

Author(s): Eulau, Heinz, Jonathan W. Siegel, and Stephen Weatherford.

Title: Interpersonal Contexts of Political Behavior

Date: July 1979

Dataset(s): 1979 Pilot Study

Abstract

This paper addresses "network analysis" -- a field of study concerned with the contextual treatment of individual-level social phenomena. The 1979 Pilot Study included two types of network-related questions; those related to the demographic and ecological properties of neighborhoods, and another set of items eliciting information concerning the self-perceived interactions of respondents. The authors discuss the coding, distribution, and interpretation of the responses to these questions. Eulau, Siegel, and Weatherford also attempt to validate their measures by estimating the correlations among different aggregate variables, constructed from the Pilot Study network items. While the paucity of cases do not allow the authors to introduce desired control variables into the analysis, they find that most of the measures examined in the study are related in a plausible manner. The authors also find that the relationships between demographic variables and the network variables follow expected patterns, thereby providing additional support for the validity of the Pilot Study measures. Finally, the authors examine the effects of political conversation in the neighborhood zone. They find that political conversation is related to several crucial aspects of political behavior and beliefs. However, its effect varies by individual.

A Technical Report

on

Interpersonal Contexts of Political Behavior
("Network Analysis")

based on data from

The 1980 Election Pilot Study of the Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan

prepared by

Heinz Eulau, Stanford University

Jonathan W. Siegel, Stanford University

Stephen Weatherford, University of California (SB)

July 1979

Preface

This technical report on "Interpersonal Contexts of Political Behavior" examines data collected in connection with the 1980 Election Pilot Study and conducted in Spring, 1979, by the Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in this important research and development effort of the Center.

The report is both preliminary and incomplete. First, it must be considered preliminary because we undertook the analyses and writing of the report in an exceedingly limited time frame--between June 25 and July 20--a mere four weeks. We therefore expect to reexamine the data at a later time and, especially, to reflect on what we have learned, something which really has been impossible as of this moment. We must also postpone, for the time being, whatever recommendations we might make to the NES/CPS 1980 Planning Committee and the Board of Overseers concerning the inclusion in the 1980 study of what we reluctantly refer to as "network questions" (see Part 1 for elaboration).

Second, the report's Part 5 is underdeveloped. It concerns examination of the relationships between the "network variables" and such dependent variables as we could extract for meaningful analysis from other questions of the Pilot Study (and over whose inclusion we had no control). We shall introduce in this report some illustrative examples, but fuller treatment must await a paper we expect to present at a September roundtable on the Pilot Study to be held in connection with the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association.

Table of Contents

Preface

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Part 1. Introduction: From Contextual to Network Analysis

Part 2. Marginal Distributions and Construction of Measures

2.1 The Neighborhood as Communal Context

2.10 Years in Neighborhood

2.11 Neighborhood Quality

2.12 Population Stability

2.13 Personal Mobility

2.14 Party Knowledge and Existence

2.2 The Neighborhood as Life Space

2.20 Shopping, Working, Church-going

2.21 Life Space Activities

2.22 Shop, Work and Church Commuting

2.23 Median Commute

2.3 The Social-Interpersonal Context

2.30 Social Contact

2.31 Contact Number

2.32 Contact Years

2.33 Intimacy

2.34 Consociation

2.4 The Political Primary Zone

2.40 Political Conversation

2.41 Political Climate

2.42 Primary Zone Political Composition

2.43 Political Milieu

2.44 Cognitive Capability

Part 3. Validation through Inter-Item Analysis of Variables

Table of Contents, cont.

- 3.1 The Neighborhood as Communal Context
- 3.2 The Neighborhood as Life Space
- 3.3 Social Contact: The Primary Zone as Context
- 3.4 Communal Context and Life Space
- 3.5 Communal Context, Life Space and Social Contact
 - 3.51 Neighborhood Party Organization and Social Contact
- 3.6 The Primary Zone as Political Environment
 - 3.61 Preliminary Note on Party Identification and the Partisan Composition of the Primary Zone
- 3.7 The Contextual Parameters of the Political Primary Zone
 - 3.71 Political Primary Zone and Communal Context
 - 3.72 Political Primary Zone and Neighborhood as Life Space
 - 3.73 Political Primary Zone and Interpersonal Relations
- 3.8 Conclusion

Tables 3.10 - 3.76

Part 4. Demographic Correlates of Communal Context, Life Space, Social Context and Political Primary Zone Variables

Table 4.1

- 4.10 Years in Neighborhood
- 4.11 Neighborhood Quality
- 4.12 Population Stability
- 4.13 Personal Mobility
- 4.14 Party Knowledge
- 4.15 Party Existence
- 4.16 Shopping
- 4.17 Working
- 4.18 Church-going
- 4.19 Life Space
- 4.20 Shop Commuting
- 4.21 Work Commuting
- 4.22 Church Commuting
- 4.23 Median Commuting
- 4.24 Social Contact

Table of Contents, cont.

- 4.25 Contact Number
- 4.26 Contact Years
- 4.27 Intimacy
- 4.28 Consociation
- 4.29 Political Conversation
- 4.30 Political Climate
- 4.31 Cognitive Capability
- 4.32 Political Milieu
- 4.33 Primary Zone Political Composition
- 4.34 Primary Zone Partisanship

Part 5. Validation through Dependent Variable Analysis

- 5.1 The Primary Zone as Context for Political Conversation and Political Behavior

Tables 5.10 - 5.18

- Appendix A. The "Neighborhood Quality" Variable: What People Mean by "Good" and "Not so Good" Neighborhoods
- Appendix B. Comparison of the Correlation Coefficients for the Associations of "Working" (in Neighborhood or Elsewhere), and Communal Context, Life Space, Political Primary Zone and Demographic Variables, for Sample which Includes Housewives as "Working in Neighborhood" and Sample Omitting Them
- Appendix C. Choice of Cutting Points in Constructing the Measures of Intimacy and Consociation: The Consequence of Contextual Composition for Measurement
- Appendix D. The Day Dwellers and the Night Dwellers: A Comparison

List of Tables

- 3.10 The Communal Context
- 3.11 Party Organizations, Neighborhood Quality and Stability
- 3.21 The Neighborhood as Life Space
- 3.22 Type of Life Space Activity and Number of Activities
- 3.23 Distribution of Respondents by Place and Type of Activity
- 3.24 Type of Activity and Life Space
- 3.25 The Non-Neighborhood as Life Space
- 3.26 Average Total Commuting and Commuting to Work, Shopping and Church
- 3.27 Place of Shopping and Commuting to Work
- 3.28 Life Space Activities in Neighborhood and Commute Distance
- 3.31 The Primary Zone as Social Context
- 3.41 Communal Context and Life Space Activities
- 3.42 Life Space Activities as Functions of Communal Context
- 3.43 Life Space Commuting as Function of Communal Context
- 3.51 Interpersonal Contact and Neighborhood Communal Context
- 3.52 Interpersonal Contact and Life Space
- 3.53 Commuting and Interpersonal Contact
- 3.54 Average Number of Years Contacts are Known, Communal Context and Life Space Variables
- 3.55 Intimacy, Communal Context and Life Space Variables
- 3.56 Consociation, Communal Context and Life Space Variables
- 3.57 Party Organization Knowledge and Party Existence, Communal Context and Life Space Variables
- 3.61 The Political Homogeneity of the Primary Zone
- 3.62 Cognitive Capability and Specification of Political Primary Zone
- 3.63 Political Conversation and Partisan Identification of Social Contacts in Political Primary Zones

List of Tables, cont.

- 3.64 Political Conversation and Political Composition of Primary Zone
- 3.65 Political Conversation and Cognitive Capability
- 3.66 Political Conversation and Political Climate
- 3.67 Political Climate and Cognitive Capability
- 3.68 Political Composition of Primary Zone and Political Climate
- 3.69 Political Milieu and Political Climate of Primary Zone
- 3.691 Party Identification (Seven-Point) and Partisan Composition of Primary Zone
- 3.692 Party Identification (Three-Point) and Partisan Composition of Primary Zone
- 3.693 Partisan Composition of Primary Zone and Political Party Identification
- 3.694 Partisan Composition of Primary Zone and Political Party Identification Revised
- 3.695 Political Primary Zone Components
- 3.71 Political Primary Zone and Neighborhood Communal Context
- 3.72 Partisan Composition of Primary Zone, and Party Knowledge and Party Existence
- 3.73 Political Primary Zone and the Neighborhood as Life Space
- 3.74 Comparison of Political Primary Zones of Those who Work in Neighborhood, Nearby and Far Away
- 3.75 Comparison of Political Primary Zones and Political Climate of Those who Worship in Neighborhood, Nearby and Far Away
- 3.76 Political Primary Zone and Interpersonal Relations
- 4.10 Demographic Correlates of Social Relations & Primary Zone
- 4.11 Political Composition of Primary Zone by Education
- 4.12 Political Composition of Primary Zone by Income
- 4.13 Political Composition of Primary Zone by Region
- 4.14 Political Composition of Primary Zone by Age

List of Tables, cont.

