might not integrate directly into the national community and it might have nothing to do with "goals." But not everything that human beings do has "goals." The good may lie in the action itself, such as smiling, saying "Good evening," chatting a few words about the weather or some other inconsequential subject. In my own experience of neighborhoods which confer a real sense of living in an area having a certain "quality" and giving its members some mild "conviviality," the role of the old-fashioned grocery shop, butcher shop, hardware store seemed rather important. The men who ran these shops knew a lot about the residents without being malicious gossips, they transmitted some of this information which heightened the sense of community. Meeting other persons from the district in the shop, "passing the time of day with them" was a minor satisfaction. The fact that most of the children from the street or several streets went to the same school made the parents of the children who became friends aware of each other even if they did not become friends with each other. . . . Churches are meeting places; priests and ministers know many of the residents and help to make residents of the area more aware of each other and therefore more identified with the area [personal communication].

## REFERENCES

- ALISSI, A. (1970) "Delinquent subcultures in neighborhood settings: a social system perspective." *J. of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 7: 46-57.
- ANDERSON, N. and E. C. LINDEMAN (1928) *Urban Sociology*. New York: Knopf.
- AXELROD, M. (1956) "Urban structure and social participation." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 21: 13-18.
- BABCHUCK, N. and J. EDWARDS (1965) "Voluntary associations and the integration hypothesis." *Soc. Inquiry* 35: 149-162.
- BACON, E. (1968) "American homes and neighborhoods, city and county." *Annals of Amer. Academy of Pol. and Social Sci.* 376: 117-129.
- BARNES, J. (1954) "Class and committees in a Norwegian island parish." *Human Relations* 7: 39-58.
- BAUER, C. (1945) "Good neighborhoods." *Annals of Amer. Academy of Pol. and Social Sci.* 242: 104-115.
- BELL, W. (1969) "Urban neighborhoods and individual behavior," pp. 120-146 in P. Meadows and E. Mizurichi (eds.) *Urbanism, Urbanization and Change: Comparative Perspectives*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- (1959) "Social areas: a typology of neighborhood," pp. 61-92 in M. Sussman (ed.) *Community Structure and Analysis*. New York: Crowell.
- and M. BOAT (1957) "Urban neighborhoods and informal social relations." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 62: 391-398.
- BELL, W. and M. T. FORCE (1956) "Urban neighborhood types and participation in formal associations." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 21: 25-34.

- BERNARD, J. (1937) "An instrument for the measurement of neighborhood with experimental applications." *Southwest Social Sci. Q.*: 145-160.
- BERRY, B.J.L. (1971) "Comparative factorial ecology." *Economic Geography* 47(2, Supplement).
- BONJEAN, C. (1966) "Mass, class, and the industrial community." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 72: 149-162.
- BOTT, E. (1957) *Family and Social Networks*. London: Tavistock.
- BRUNNER, E. (1927) *Village Communities*. New York: George Doran.
- BURGESS, E. (1925) "Can neighborhood work have a scientific basis?" pp. 142-155 in R. Park and E. Burgess (eds.) *The City*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- BURKHARDT, J. (1971) "Impact of highways on urban neighborhoods: a model of social change." *Highway Research Record* 356: 85-94.
- CAPLOW, T. and R. FORMAN (1950) "Neighborhood interaction in a homogeneous community." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 15: 357-366.
- CARLSON, D. (1978) *Revitalizing North American Neighborhoods (HUD-502-PDR)*. Washington, DC: Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- CARPENTER, N. (1932) *The Sociology of City Life*. New York: Longman.
- CHOLDIN, H., E. JACOBSEN, and C. YAHNKE (1975) "Effects of crowded dwellings in family life." *Soc. Symposium* 14: 59-73.
- COLEMAN, R. P. (1978) *Attitudes Toward Neighborhoods: How Americans Choose to Live*. Cambridge: Working Paper 49, Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.
- CONWAY, P. (1926) "The apartment house dweller." M.A. thesis, University of Chicago.
- COOLEY, C. (1909) *Social Organization*. New York: Scribner.
- CRUMP, B. (1977) "The portability of urban ties." Presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association September 5-9, Chicago.
- CUNNINGHAM, J. U. (1965) *The Resurgent Neighborhood*. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers.
- DANIELS, J. (1920) *America via the neighborhood*. New York: Harper & Row.
- DAVIES, J. C. (1966) *Neighborhood Groups and Urban Renewal*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- DENNIS, N. (1958) "Popularity of the neighborhood community idea." *Soc. Rev.* 6: 191-206.
- DEUTSCHBERGER, P. (1946) "Interaction patterns in changing neighborhoods." *Sociometry* 9: 303-315.
- DEVERAUX, E. (1960) "Neighborhood and community participation." *J. of Social Issues* 16(4): 64-84.
- DEWEY, R. (1950) "The neighborhood, urban ecology, and city planners." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 15: 502-507.
- DORE, R. P. (1958) *City Life in Japan. A Study of a Tokyo Ward*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- DOUGLASS, H. P. (1925) *The Suburban Trend*. New York: Century.
- DUFF, R. and W. LIU (1972) "The strength in weak ties." *Public Opinion Q.* 36: 361-366.
- DURANT, R. (1968) "Community and association in a London housing estate," pp. 159-185 in R. E. Pahl (ed.) *Readings in Urban Sociology*. New York: Pergamon.
- "Editorial" (1928) *Neighborhood: A Settlement Q.* 1: 35.
- ELMER, M. (1914) "Social surveys of urban communities." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.