- 4.15 Political Composition of Primary Zone by Sex
- 4.16 Political Composition of Primary Zone by Marital Status
- 5.10 Primary Zone as Conversational Context and Voter Turnout in 1978
- 5.11 Primary Zone as Conversational Context and Voter Turnout in 1976
- 5.12 Primary Zone as Conversational Context and Partisan Choice in 1978
- 5.13 Primary Zone as Conversational Context and Partisan Choice in 1976
- 5.14 Primary Zone as Conversational Context and Political Interest
- 5.15 Primary Zone as Conversational Context and Attention to Television News
- 5.16 Primary Zone as Conversational Context and Attention to Newspaper News
- 5.17 Primary Zone as Conversational Context and Political Party Identification
- 5.18 Primary Zone as Conversational Context and Political Composition of Primary Zone
- A1 Distribution of Responses in Broad CPS Code Categories Concerning Neighborhood Quality
- A2 Distribution of Responses in Detailed CPS Code Categories in which Responses concerning Neighborhood Quality were Five Percent or More
- A3 Distribution of Responses Concerning Quality of Neighborhood, Recoded Categories
- B1 Comparison of Correlation Coefficients for Sample that Includes and Sample that Omits Housewives from Analysis
- C1 Cross-tabulations of Individual-Level Data for Variables Out of Which the Measures of Intimacy and Consociation were Constructed
- C2 Comparison of Relationship between Intimacy and Consociation (Frequency of Contact) at Individual Level, Aggregate Level and Grouped Level
- D1 Social Contacts of Day-Dwellers and Night-Dwellers
- D2 Political Primary Zone of Day-Dwellers and Night Dwellers
- D3 Communal Context of Day-Dwellers and Night-Dwellers
- D4 Demographic Characteristics of Day-Dwellers and Night-Dwellers

Part 1. Introduction: From Contextual to Network Analysis

The purpose here is to sketch briefly the background for this technical report on the "network data" generated by the 1980 Pilot Study.

Because of increasing or, perhaps better, reviving interest in the contextual treatment of individual-level social phenomena like citizen participation in elections, the original CPS proposal to the National Science Foundation for long-term funding included a project on social network analysis of voting behavior to be conducted as part of the "supplemental" 1980 study. The NES/CPS request for substantial funding of this project was not authorized because it was felt that the project required considerably more preliminary planning and development. However, in order to facilitate such preliminary work (and thus implicitly recognizing the potential merit of the project), the NES/CPS budget provided for relatively small sums to be spent on R&D work in this area during budget years II (1978-79) and III (1979-80) of the grant period.

Three activities were therefore initiated, as follows:

1.1 The senior author of this technical report began an extensive review of the literature, especially in anthropology and sociology, on "network analysis." This work is far from completed, but a first report, The Columbia Studies of Personal Influence in Voting and Public Affairs (July-August, 1978) was distributed to members of the NES/CPS Board, the 1980 Planning Committee, and the CPS staff.

1.2 A conference on "Social Network Analysis in the Study of

Political and Electoral Behavior" was organized in 1978-79 and held, under the NES/CPS Board's auspices, at Stanford University on May 10-11, 1979. The conference was attended by fourteen persons, including six specially invited scholars from sociology and social psychology knowledgeable in network analysis, two observer-participants from the National Science Foundation and the Social Science Research Council, several NES/CPS Board members and the authors of this technical report. Seven of the participants prepared post-conference memoranda reflecting on the conference proceedings and summarizing their views (see "Post-Conference Memoranda on Network Analysis in Politics," dated July 10, 1979).

3. A set of neighborhood context- and network-relevant interview questions were developed, pre-tested in early January, 1979, and administered in the field in connection with Wave II of the Pilot Study during April, 1979. These questions are reviewed in Part 2 of this technical report which, in Parts 3, 4 and 5, as well as in Appendices A, B, C and D presents preliminary analyses of the data.

Since planning the entire project on network analysis in 1976, we have become even more convinced of the need to explore and substantiate the much-neglected interactional aspects of the vote choice and political behavior more generally. What confirms us in this conviction is the considerable interest that so many scholars have expressed in what, for better or worse, is now called "contextual data." By "contextual data" is usually meant data concerning the properties--demographic, ecological, or socio-economic--of the areas in which people live. But by "contextual data" can also be meant the "compositional" (or "structural") properties

of a group that emerge from the interactions of the individuals who constitute the group. It should be pointed out, therefore, that the presumably contextual effects observed in the behavior of a dependent variable, regardless of whether the contexts are constructed from aggregate indicators (say educational level of census tracts) or from aggregation of survey-derived individual-level data, remain essentially inferential statements, often implying but not really demonstrating that the observed effects are due to people actually being in contact with each other in the context that is being specified and measured. To quote from a recent monograph by Flanagan and Richardson (1977: 56), that explicitly adopts a network perspective and uses the concept of network in its title,

... we have neither sociometric data on social networks or even self-reported data on the respondents' perceptions of the partisan preferences of the small groups and organizations they are involved in. We are, therefore, only using surrogates here as our indicators of social network influences.

The 1980 pilot study, by way of contrast, included two types of network-relevant questions: first, a set of questions asked of the respondents concerning demographic, ecological and party-organizational aspects of their neighborhood; and second, a set of questions eliciting information concerning their self-perceived interactions, social and political, with some of their neighbors. Although the latter set of questions approximates the requirements of network analysis, it does not constitute such analysis because, unlike required by a genuine network approach, no effort was made to interview, in turn, the persons

who had been named by the respondents as "social contacts." We therefore use the term "network" most sparingly in this report.

Because people live in a neighborhood that may be characterized as high-, medium- or low-status in terms of some aggregate indicators, the independently observed effects of such social environments-- independent, that is, from individual-level effects--cannot be simply attributed to interpersonal relations in the neighborhood. There is evidence that, under contemporary, primarily urban conditions of communication, transportation and work location, "neighborhood" (as social environment) may not be the "primary context" of many people's interactions and social identifications. Considerations of this kind underlie the questions asked in the pilot study concerning what we call a person's "life space" (operationalized in the study by questions concerning shopping habits, work location, church-going and commuting for the purpose of performing these activities).

Let us be more explicit: the boundaries of the areas in which people reside and for which we collect census-type aggregate data for the purpose of contextual analysis are probably not the boundaries within which these people acquire, hear about or reinforce their political attitudes, opinions, preferences and vote choices. People may work outside their census tract defined neighborhoods, attend church elsewhere, shop elsewhere, and probably have friends living in other areas. In short, "social-environmental" and "social-network" contexts may not overlap. Whether they do or do not overlap is, as our colleague John Sprague would be the first to concede, an eminently empirical question. It is an empirical question worth answering because, we

suggest, it can tell us something not only about the effects of social interaction in electoral behavior and the theoretical importance of social interaction, but also about the meaning of the effects obtained in that kind of contextual analysis which assumes the social environment constructed from aggregate-areal data to be an operative variable at the individual level of voting and other manifestations of political behavior.

It should be obvious that our interest in contextual data of an environmental sort and analysis, and an interest in social network data proper and analysis, are closely related. The importance of linking the former and the latter may be illustrated by an example of what has been observed in some studies of contextual effects--namely, that while an upper-SES environment may reinforce and accelerate the (already high) participation rate of upper-SES persons, it may have the opposite effect on lower-SES persons living in the same environment; that is, the environment has a depressing effect at the individual level. We have seen some fanciful "explanations" of this phenomenon, but they do not ring true. The one-step survey can tell us a great deal about this sort of outcome of contextual analysis if we ask the right questions (as we hope we did, in part, in the Pilot Study), but two-step or three-step networking (through snowball sampling) might tell us considerably more.

Part 2. Item Description, Marginal Distributions and Construction of Measures

This item description, including the marginal distributions of the data, reports on Questions F1 through F11b of the pilot study interview schedule and the measures which are constructed out of the questions. It does not report on a number of "primary group" questions that appear in the interview schedule on the initiative of other R&D investigators (we shall use some of these questions as "dependent variables" in Part 5). Chart 2.1 represents an overview of the variables, as named, and indexes their location in the following description.

For the purpose of this presentation, the items are grouped into the four major conceptual categories which are used in the inter-item analysis of Part 3. These categories are: 1) The Communal Context of the Neighborhood; 2) The Neighborhood as Life Space; 3) The Social-Interpersonal Context; and 4) The Political Primary Zone. The questions themselves are of four epistemological kinds that involve: 1) Statements involving "object appraisal;" 2) Statements about self; 3) Statements about self and others; and 4) Statements about others. Chart 2.2 provides an overview by cross-tabling the four conceptual categories and the four epistemological classes.