- FELLIN, P. and E. LITWAK (1968) "The neighborhood in urban American society." *Social Work* 13: 72-80.
- (1963) "Neighborhood cohesion under conditions of mobility." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 28: 364-377.
- FESSLER, D. R. (1952) "The development of a scale for measuring community solidarity." *Rural Sociology* 17: 144-152.
- FESTINGER, L., S. SCHACHTER, and K. BACK (1950) *Social Influence*. New York: Harper & Row.
- FISCHER, C., M. BALDASSARE, K. GERSON, R. JACKSON, L. JONES, and C. STUEVE (1977) *Networks and Places, Social Relations in the Urban Setting*. New York: Macmillan.
- FOLEY, D. (1952) *Neighbors or Urbanities*. Rochester, NY: Univ. of Rochester Press.
- (1950) "The use of local facilities in a metropolis." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 56: 238-246.
- FOLLETT, M. (1918) *The New State*. New York: Longman.
- FREDERICK, C. (1928) "Is suburban living a delusion?" *Outlook* 148: 290-291; 313.
- FREDERICKSON, G. (1973) *Neighborhood Control in the 1970s*. New York: ITT.
- FRIED, M. and P. GLEICHER (1961) "Some sources of residential satisfaction in an urban slum" *J. of Amer. Institute of Planners* 27: 305-315.
- GALPIN, C. (1915) *The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community*. Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 3. Madison: Wisconsin Experiment Station.
- GANS, H. (1962) *The Urban Villagers*. New York: Macmillan.
- GRANOVETTER, M. (1973) "The strength of weak ties." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 78: 1360-1380.
- GREER, S. (1956) "Urbanism reconsideration: a comparative study of local areas in a metropolis." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 21: 19-25.
- and E. KUBE (1959) "Urbanism and social structure," pp. 93-112 in M. Sussman (ed.) *Community Structure and Analysis*. New York: Crowell.
- GUTERBOCK, T. M. (1980) *Machine Politics in Transition*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- GUTERMAN, S. (1969) "In defense of Wirth's 'Urbanism as a way of life.'" *Amer. J. of Sociology* 74: 492-499.
- GUTMAN, R. and D. POPENOE [eds.] (1970) *Neighborhood, City, and Metropolis*. New York: Random House.
- HEBERLE, R. (1969) "The normative elements in neighboring relations." *Pacific Soc. Rev.* 3: 3-11.
- HESSLINK, G. K. (1970) "The functions of neighborhood in ecological stratification." *Sociology and Social Research* 54: 441-459.
- (1968) *Black Neighbors*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- HILL, S. L. and B. FRANKLAND (1967) "Mobility as a measure of neighborhood." Paper sponsored by the Committee on Indirect Effects of Highway Improvements, Highway Research Record, 187: 33-42.
- HUNTER, A. (1979) "The urban neighborhood." *Urban Affairs Q.* 14: 267-288.
- (1975) "The loss of community." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 40: 537-552.
- (1974) *Symbolic Communities*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- ISAACS, R. (1948a) "The neighborhood theory." *J. of Amer. Institute of Planners* 14: 15-23.
- (1948b) "Are urban neighborhoods possible?" *J. of Housing* 177-180.

- JANOWITZ, M. (1975) "Sociological theory and social control." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 81: 82-108.
- (1952) *The Community Press in an Urban Setting*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- and G. SUTTLES (1978) "The social ecology of citizenship," in R. Sarri and Y. Hasenfeld (eds.) *The Management of Human Services*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- JONES, T. J. (1904) *The Sociology of a New York City Block*. New York: Macmillan.
- KASARDA, J. and M. JANOWITZ (1974) "Community attachment in mass society." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 39: 328-339.
- KELLER, S. (1968) *The Urban Neighborhood*. New York: Random House.
- (1966) "Neighborhood concepts in sociological perspective." *Ekistics* 22: 67-76.
- KENNEDY, J. C. (1914) *Study of a Chicago Stockyard Community*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- KEY, W. (1965) "Urbanism and neighboring." *Soc. Q.* 6: 379-385.
- KINCHELOE, S. C. (1938) *The American City and Its Church*. New York: Friendship Press.
- KOBWIN, S. (1958) "The conflict of values in delinquency areas," pp. 498-505 in H. Stein and R. Cloward (eds.) *Social Perspectives on Behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- KORNBLUM, W. (1974) *Blue Collar Community*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- LANDECKER, W. S. (1951) "Types of integration and their measurement." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 56: 332-340.
- LAUMANN, E. (1973) *Bonds of Pluralism*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- (1966) *Prestige and Association in the Urban Community*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- LEE, T. (1968) "Urban neighborhoods as a socio-spatial schema." *Human Relations* 21: 241-267.
- LIEBOW, E. (1967) *Tally's Corner*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- LITWAK, E. (1961) "Voluntary associations and neighborhood cohesion." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 26: 258-271.
- (1960) "Reference group theory, bureaucratic career and neighborhood primary group cohesion." *Sociometry* 23: 72-84.
- and H. MEYER (1974) *School, Family and Neighborhood*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- and J. SZELENYI (1969) "Primary group structures and their functions: kin, neighbors and friends." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 34: 465-481.
- MACCOBY, E., J. JOHNSON, and R. CHURCH (1958) "Community integration and the social control of juvenile delinquency." *J. of Social Issues* 14(2): 38-51.
- MACDONALD, J. S. and L. D. MACDONALD (1974) "Chain migration, ethnic neighborhood formation, and social networks," pp. 226-235 in C. Tilly (ed.) *An Urban World*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- MANN, P. (1954) "The concept of neighborliness." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 60: 163-168.
- MARSHALL, N. (1972) "Privacy and environment." *Human Ecology* 1: 93-110.
- MARTINDALE, D. (1958) "Prefatory remarks: the theory of the city," pp. 9-67 in M. Weber, *The City*. New York: Macmillan.
- MAUER, R. and J. BAXTER (1972) "Images of the neighborhood and city among black, Anglo, and Mexican-American children." *Environment and Behavior* 4: 351-388.