As it would be cumbersome to speak of "respondent-with-knowledge-of-party," especially when we discuss relationships between variables, we shall simply use the expression "party knowledge" and, for instance, speak of the relationship between party knowledge and social contact.

Chart 2.1. The Measures

<u>VAR NAME</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
Years of Residence	2.10	Number of years R has lived in neighborhood (Q. F1. VAR 46)
Neighborhood Quality	2.11	R's appraisal of the neighborhood's quality (Q. F2. VAR 48)
Population Stability	2.12	R's perception of people moving in or out (Q. F6. VAR 58)
Personal Mobility	2.13	R's own intention to move or stay in neighborhood (Q. F7. VAR 59)
Party Knowledge	2.14	R's awareness of party organization (Q. F8. VAR 60)
Party Existence	2.14	R's report on existence of party organization in neighborhood (Q. F8. VAR 60)
Shopping Working Church-going	2.20	Does R perform these "life space" activities in neighborhood or elsewhere? (Q.F3, F4, F5. VAR 52, 54, 56)
Life Space Index	2.21	Number of activities in neighborhood (based on VAR 52, 54, 56)
Shop Commute Work Commute Church Commute	2.22	Number of miles R commutes to shopping, work and church if not in neighborhood (Q. F3a, F4a, F5a. VAR 53, 55, 57)
Median Commute	2.23	Median for total averaged miles R commutes outside neighborhood (based on VAR 53, 55, 57)
Social Contact/ Neighboring	2.30	R's report on social contact with neighbors (Q. F9. VAR 61)
Contact Number	2.31	Number of neighbor contact names given by R (Q. F10. VAR 62)
Contact Years	2.32	Number of years R knows neighbors (contacts) (Q. F10a. VAR 63, 67, 71)
Intimacy	2.33	How "close" R feels to neighbors (contacts) (Q. F10b. VAR 65, 69, 73)
Consociation	2.34	How frequently R interacts with social contacts (Q. F10c. VAR 66, 70, 74)

Chart 2.1. Cont.

<u>VAR NAME</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
Political Conversation	2.40	R's talking with social contacts about politics (Q. F11. VAR 75, 78, 81)
Political Climate	2.41	R's agreeing/disagreeing with conversation partners (Q. F11a. VAR 76, 79, 82)
Primary Zone Political Composition	2.42	R's designation of political party identification of social contacts (Q. F11b. VAR 77, 80, 83)
Political Milieu	2.43	Measures homogeneity/heterogeneity of R's primary zone (based on VAR 77, 80, 83)
Cognitive Capability	2.44	R's ability to specify the party identification of his/her contacts (based on VAR 77, 80, 83)

Chart 2.2. The Epistemological Properties of the Variables

Epistemological Properties of Statements	Analytic Categories			
	<u>Communal Context</u>	<u>Neighborhood Life Space</u>	<u>Social Context</u>	<u>Political Primary Zone</u>
About "Objects"	Neighborhood Quality			
	Population Stability			
	Party Existence			
About "Self" Only	Years of Residence	Shopping Working		Cognitive Capability
	Personal Mobility	Church-going Life Space		
	Party Knowledge	Shop Commute Work Commute Church Commute Median Commute		
About "Self" and "Others"			Social Contact	Political Conversation
			Contact Number	Political Climate
			Contact Years	
			Intimacy	
			Consoci- ation	
About "Others" Only				Political Composition
				Political Milieu

The differentiation of the questions and measures from an epistemological standpoint is important because it gives a clue to their reliability and the nature of the inferences that can be made. For instance, the questions and measures subsumed under "Object Appraisal" are either "judgmental" or "informational," but we shall sometimes use them as if they provided "objective" data or "facts." As an example, Question F2, asking the respondent to judge his/her neighborhood as "good" or "not so good" will be treated as if the neighborhood were "in fact" good or not so good, even though we know that we are dealing with a subjective evaluation. On the other hand, Question F8, asking the respondent whether he knows about party organizations in the neighborhood, is treated both cognitively, yielding a measure of "party knowledge" (distinguishing between those who give a "firm" answer and those who do not), and informationally, yielding a measure of "party existence" (the "yes" or "no" responses of those giving a firm answer). Again, both measures are treated as "facts"--there are neighborhoods where knowledge about party organization is either high or low, and there are neighborhoods where party organizations do or do not exist. Clearly, the different questions yield more or less reliable answers, and we shall occasionally comment on the epistemological character of the questions and our use of them as we present the questions, the marginal distributions and the measures.

Some of the data are aggregated for the purpose of index construction into individual- or micro-level constructs. For instance, a measure called "Life Space" reports whether the respondent carries on one, two or three of his "life space activities" (shopping, working, church-going) in the neighborhood; or a measure called "Median Commute" separates out

those respondents whose average commuting distance in his/her three life space activities is below or above the median for all respondents. On the other hand, the measure called "Political Composition of Primary Zone" aggregates the information about the party identification of the respondent's several social contacts for the purpose of serving as a surrogate macro-contextual variable in our individual-level analysis.

Although we will have more to say about the "small-n problem" and its effect on index construction, cross-tabulation and measurement in the opening pages of Part 3, we present here, in Chart 2.3, an overview of the number of cases available for analysis--in terms of totals as well as when the measures are dichotomized or trichotomized. We had initially available the 236 interviews with Wave II respondents. As we discovered quickly, numbers vanished rapidly in cross-tabulations, either because of missing data on one or another variable or because there were not enough cases in a given category of a variable. Although we would prefer to work with the more refined trichotomous or tercile measures, we do so only when we could not do otherwise and opted for dichotomous treatment whenever possible to maintain as much stability in the cells of the cross-tabulations as possible.

Finally, we present in Chart 2.4 the percentage differences in the marginal distributions of the data between Forms A and B (A-B) of the interview schedule. As appears, with a few exceptions, the differences are quite small. We have not examined where Forms A and B were administered and can therefore not comment, at this time, on whether the differences are systematic or random.

Chart 2.3. Number of Cases Available for Analysis

<u>VAR</u>	<u>VARNAME</u>	<u>TOTAL FOR ANALYSIS</u>	<u>DICHOTOMY/ MEDIAN CUT</u>	<u>TRICHOTOMY/ TERCILES</u>
46	Years of Residence	236	117/119	79/80/77
48	Neighborhood Quality	231	200/31	200/9/22
52	Shopping Place	236	118/118	
53	Shopping Commute	116	62/54	
54	Work Place	190	72/108	
55	Work Commute	105	53/52	
56	Church Place	198	107/91	
57	Church Commute	90	43/47	
	Life Space	151	73/78	30/94/27
	Median Commute	188	92/96	65/62/61
58	Population Stability	224	40/184	
59	Personal Mobility	232	69/163	55/14/163
60	Party Knowledge	236	153/83	
60	Party Existence	153	70/83	22/48/83
61	Social Contact	236	173/63	
62	Contact Number	172	39/133	10/29/133
63	#1 Contact Years	170	85/85	
65	#1 Contact Closeness	170	67/103	67/80/23
66	#1 Contact Frequency	160	75/85	75/37/48
67	#2 Contact Years	159	79/80	
69	#2 Contact Closeness	160	50/110	50/75/35
70	#2 Contact Frequency	152	62/90	62/26/64
71	#3 Contact Years	127	61/66	
73	#3 Contact Closeness	130	30/100	30/64/36

Chart 2.3. Cont.

<u>VAR</u>	<u>VARNAME</u>	<u>TOTAL FOR ANALYSIS</u>	<u>DICHOTOMY/ MEDIAN CUT</u>	<u>TRICHOTOMY/ TERCILES</u>
74	#3 Contact Frequency	125	35/90	35/25/65
	Years of Contact	170	85/85	57/56/57
	Intimacy	170	82/88	25/57/88
	Consociation	162	94/68	30/64/68
75	#1 Conversation	172	74/98	
76	#1 Agreement	71	58/13	
77	#1 Party Perception	172	96/76	
77	#1 Party Identification	96		31/23/42
78	#2 Conversation	161	58/103	
79	#2 Agreement	56	44/12	
80	#2 Party Perception	161	91/70	
80	#2 Party Identification	91		21/15/55
81	#3 Conversation	132	44/88	
82	#3 Agreement	42	33/9	
83	#3 Party Perception	132	75/57	
83	#3 Party Identification	75		19/18/38
	Political Conversation	172	92/80	32/60/80
	Political Climate	91	63/28	63/18/10
	Primary Zone Composition	119	44/75	44/54/21
	Political Milieu	119		76/22/21
	Cognitive Capability	168	119/49	75/44/49

Chart 2.4. Range of Percentage Differences between Forms A and B (A-B)

VAR	CODE OR ANALYTIC CATEGORIES						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
46	-3	+6	-2	0	0	+1	-2
48	-3	+2	+1				
52	-8	+8					
54	-8	+8					
56	-1	+1					
53	+11	-11					
55	+9	-9					
57	+1	-1					
58	0	0					
59	+4	+4	-9				
60	+3	-2	+8	-10			
61	+1	-1					
62	+4	+6	-10				
63	+9	-9					
67	+6	-6					
71	0	0					
65	+14	-9	-5				
69	+14	-14	0				
73	+10	-8	-2				
66	+5	+11	-11	-1	-3	-2	
70	+7	-1	+2	+1	-6	-1	
74	+6	+4	-3	-7	+2	-4	
75	+4	-4					
78	+6	-6					
81	-6	+6					
76	+8	-8					
79	+26	-26					
82	+1	-1					
77	-12	+4	+8				
80	-7	+8	+2				
83	+14	+12	-25				

2.1 The Neighborhood's Communal Context

2.10 YEARS OF RESIDENCE (VAR 46)

Q. F1. "We have talked about the country and how it is getting along. We are also interested in how people in your neighborhood are getting along--we mean people who live within three or four blocks from you. First of all, how long have you lived around here?"