- McLEAN, E. and W. ADKINS. (1971) "Freeway effects on residential mobility in metropolitan neighborhoods." *Highway Research Record* 356: 95-104.
- McCLENAHAN, B. (1946) "The communality: the urban substitute for the traditional community." *Sociology and Social Research* 30: 264-274.
- (1929) *The Changing Urban Neighborhood*. Los Angeles: Univ. of Southern California Press.
- McKAY, H. (1949) "The neighborhood and child conduct." *Annals of Amer. Academy of Pol. and Social Sci.* 261: 32-41.
- McKENZIE, R. (1923) *The Neighborhood*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- MOORE, R. (1974) "Patterns of activity in time and space: the ecology of the neighborhood, in D. Kanter and T. Lee (eds.) *Psychology and the Built Environment*. London: Architectural Press.
- MOORE, W. (1969) *The Vertical Ghetto: Everyday Life in an Urban Project*. New York: Random House.
- MORRIS, D. and K. HESS (1975) *Neighborhood Power*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- "Neighborhood" (1933) *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan.
- Neighborhood Diversity (1977) *Hearings before the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, United States Senate, 95th Congress, First Session on Problems of Dislocation and Diversity in Communities Undergoing Neighborhood Revitalization Activity*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- NOHARA, 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: St. Martin's.
- O'BRIEN, D. J. (1972) "The public goods dilemma and the 'apathy' of the poor toward neighborhood organization." *Social Service Rev.* 48: 229-244.
- OGBURN, W. L. and M. NIMKOFF (1934) *The Family*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- PARK, R. E. (1952) *Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology*. New York: Macmillan.
- (1926) "The urban community as a spatial pattern and moral order," pp. 3-18 in E. W. Burgess (ed.) *The Urban Community*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- (1915) "The city: suggestions for the investigation of human behavior in the city environment." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 20: 577-611.
- and E. BURGESS (1925) *The City*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- PERRY, C. A. (1929) "The neighborhood unit," pp. 22-140 in *Neighborhood and Community Planning, Regional Survey (Vol. 7)*. New York: Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs.
- PFEIL, E. (1968) "The pattern of neighboring relations in Dortmund-Nordstadt," pp. 136-158 in R. E. Pahl (ed.) *Readings in Urban Sociology*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- PHILLIPPI, B. and D. LUENBERGER (1977) "Neighborhood effects and maintenance of the urban housing stock." *J. of Mathematical Sociology* 5: 151-172.
- PHILLIBER, W. (1976) "Prior training, opportunity, and vested interest as factors influencing neighborhood integration." *Pacific Soc. Rev.* 19: 231-244.
- PRATT, E. E. (1911) *Industrial Causes of Congestion of Population in New York City*. New York: Macmillan.
- QUEEN, S. and L. THOMAS (1939) *The City*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- REED, P. (1974) "Situating interaction: normative and non-normative bases of social behavior in two urban residential settings." *Urban Life and Culture* 2: 460-487.
- REISS, A. Jr., and A. RHODES (1961) "The distribution of juvenile delinquency in the social class structure." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 26: 720-732.

- RIEMER, S. (1951) "Villagers in metropolis." *British J. of Sociology* 2: 31-43.
- ROPER, M. (1935) *The City and the Primary Group*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Libraries.
- ROSS, H. L. (1962) "The local community: a survey approach." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 27: 127-134.
- SANOFF, H. (1970) "Social perceptions of the ecological neighborhood." *Ekistics* 30: 130-133.
- SEWELL, W. and M. ARMER (1966) "Neighborhood contest and college plans." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 31: 159-168.
- SHEVKY, E. and W. BELL (1955) *Social Area Analysis*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
- SHILS, E. (1975) *Center and Periphery: Essays in Macro Sociology*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- SHUVAL, J. (1956) "Class and ethnic correlates of casual neighboring." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 21: 453-458.
- SMITH, J., W. FORM, and G. STONE (1954) "Local intimacy in a middle-sized city." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 60: 276-284.
- SMITH, R. (1975) "Measuring neighborhood cohesion: a review and some suggestions." *Human Ecology* 3: 143-160.
- SNEDDEN, D. (1926) "Neighborhoods and neighborliness." *Social Forces* 5: 231-236.
- STEIN, M. (1960) *The Eclipse of Community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- SUTTLES, G. (1972) *The Social Construction of Communities*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- (1968) *Social Order of the Slum*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- SWEETSER, F. (1978a) "Neighborhood typologies and social ecological theory." Presented at International Sociological Association 9th World Congress of Sociology, Uppsala, Sweden, August 16.
- (1978b) "Measuring neighborhood differentiation in the 1980s." Presented at the Conference on Economic and Demographic Change: Issues for the 1980s, International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, Helsinki, August.
- (1965) "Factor structure as ecological structure in Helsinki and Boston." *Acta Sociologica* 8: 205-225.
- (1941) *Neighborhood Acquaintance and Association*. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- TAUB, R. P., G. P. SURGEON, S. LINDHOLM, P. B. OTTI, and A. BRIDGES (1977) "Urban voluntary associations, locality based and externally induced." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 83: 425-442.
- TERPENNING, W. (1931) *Village and Open Country Neighborhoods*. New York: Century.
- THOMAS, W. I. (1966) *On Social Organization and Social Personality*. Selected Papers (edited and introduced by M. Janowitz). Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- TIMMS, D. W. G. (1971) *The Urban Mosaic: Towards a Theory of Residential Differentiation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- TOMEH, A. (1969) "Empirical considerations on the problems of social integration." *Soc. Inquiry* 39: 64-76.
- (1964) "Informal group participation and residence patterns." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 70: 28-35.
- TURNER, R. (1964) *The Social Context of Ambition*. New York: ITT.