Purpose: The question was designed to yield a measure of a person's "social integration" into his/her neighborhood; but the measure can also serve as a measure of a neighborhood's social integration potential if one compares neighborhoods with long-term and short-term residents.

Coding: Answers were translated into number of years and months if an answer of more than 12 months or a fraction of years was given. If the range was given, the midpoint was coded. For the purpose of analysis, the monthly code (VAR 47) was ignored and the respondents, 32 in all, were coded as "less than one year."

Distribution: The median for the pilot sample was eight years, with 117 cases below and 119 cases above the median. The range was from less than one year to 83 years (one case). There were no missing cases.

Measure: Although we experimented with terciles, we settle on a dichotomized measure--"long residence" (more than eight years) and "short residence" (eight years or less)--using the median as the cutting point.

Interpretation: Straightforward as specified under "Purpose." However, there remains some difficulty with the concept of the "neighborhood" in which the respondent has presumably lived for the years he/she indicated. Pre-testing of the questionnaire revealed that leaving the definition of neighborhood up to the respondent made for undeterminable variability. Therefore, the pilot questionnaire defined neighborhood for the respondent

in terms of "three or four blocks from you." Interviewer reports indicate that this definition is not serviceable in rural areas. We do not know how interviewers resolved this problem.

2.11 NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY (VAR 48)

Q. F2. "Generally speaking, would you say this is a pretty good neighborhood to live in, or not so good?"

Purpose: The initial purpose of the question was, of course, to discover the respondent's subjective feeling about his/her neighborhood. As we did not define the meaning of "good" for the respondent, we asked him/her a follow-up question (F2a)--"What makes you say this?" However, we did not use the answers to this follow-up question in order to develop a perhaps more sophisticated measure. We assumed that a respondent's appraisal of the neighborhood would affect his/her perceptions of other aspects of the neighborhood about which we sought "more objective" information. (See Appendix A for the responses to the follow-up question).

Coding: The coding allowed for a middle category "depends." But only nine cases fell into this category.

Distribution: The marginal distribution is highly skewed, with 87% of the cases in the "good" category. Only five respondents gave the "don't know" answer.

Measure: A dichotomized nominal variable which divides the respondents into those who judged the neighborhood "good" and those who are placed into a combined "not so good" and "depends" category with 31 respondents (or 13%) of whom nine were originally in the "depends" category.

Interpretation: Despite the skewed distribution, we shall treat this variable as a component of the neighborhood's "communal context" as if it were an "objective" measure. Future research should provide for a

more discriminating question and measure.

2.12 POPULATION STABILITY (VAR 58)

Q. F6. "As far as your neighborhood is concerned, would you say people move in and out a great deal or not very much?"

Purpose: The question was intended to tap the respondent's sense of his/her neighborhood's stability as a residential area. A neighborhood from which people move a great deal should significantly differ from a neighborhood with little turnover of population.

Coding: The two-category code--"great deal" and "not very much"--was given by the question and did not provide for a middle category.

Distribution: Highly skewed with 82% of the respondents reporting "not very much" population movement. Twelve respondents gave the "don't know" answer.

Measure: A dichotomized nominal variable in terms of the untouched code categories characterized as "high" and "low." DK's were treated as missing cases.

Interpretation: Although the measure is probably quite unreliable as a "factual" one, we shall use it as such and as a property of the communal context. It may well be that the skewed distribution in this case, just as in the case of neighborhood quality, is due to sampling bias--in the sense that "good neighborhoods" (from which people are less likely to move) were oversampled. The question, also, should provide for more differentiated responses.

2.13 PERSONAL MOBILITY (VAR 59)

Q. F7. "How about you? If you had the chance, would you move out of this neighborhood, or are you satisfied to stay here?"

Purpose: The question is ambiguous. On the one hand, it seems to ask about the respondent's "satisfaction" with his/her neighborhood and could be interpreted as indicative of his/her commitment to the neighborhood. On the other hand, one can be "satisfied to stay" and yet want to move if there is a "chance" that is really unrelated to one's satisfaction or commitment, as when one has a better career opportunity elsewhere. We therefore did not use the question to measure "satisfaction" but personal mobility intention.

Coding: The code provides for three categories--"move out," "depends," and "stay here."

Distribution: Like on the quality and stability measures, the distribution of the cases on the personal mobility measure is skewed, if somewhat less so--with 70% of the respondents in the "stay here" category. There were only four missing cases.

Measure: A dichotomized nominal variable with respondents who indicated they might "move out" or were ambivalent ("depends") combined into a single category (high mobility), leaving the respondents who said they would stay (low mobility) untouched.

Interpretation: "Low mobility" (would stay) is interpreted to mean that the neighborhood as an aggregate is "stable," but the measure differs from the prior stability measure in that the latter is one of perception of others while the present measure refers to the respondent himself/herself. Despite its ambiguity, therefore, it may be a more reliable measure of one component of the neighborhood's communal context. Future

research should present the respondent with more options that would provide a stronger test of commitment or intention. For instance, one might ask: "If your employer wanted you to move elsewhere (another city?), would you do so, or would you look for another job here or nearby so that you can remain in this neighborhood?"

2.14 PARTY KNOWLEDGE and PARTY EXISTENCE (VAR 60)

Q. F8. "As far as you know, is there a Democratic or a Republican party organization in this neighborhood? (Which one?)"

Purpose: The question taps the respondent's knowledge as a respondent as such and as an informant. Either he/she is aware of parties or not--the question yields a variable called "party knowledge." But those aware of party activity in the neighborhood can also serve as informants as to whether one party organization or the other, or both, are present or not--the question yields a variable called "party existence" as a property of the neighborhood's communal context.

Coding: Respondents giving a firm answer were coded into four categories--yes, Democratic; yes, Republican; yes, both; and no, neither. Others were coded "don't know."

Distribution: Of all 236 respondents, 65% gave firm positive or negative answers, and 35% were DK's. Of the 153 firm cases, 8% reported Democratic organization, 6% Republican, 31% both, and 54% denied the existence of a party organization. There are no missing cases.

Measure: The data are used in the form of two measures--one for all 236 respondents that simply divides them into the knowledgeable and ignorants--the "party knowledge" variable. The other measure, based on the knowledgeable only, treats the ignorants as missing cases and provides for

two dichotomous categories--those reporting the existence and those asserting the non-existence of party organization as a property of the neighborhood's communal context.

Interpretation: The two measures speak for themselves. In future research one would want to probe whether those respondents coded "no"--there is no organization--may not in fact be simply ignorant of party organization in the neighborhood. The reliability of the "no" responses is therefore open to question.

2.2 The Neighborhood as Life Space

2.20 SHOPPING (VAR 52), WORKING (VAR 54), CHURCH-GOING (VAR 56)

- Q. F3. "Where do you do most of your family's household shopping? Is it here in the neighborhood, or elsewhere?"
- Q. F4. "Where do you work? Is it nearby here in the neighborhood, or is the place where you go to work elsewhere?"
- Q. F5. "When you go to church or religious services, is it here in the neighborhood or is it elsewhere?"

Purpose: The purpose of the three questions is to explore the neighborhood as what we call a "life space" of which shopping, working and church-going may be considered dimensions. Unfortunately omitted from the questionnaire was a question which might have asked respondents where they pursue their leisure-time activities.

Coding: The coding was uniform for all three questions--in neighborhood, elsewhere or both. In the question on church-going, provision was made for those not going to church who had to be treated, along with the DK's, as missing cases.