- USEEM, R., J. USEEM, and D. GIBSON (1960) "The function of neighboring for the middle class male." *Human Organization* 19: 68-76.
- WALLIN, P. (1953) "A Guttman scale for measuring women's neighborliness." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 59: 243-246.
- WARREN, D. (1978) "Explorations in neighborhood differentiation." *Soc. Q.* 19: 310-331.
- (1977) "Social bonds in the metropolitan community. (unpublished)
- (1976) "The helping roles of neighbors: some empirical patterns." (unpublished)
- (1975) *Black Neighborhoods: An Assessment of Community Power*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- (1969) "Neighborhood structure and riot behavior in Detroit: some exploratory findings." *Social Problems* 16: 464-484.
- and R. B. WARREN (1977) *The Neighborhood Organizer's Handbook*. Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame Press.
- (1975) "Six kinds of neighborhoods." *Psychology Today* 9(June): 74-79.
- WELLMAN, B. (1979) "The community question: the intimate networks of East Yorkers." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 84: 1201-1231.
- (1976) *Urban Connections*. Research Paper 84 (December). Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
- and B. LEIGHTON (1979) "Networks, neighborhoods and communities." *Urban Affairs Q.* 14: 363-390.
- WHYTE, W. F. (1943) *Street Corner Society*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- WILSON, A. (1959) "Residential segregation of social classes and aspirations of high school boys." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 24: 836-845.
- WIRTH, L. (1938) "Urbanism as a way of life." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 44: 8-20.
- (1928) *The Ghetto*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- WOODS, R. A. (1923) *The Neighborhood in Nation-Building*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- WOOLSTON, H. (1938) *Metropolis: A Study of Urban Communities*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- (1909) *A Study of the Population of Manhattanville*. New York: Macmillan.
- YATES, D. (1973) *Neighborhood Democracy*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- YOUNG, K. (1918) *A Sociological Study of a Disintegrated Neighborhood*. M.A. thesis, University of Chicago.
- ZIMMERMAN, C. C. and P. SOROKIN (1929) *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- ZITO, J. (1974) "Anonymity and neighboring in an urban high-rise complex." *Urban Life and Culture* 3: 243-263.
- ZORBAUGH, H. (1929) *The Gold Coast and the Slum*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

## APPENDIX

The following articles are important in rounding out the bibliography on American urban studies:

- FAVA, S. (1956) "Suburbanism as a way of life." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 21(February): 34-37.
- GUEST, A. and J. ZUICHES (1971) "Another look at residential turnover in urban neighborhoods." *Amer. J. of Sociology* 77: 457-467.

- MEAD, M. (1966) "Neighborhoods and human needs." *Ekistics* 21: 124-126.
- SHUVAL, J. (1962) "The micro neighborhood: an approach to ecological patterns of ethnic groups." *Social Problems* 9(Winter): 272-280.
- SWEETSER, F. L. (1942) "A new emphasis for neighborhood research." *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 7: 525-533.
- TANNENBAUM, J. (1948) "The neighborhood: a socio-psychological analysis." *Land Econ.* 24: 358-369.
- WILSON, J. Q. (1968) "The urban unease: community vs. city." *Public Interest* 12(Summer): 25-39.

*Philip Olson is Professor of sociology at the University of Missouri—Kansas City. In addition to his interest in urban neighborhoods, he has been doing research on micro communities and is now studying urban neighborhoods and care of the elderly in the People's Republic of China.*