Distribution: The marginal distributions are as follows--

	<u>Shopping</u> N=236	<u>Working</u> N=236	<u>Church-going</u> N=236
Neighborhood	50%	31%	45%
Elsewhere	50	46	39
No work, church	-	21	16
DK/NA	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100%	100%

Measure: a) Shopping--three respondents reporting both neighborhood and elsewhere are classified as "elsewhere" to produce a dichotomized nominal variable; b) Working--there were 28 women who described themselves as "housewives" who are coded as working in the neighborhood in order to save these cases for analysis; a separate check on the variable with these cases omitted indicated that there is no significant difference between the two measures and that the direction and strength of the associations for "working in the neighborhood or elsewhere" remain about the same. One respondent claiming to work in both neighborhood and elsewhere is assigned to the "elsewhere" category to produce a dichotomized nominal variable; c) Church-going--two cases worshipping in both neighborhood and elsewhere are classed as going to church elsewhere. Respondents not going to church are treated as missing cases. Again a dichotomized nominal variable.

Interpretation: The measures of life space activities are straightforward and self-explanatory. Interviewers had evidently no difficulties in having the respondent define the location of his/her activity. An attempt to scale the three activities did not produce a sufficiently high coefficient of reproducibility.

2.21 LIFE SPACE (based on VAR 52, 54, 56)

Purpose: Although we failed in obtaining a scaled measure of the three life space activities, we sought a summary measure that would give an over-all impression of the neighborhood as a person's life space. The measure entitled "Life Space" seems to be a satisfactory substitute.

Measure: For those respondents who shopped, worked and worshipped, the number of their activities in the neighborhood are counted to produce an additive measure that can range from 0, no activities being carried on in the neighborhood, to 3--all activities being performed there. Respondents not working or attending church are dropped from the analyses as missing cases. The resulting four-point scale is too unwieldy for work with the small number of cases available for cross-tabulations. Respondents with 0 and 1 activity are therefore combined, for certain analytic purposes, into a category called "few," and those with 2 and/or 3 activities in the neighborhood into a category called "many."

Interpretation: The dichotomized measure of "Life Space" obliterates one of the most interesting and possibly important aspects of the concept--the distinction between those who carry on all of their activities in the neighborhood--the "day dwellers"--and those who carry on all of their activities elsewhere--the "night dwellers." Because of the intrinsic interest in whether "neighborhood context" makes a difference for day and night dwellers, App. D of this paper presents a separate analysis of these extreme "types."

2.22 SHOP COMMUTING, WORK COMMUTING, CHURCH COMMUTING (VAR 53, 55, 57)

Q. F3a. "About how many miles away is the place where you do your shopping?"

Q. F4a. "About how many miles away is the place where you work?"

Q. F5a. "About how many miles away is the place at which you go to church or attend religious service?"

Purpose: These questions were asked only of the respondents who reported carrying on one or the other of the three life space activities elsewhere. In asking the questions, it was assumed that physical distance from home to do one's shopping, working or worshipping might translate into "psychological distance," or that the time spent in commuting might separate one more or less from the neighborhood's communal context and involvement in the life of the neighborhood.

Coding: Actual commuting miles reported by the respondent were recorded.

Distribution: Some marginal cuts and distributions for the three sets of commuting data look as follows--

<u>Number of Miles Commute Distance</u>	<u>Shopping N=116</u>	<u>Working N=105</u>	<u>Church-going N=90</u>
One	17%	4%	20%
Two to five	56	38	50
Six and more	27	58	30
	100%	100%	100%
Mean	4.86	10.58	5.20
Median	2.5+	7.0+	3.0+
Below Median	53.4%	50.5%	47.8%
Above Median	46.6%	49.5	52.2
	100%	100%	100%

Measure: Respondents were classed into two groups--those below the median (1-3 miles for shopping and church-going; 1-7 miles for working)

and those above the median (4 miles and more for shopping and church-going and 8 miles and more for working).

Interpretation: Straightforward.

2.23 MEDIAN COMMUTE (based on VAR 53, 55, 57)

Purpose: Median Commute is to serve as a summary index that might be more efficient for the small-n analysis of relationships between respondents' life space environments and other contexts or behavioral patterns than the individual commuting measures. It may also be thought of as an indicator of a neighborhood's peripheral location in the larger ecological environment.

Measure: "Median Commute" is built on the average distance of the respondent's commuting to those places where he/she may do his/her shopping, working and/or worshipping. The average for each respondent was computed for all his/her reported commuting miles, and this average was divided at the median for all respondents to obtain a dichotomized measure of total commuting distance. The two comparison groups produced by the measure are those who commute, on the average, five miles or less overall and those who commute, on the average, more than five miles.

Interpretation: Although "Median Commute" probably conceals much of what goes on in respondents' life space outside their neighborhood as exemplified by shopping, working or worshipping at a distance, the measure may be more useful for contextual analysis than the individual measures which are more itemistic and less configurational.

2.3 The Social-Interpersonal Context

2.30 SOCIAL CONTACT/NEIGHBORING (VAR 61)

Q. F9. "Are there people living in this neighborhood with whom you or your family get together? I mean, people whose homes you visit, who you go to the movies or ball games with, or just talk with when you see them?"

Purpose: The question serves initially as a filter to identify respondents who interact with their neighbors in more than the most casual fashion so that they may then be asked questions concerning particular neighbors in a respondent's "primary zone." The question may of course also serve the purpose of constructing a measure of "social contact" in its own right, distinguishing between the more isolated persons and the more socially integrated ones.

Coding: Straightforward--yes and no.

Distribution: Those reporting social contacts constitute 73% of the total sample of 236; those with no social contacts make up 27%. There are no missing cases. In other words, there will be 173 cases available for analysis of interpersonal relations in the respondent's primary zone.

Measure: Straightforward.

Interpretation: Although the measure is suggestive as an index of "alienation" vs. sociability, we have not used it as such in the inter-item analysis, largely because people without contacts in the neighborhood may be well-connected outside. One may therefore assume, for instance, that social contact with neighbors can be facilitated or impeded by, say, the neighborhood's communal context, but one cannot assume that its absence is informative about the individual who is not involved with any neighbors in a social fashion.

2.31 CONTACT NUMBER (VAR 62)

Q. F10. "I'd like to ask you several questions about two or three of these neighbors whom you see most often. So that you and I can be sure we're talking about the same persons in the next several questions, I need to have just the first names of no more than three of these people."

Purpose: To identify the respondent's "primary zone." Although respondents were urged to give three names, enough respondents could give only one or two names so that "contact number" could serve as a variable. Contact number can therefore serve as a further differentiating measure of sociability.

Coding: Respondents were coded as giving one, two or three names.

Distribution: Of the 172 effective respondents--those who had reported social contacts--77% gave three names, 17% gave two names, and only 6% gave one name. Only one respondent refused to give any name.

Measure: The code values are used as the values in the various analyses where the "Contact Number" variable is used.

Interpretation: It is important not to confuse the notion of "primary zone" with "primary group" because nothing is known about whether the persons named by the respondent are themselves in contact with each other. It is also important in interpreting the particular measure, "Contact Number," that a respondent may have many more than three contacts in the neighborhood. The measure is, therefore, at best a very rough indicator of conviviality.

2.32 CONTACT YEARS (VAR 63, 67, 71)

Q. F10a. "About how long have you known (NAME)?"

Purpose: How long a person knows another may be indicative of the partners' mutual trust, confidence or liking, but the measure built on

years of contact is difficult to conceptualize. We are simply using it for whatever it may be worth.

Coding: Answers for each person named were translated into number of years and months, if answer of more than 12 months was given or fraction of years given. If range was given, the mid-point was coded.

Distribution: Most interesting, perhaps, is that there is a direct relationship between the order in which social contacts #1, #2 and #3 were named and, in the aggregate, the mean and median number of years they were known to the respondents, as the following table shows:

<u>Years Known to Respondents</u>	<u>First-named Contacts N=170</u>	<u>Second-named Contacts N=159</u>	<u>Third-named Contacts N=127</u>
Mean	13.25	12.25	11.91
Median	9.5	8.5	7.5
Below median N =	85	79	61
Above median N =	85	80	66

Measure: The "Contact Years" index is constructed in two steps. First, the average length of time in years that each respondent had known the contacts whom he mentioned is computed. The aggregate of these averages per respondent is then cut at the median for the entire distribution, producing one set of respondents who have known their social contacts on an average of nine years or less, and another set who have known their social contacts for over nine years.

Interpretation: The implications of the measure of "Contact Years" cannot be divined in advance because of conceptual ambiguity as to what it means to know someone for a long or short time. For instance, one cannot say a priori whether knowing a person for a long time is conducive or not

conducive to frequent interaction with the partner. What contact years means is therefore best left up to empirical determination through cross-variable analysis.

2.33 INTIMACY (VAR 65, 69, 73)

Q. F10b. "Would you say (NAME) is a very close personal friend, a good friend, or more of an acquaintance?"

Purpose: The question seeks to determine the respondent's attraction to the person named. What was of interest initially was the respondent's interpretation of the terms "friend" and "acquaintance," on the one hand, and "close" vs. "good" friend on the other. The paucity of the data does not permit such exploration, and we are using the question only for estimating very roughly the degree of "intimacy" that may be characteristic of the respondent's primary zone.

Coding: Initial coding allowed for three categories--close friend, good friend, and acquaintance.

Distribution: As the marginals show, respondents did agree to the term "friend" considerably more than to the term "acquaintance," but to the term "close" somewhat less than to the term "good." What is more interesting, however, and sheds "internal" light on the terminology is that the proportion of those calling a neighbor a "close friend" declines systematically from Name #1 to Name #3, and the proportion of those called "acquaintances" increases correspondingly, with the middle category, "good friend," remaining stable. The following table gives the data:

<u>Neighbor Designation</u>	<u>Name #1 N=170</u>	<u>Name #2 N=160</u>	<u>Name #3 N=130</u>	<u>All Names N=460</u>
Close friend	39%	31%	23%	32%
Good Friend	47	47	49	48
Acquaintance	<u>14</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>20</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Measure: The measure constructed for the purpose of analysis is more "demanding" than the measure of the individual distributions. Because, in the individual cases, respondents seemed to use the term "close friend" sparingly but "good friend" rather liberally, the measure of Intimacy is heavily loaded toward the former, as follows: 1) those who described all of their social contacts as "close friends" are categorized as "close;" 2) those who described some neighbors as close and others as good friends or acquaintances, or both, are categorized as "part close;" and 3) those who designated none of their social contacts as close are classed as "all not close." Although proceeding in this manner places some respondents giving less than three names into the same grouping as those giving all three names, it has the advantage of maintaining the number of usable cases while still producing significant categories that are aggregate descriptions of the respondent's primary zone. The marginals of the measure are as follows: 1) primary zone is "close," 15%; 2) primary zone is "partly close," 33%; 3) primary zone is "not close," 52% (N=170).

Interpretation: Both the individual measures and the aggregate primary zone measure suggest that people's interpretation of the entire series of questions concerning their social contacts and primary zone is not whimsical. We noted previously that the order in which social contacts

were named is not unrelated to the number of years a person has been known to the respondent. We now note that people "order" their social contacts in a meaningful manner--that the person first named is evidently more salient to the nominator than the person named next and so on. As a result, the aggregated measure of Intimacy would seem to be both reliable and internally valid.

2.34 CONSOCIATION (VAR 66, 70, 74)

Q. F10c. "How often do you usually get together with (NAME)? Just give me the number from this list which best describes the situation."

Purpose: The question was originally intended to produce a measure of the frequency of interaction between the respondent and the persons he had named as social contacts.

Coding: Respondents were given six alternatives in terms of which to estimate the frequency of their interactions with their social contacts and were directly coded in terms of these options (for description, see below).

Distribution: As the following table shows, respondents' ordering of their social contacts is again confirmed: almost half (47%) reported contact with Name #1 "more than once a week," and the figures decline systematically across the table as Names #2 and #3 are examined, and the figures increase systematically in the opposite direction as the less frequent contacts are indicated.

<u>Frequency of Contact</u>	<u>Name #1 N=160</u>	<u>Name #2 N=152</u>	<u>Name #3 N=125</u>	<u>All Names N=437</u>
More than once a week	47%	41%	28%	39%
Once a week	23	17	20	20
Two or three times a month	13	17	22	17
Once a month	8	13	13	11
Several times a year	2	9	13	10
Rarely	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Measure: Because, overall, the less frequent interactions are "under-represented," we made the cutting point for the primary zone summary measure as stringent as possible, creating the following measure of "Consociation:" 1) those who get together with all of their social contacts more than once a week (N=30, or 19%); 2) those who get together with some of their contacts more than once a week and less frequently with others (N=64, or 39%); and 3) those who do not get together with any of their contacts more than once a week (N=68, or 42%).

Interpretation: "Consociation" should be interpreted as a "behavioral" measure of the primary zone's social integration, in contrast to "Intimacy" which is a measure of affect.

2.4 The Political Primary Zone

2.40 POLITICAL CONVERSATION (VAR 75, 78, 81)

Q. F11. "Now I'm interested in finding out whether you talk about politics, political issues or candidates with your neighbors. Do you ever talk politics with (NAME)?"

Purpose: This is the first time respondents are asked about the political salience or content of their social interactions with their neighbors. It

should be noted that the question casts its net broadly--"politics," "political issues," and "candidates" are suggested as "fit" topics of political conversation, and we have no way to discriminate in regard to the content of the conversation.

Coding: Respondents were expected to say only "yes" or "no" to the question, and these dichotomized answers served as the code categories.

Distribution: The salience of the order in which respondents' social contacts are named as political conversationalists is again noteworthy. More respondents reported political conversation with the first-named contact than with the second- and third-named. However, for all three contacts and in the aggregate total many more respondents reported no political conversation than do. The following table gives the data:

<u>Political Conversation</u>	<u>Name #1 N=172</u>	<u>Name #2 N=161</u>	<u>Name #3 N=132</u>	<u>All Names N=465</u>
Yes, do talk	43%	36%	33%	38%
No, do not talk	<u>57</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>62</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Measure: "Political Conversation" as a property of the primary zone is computed as follows: 1) those who talked politics with all of the social contacts (N=32, or 19%); 2) those who talked politics with some but not others (N=60, or 35%); and 3) those who did not talk about politics with any of their social contacts (N=80, or 46%).

Interpretation: As the previous measures of primary zone variables, this measure ignores the number of contacts with whom the respondent is in touch and, therefore, gives only a partial view of the "density" of

his/her political involvement through conversation (for instance, a person with one social contact who is described as a partner in political conversation is located in the same grouping as the respondent who converses about politics with all three contacts whom he may have named, and so on).

2.41 POLITICAL CLIMATE (VAR 76, 79, 82)

Q. F11a. "In general, would you say you agree with (NAME) on politics or do you disagree?"

Purpose: The question was intended for the purpose of constructing a measure of what one may call the "political climate" of the respondent's primary zone environment--the comfort that may come from being surrounded by persons with whom one agrees politically or the tension or conflict that may be present.

Coding: Straightforward as "agree" or "disagree."

Distribution: As the question was asked only of those with whom the respondent reported political conversation, we are now dealing with very small numbers. It will be noted that the question does not produce the same systematic drop-off noted in connection with the Intimacy, Conso- ciation or Conversation (there is only the slightest percentage decline in the response pattern between Name #1 and Name #2). The data:

<u>Political Agreement</u>	<u>Name #1 N=71</u>	<u>Name #2 N=56</u>	<u>Name #3 N=42</u>	<u>All Names N=169</u>
Yes, agrees	82%	79%	79%	80%
No, disagrees	18	21	21	20
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Measure: The measure of "Political Climate" as a property of the primary zone is built in the same manner as the previous aggregative indices. Respondents were categorized into: 1) those who reported agreeing politically with all their conversational partners--the consensualists (N=63, or 69%; 2) those who agreed with some but disagreed with others--the dissensualists (N=18, or 20%); and 3) those who disagreed with all of their conversational associates--the antagonists (N=10, or 11%). Translated into macro language, 69% of the primary zones are consensual, 20% are dissensual, and 11% are antagonistic.

Interpretation: The answer patterns to the individual names and the results obtained by way of the aggregated primary zone measure confirm the well-known fact that people generally associate politically only with those with whom they agree politically, or that they avoid political conversation with those with whom they disagree. We shall say more about this in the inter-item analysis below. It may be noted here that in the combined primary zone measure the percentage of the category called "consensual" drops by about 10% from the individual-level aggregative measure of "agreement" for the simple reason that some persons do in fact tolerate some disagreement in their primary zone environment.

2.42 PRIMARY ZONE POLITICAL COMPOSITION (VAR 77, 80, 83)

Q. F11b. "As far as you can tell, does (NAME) consider (himself/herself) a Republican, a Democrat, an independent, or what?"

Purpose: The question is initially intended to harness the respondent's perception of the political identification or affiliation of his social contacts. The question was asked about all the contacts who had been named, not just about those who reported political conversation. The

ultimate purpose was to develop an index of the political composition of the respondent's primary zone as context in its own right. The data are also used to construct two other measures--a measure of the primary zone as a "Political Milieu" (2.43 below) and a measure of respondents "Cognitive Capability" (2.44 below).

Coding: The code categories provided for four alternatives--Republican, Democrat, Independent and Other--and, of course, a significant "don't know" category.

Distribution: We shall present the base data in two sets--first the entire array of responses per social contact named, and then omitting the respondents who did not know their contacts' party identification or gave no answers.

<u>Contact's Party Identification</u>	<u>Name #1 N=172</u>	<u>Name #2 N=161</u>	<u>Name #3 N=132</u>	<u>All Names N=465</u>
Republican	18%	13%	14%	15%
Independent	13	9	14	12
Democrat	24	34	29	29
Don't know	40	40	39	40
Not ascertained	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Altogether, then, some 40% of the respondents were unaware of their social contacts' party identification, and another 4% could not be ascertained. We shall deal with this perceptual aspect of the distribution under "Cognitive Capability" (2.44 below). The following table presents the distributions for those who could specify their contacts' political party identification.

<u>Party Identification</u>	Name #1 N=96	Name #2 N=91	Name #3 N=75	All Names N=262
Republican	32%	23%	25%	27%
Independent	24	17	24	21
Democrat	<u>44</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>52</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Measure: The indices of the political composition of the primary zone were built in various stages. A first step was to classify the 119 respondents for whom data are available into seven groupings, as follows:

1) Pure Republican--all contacts named are Republican; 2) Dominant Republican--at least two of three contacts are Republican; 3) Pure Independent--all contacts are independent; 4) Dominant Independent--at least two of three contacts are independent; 5) Pure Democrat--all contacts are Democratic; 6) Dominant Democrat--at least two of three contacts are Democratic; and 7) Mixed--one contact Republican and/or Democratic and/or Independent. The following table shows the distribution of the respondents into these seven categories:

<u>Primary Zone</u>	<u>N =</u>	<u>% =</u>
Purely Republican	18	15
Dominantly Republican	5	4
Purely Independent	15	13
Dominantly Independent	6	5
Purely Democratic	43	36
Dominantly Democratic	11	9
Mixed ("Hybrid")	<u>21</u>	<u>18</u>
	119	100

Because these categories would be quite unmanageable for the purposes of analysis, they are collapsed into four by combining the "pure" and "dominant" categories. Moreover, subsequent analysis suggested

that the categories should be ordered as indicated in the following table:

<u>Primary Zone</u>	<u>N =</u>	<u>% =</u>
Republican	23	19
Democratic	54	45
Hybrid	21	18
Independent	<u>21</u>	<u>18</u>
	119	100

Finally, for some analytic purposes, it seems suggestive to combine the Republican and Democratic primary zone categories into a single category of "Partisan," as follows:

<u>Primary Zone</u>	<u>N =</u>	<u>% =</u>
Partisan	77	64%
Hybrid	21	18
Independent	<u>21</u>	<u>18</u>
	100%	100%

Interpretation: Not much need be said here about the measure of "Primary Zone Political Composition." Suffice it to say that the combining of Republican and Democratic categories into a single category of "Partisan" is dictated partly by analytic-conceptual considerations which will be discussed in connection with the inter-item analyses, but partly also by the small number of Republican "cases" which, in analysis, makes for a good deal of "breakage effect" in favor of the Democratic "cases." Awareness of this breakage effect is critical for adequate interpretation of tabular results in the analyses.

2.43 POLITICAL MILIEU (based on VAR 77, 80, 83)

Purpose: The initial classification of the primary zones into "pure" and "dominant" types suggests that, whatever their party or independent designations, the types might have some properties in common which would warrant combining them into a new set that might be termed "Political Milieu." In other words, for some theoretical purposes, "pure" primary zones might have more in common regardless of whether, as far as partisanship is concerned, they are Republican, Democratic or Independent. We therefore combine all pure types into a category called "Homogeneous" and all dominant types into a category called "Dominant," and we translate the original "mixed" or "Hybrid" category into "Heterogeneous."

Distribution: Of the 119 respondents with specified primary zones, 76, or 64%, have homogeneous zones; 22, or 18%, have dominant zones; and 21, or 18%, have heterogeneous zones.

Measure: The measure of "Political Milieu" provides for three nominal types: 1) Homogeneous--all three contacts are either of one or the other political party identification or purely independent; 2) Dominant--two contacts are specified as either Republican or Democratic or independent; 3) Heterogeneous--one contact is perceived as Republican, one as Democratic, and one as Independent; or any other non-homogeneous or non-dominant combination.

Interpretation: Although the percentage distributions look very much like those for the measures called "Political Composition of Primary Zone" (for instance, 64% of the primary zones were "partisan" as defined earlier, as "against" the 64% of the primary zones here called "homogeneous"), the likeness in the distributions is coincidental. Only the

respondents with what was called a "hybrid zone" earlier are the same as the grouping here called heterogeneous.

2.44 COGNITIVE CAPABILITY (based on VAR 77, 80, 83)

Purpose: The large number of respondents who could not specify the party identification of their social contacts suggest comparison between them and those who did describe the party identification of their neighbors. The comparison might be helpful to explore the possibility that other contexts might have an effect on respondents' ability to perceive and designate the party identification of their social contacts. We therefore construct a grouped measure called "Cognitive Capability."

Distribution: The distribution of the respondents in terms of "Cognitive Capability" is as follows--

<u>Primary Zone Composition</u>	<u>N =</u>	<u>% =</u>
Is perceived for all social contacts named	75	45
Is perceived for some social contacts named	44	26
Is not perceived for any social contacts named	<u>49</u>	<u>29</u>
	168	100

Measure: The measure is simply constructed by adding, for the second category listed under "Distribution," the number of positive and don't know responses. For certain analytic purposes, respondents perceiving all or some of their contacts' party identification will be combined and contrasted to those who could not specify the party identification of

any of their neighbors with whom they maintain social relations.

Interpretation: The measure of "Cognitive Capability" is, of course, not a measure of any property that might inhere in a primary zone as such but a strictly micro-level variable, even though it is a compositional rather than individual construct.

Part 3. Validation through Inter-Item Analysis of Variables

The validity of a measure--whether it indeed is an operational index of the concept it is supposed to "stand for" and measure--can best be ascertained by its viability in the crucible of empirical analysis. In order to undertake such validation tests, one need not entertain precise, theoretically-derived hypotheses about expected relationships between the variables whose stability as indices and clarity or ambiguity are at issue. It suffices that the relationships "make sense." This is not to say that, in proceeding, one is not more or less aware of or influenced by extant theories and hypotheses, but plausibility is sufficient. We shall examine here the relationships between those variables enumerated in Part 2 which seem plausible, but we shall also correlate those items where the absence of a relationship might be expected if one were to theorize about the matter at length. In general, we would expect the variables that are supposed to represent components of a particular contextual constellation to "hang together," but we cannot as easily assume that inter-context variables will be related, precisely because contexts may be quite independent of each other. If we do discover significant and plausible relationships across contexts, the validity of a given variable would seem to be further confirmed. But as we are on a methodological fishing expedition, we do not propose to "generalize" from the outcomes of the analyses, even if at times we seem to be doing so. A further word of explanation is called for.

If we sound at times as if we were generalizing, this is due to the fact that we are analyzing the data as if we had a large national random

probability sample of cases rather than a random though numerically impoverished data set. It seems to us that only by entertaining this illusion can we proceed from description to interpretation of the analytic outcomes. We are therefore acting a bit like children playing their games that are **modelled** on what the children perceive as adult conduct: there is an element of "reality" in the games (like "playing house") but the children know that they are playing. **Illu-**sions are not delusions. What we are saying simply is: if only we had more data! On the other hand, though we sensed in the data a sampling bias toward the "better class of people," we are persuaded to believe that we are dealing with a "good" data set, that is a random sample, even though the largest number of cases available for **cross-**tabulation is only 236: We doubt that otherwise we would have obtained as many meaningful relationships or meaningful absent relationships as we have.

The much greater handicap under which we are analyzing the data does not stem, therefore, from possible sampling bias than from the numerical paucity of the data. Because of ever-vanishing cases, we cannot introduce many controls which even cursory considerations would require us to introduce were we dealing with a large sample. As a result, relationships that appear to be present or even strong might turn out to be spurious if controls were introduced. And, on the other hand, relationships that appear to be weak or absent might, in fact, be strong or present if proper controls were introduced. We see no way out of the dilemma so created by the paucity of the data. In general, therefore, we must fall back, more often than not, on the plausibility

criterion or, occasionally, on such theoretical but well-grounded knowledge that seems applicable under the circumstances.

Because of the paucity of the data, also, we are less concerned with the strength of observed relationships than with the direction of the signs of the coefficients. As we are dealing mostly with nominal or weakly ordered ordinal variables, refined measurement is not only impossible but probably counter-productive. The association of variables and the direction of the signs is therefore more important for our purposes than is the strength of a relationship. We therefore use the gamms coefficient of correlation less to measure the actual strength of an association between variables but more as a convenient device to summarize the observed relationships. Suffice it to say two things here: first, whenever a table includes a cell with no cases, we substitute phi (for 2x2 tables) or Cramer's V (for more complex tables) in order to avoid +1 or -1 coefficients; and second, we are aware that gamma is inappropriate when ordinality is in doubt or a relationship is curvilinear. However, in the 2x3 tables, of which many occur, a gamma of zero or near-zero is usually indicative of curvilinearity if the **three-**category index is ordinal and can serve as a meaningful measure.

We use Chi square not as a measure of sample distribution and **signi-****ficance** but rather as a tool that gives us a stable measure of percentage differences between comparison groups so that we will not interpret the associations indexed by gamma whimsically. Because of the small numbers involved, we are relaxing the conventional $p = .05$ or less criterion and adopt $p = .10$ as the standard to indicate, on first inspection, that an association between variables has attained a Chi square value of some

respectability. But as Chi square is sensitive not only to the total number of cases and their internal distributions but also to their marginal distributions, we shall encounter "strong" associations that are not within the criterion adopted here and "weak" associations that are. In short, we asterize an association only as a mnemonic device to alert us to a relationship that may deserve special attention. But, then, zero or near-zero correlations cannot be discarded in our "game" as evidence that a variable is not viable--literally, "does not show the way." It may be doing so admirably. We emphasize this point because it is all too often the case to "read away" statistically insignificant differences between comparison groups or relationships between variables. As we are engaged in an exploratory journey and unburdened by formal hypotheses, we shall ignore a relationship between the variables in any matrix only either if there is no plausible reason for it in logic or if no pattern emerges from the juxtaposition of relevant relationships. The procedure is one of "interpretative heuristics."

3.1. The Neighborhood as Communal Context

Six variables serve to define and measure the neighborhood's "communal context"--length of residence, neighborhood "quality," population stability, personal mobility, awareness of political party organizations in the neighborhood and their actual presence or absence. How long a person has lived in a neighborhood probably affects his/her knowledge and perceptions of as well as attitudes toward it, but what one thinks of the neighborhood and how one knows about it is also likely

to determine (all other things being equal) how long one continues to live there. If there is such a thing as a communal context, the variables ought to "hang together" in a meaningful way; or, from a methodological standpoint, if they are plausibly related, their validity can be considered confirmed. Table 3.10 presents the relevant inter-item correlation coefficients.

TABLE 3.10 HERE

As Table 3.10 shows, the "contextual" variables are, on the whole, quite meaningfully related. Years of residence has evidently no effect on judgment concerning the neighborhood's quality; whether a neighborhood is "good" or "not so good" as a place to live in seems to be so clear that old-timers and new-comers are agreed in their appraisal. But the longer people have lived in a neighborhood, the more stable is the population (of course, as perceived; but as mentioned earlier, we may drop such repetitive reminder as we go along). And the longer people have lived in the neighborhood, the less is their personal mobility (intention) and the more aware are they of whether party organizations are active. But the existence of party organizations (as reported by the "knowledgeables") is, as one should expect, independent of people's length of residence.

We noted, in Part 2, that the distributions of the quality, stability and mobility measures are highly skewed. Nevertheless, they are meaningfully related: the better the neighborhood's quality, the more stable is the population and the less is personal mobility; and,

of course, the more stable the population, the less is personal mobility. Although the coefficients are comparatively low, neighborhood quality, population stability and personal mobility are related to residents' awareness of party organizations--the first two positively, the latter (as one should expect) negatively. One would, of course, want to control all of these relationships by respondents' SES, for, as we shall see in Part 4, SES is related to these variables, but this is impossible here. Whether a party organization actually functions in the neighborhood, if we can trust those who claim to know, is unrelated, as it should be, to years of residence but also to personal mobility. On the other hand, we note a tendency for party organization to be absent in the "better" neighborhoods where the population is relatively stable.

In general, then, it appears that people have a coherent view of their neighborhood and that the neighborhood constitutes a relatively well integrated context for their lives. Although their assessment of a neighborhood's residential quality is independent of their length of residence, the latter provides an anchor for other cognitive orientations. It may be, of course, and probably is, the other way round: given the impact of one's appraisal of the neighborhood on one's plan to stay or leave, a good neighborhood is more likely to make for prolonged residence than a poor one. (The absence of a relationship between years of residence, and neighborhood quality is, probably due to "sample bias" in connection with quality and the lack of variance in the data).

Of particular interest here is the neighborhood as a "partisan environment." Although the presence or absence of party organizations reported by the respondents is unrelated to their length of residence

and their plan for the future ($g = .05$ and $.02$, respectively), it does seem to be related, if only weakly, to the nature of the neighborhood: the existence of party organization is more likely to be reported in those neighborhoods that respondents judge to be of lesser quality ($g = -.19$) and from which they see people move a great deal ($g = -.27$). However, as Table 3.11 shows, the number of respondents in the two relevant categories is so small that not much credence can be placed in the results.

TABLE 3.11 HERE

3.2. The Neighborhood as Life Space

For some people the neighborhood is merely a place where they sleep; they are the "night dwellers." For others the neighborhood is a place where they spend all of their waking hours--the "day dwellers." And there are other people "in-between." Three variables initially used to specify the neighborhood as "life space" are people's shopping habit, work place and church-going: do they engage in these activities in the neighborhood or elsewhere? Table 3.01 presents the inter-item correlation coefficients as well as the coefficients for each of the three variables and the summary measure called "Life Space."

TABLE 3.21 HERE

The coefficients in Table 3.21 for the relationships between the individual activities carried on in the neighborhood or elsewhere and

the Life Space variable are, of course, auto-correlational, but they indicate that the summary measure captures the individual activities. The individual-item coefficients show that people are more or less strongly integrated into their neighborhood as life space. This can be clearly seen if one examines a given activity within the total context of all three activities. Table 3.22 presents the data on type of activity within the Life Space context which discriminates between the night-dwellers, day-dwellers and those in-between. Of the 151 respondents for whom relevant data are available, 20% are night-dwellers, 18% are day-dwellers, and 62% are more or less integrated into the neighborhood in terms of one or two day-time activities.

TABLE 3.22 HERE

The drop-off in the working category for those who carry on one or two activities in the neighborhood is due, of course, to the marginal distributions in the data, as can be seen in Table 3.23. The drop-off would be even greater if "housewives" were excluded. Table 3.23 therefore also gives the data with the housewives omitted. It shows a difference of 11%. (However, as "housewivery" affects only the category of "working in the neighborhood," we shall omit them in all other connections where, in fact, the difference is minor).

TABLE 3.23 HERE

The measure of Life Space, it will be recalled from Part 2, combines (because of the small numbers involved in the extreme categories of Table 3.22), those who reported two and three activities as against those who reported only one or none. The measure disguises, of course, those whom we call the pure "day-dwellers" and "night-dwellers" (with whom we shall deal elsewhere). Table 3.24 presents the distribution of respondents by type of activity carried on in the neighborhood and the centrality and peripherality of the neighborhood as a life space. Church-going is closely followed by shopping as the activities that occur in the neighborhood when the neighborhood as life space is relatively central--that is, when two or three activities over-all are carried on in the neighborhood. Working as a neighborhood activity drops off by 14% and 6% respectively, however. Work, more than the other two activities, takes people out of their neighborhood.

TABLE 3.24 HERE

Commuting. While "neighborhood" was defined for the respondents as the area "within three or four blocks from you" (though rural respondents found the definition inapplicable), "elsewhere" as the place for the activities composing the life space was undefined. However, those reporting activity elsewhere were asked "how many miles away" the place of a given activity in fact is, on the assumption that inasmuch as distance translates into time, those commuting lesser distances for the purposes of shopping, church-going or working are likely to be more involved in their neighborhood than those commuting longer dis-

tances and having less time for such involvement. The measures used in this connection are very crude dichotomized ones (necessitated by the small N of respondents in the "elsewhere" categories); nevertheless, as Table 3.25 shows, the measures are positively and, in two situations, strongly related--those engaged in one activity more distantly from the neighborhood are also engaged in another activity more distantly. Table 3.25 also presents the correlation coefficients for the relationship between each single distance item and the median summary measure built on average distance across all three types of activity.

TABLE 3.25 HERE

Because we shall use the measure of "Median Commute" in subsequent analyses, Table 3.26 is designed to inspect it more closely. The table reveals what the median measure itself conceals. Half of all work commuters commute "far" over-all and also commute to work at a greater distance (seven miles or less) as against slightly over a third (36%) of all commuters who commute "near" and also work at a lesser distance. Church commuters are well-balanced in over-all commuting and commuting to church. In the case of shopping commuters, however, the commuting behavior observed for work commuting is reversed: more of all shopping commuters (45%) commute "near" over-all and also shop at a lesser distance, while only a third (34%) of all shopping commuters travel "far" over-all and at a greater distance.

TABLE 3.26 HERE

It is possible to explore further a person's life space by observing the connection between his/her integration into the neighborhood in regard to a particular type of activity and his/her willingness or need to engage in another activity by commuting beyond the neighborhood. For instance, one can compare persons doing their shopping in the neighborhood but going outside the neighborhood for work with those who do their shopping elsewhere and also leave the neighborhood for work. Table 3.27 serves the purpose of illustration. It appears

TABLE 3.27 HERE

that people who find the neighborhood a convenient place to shop in may have to, or be willing to, commute relatively far for their work, while others who shop elsewhere may have an opportunity to work relatively close to their neighborhood. Table 3.28 pursues the same theme in regard to the other possible combinations of place of activity in one domain of the life space and commuting to another place of activity by way of the relevant coefficients.

TABLE 3.28 HERE

It should be noted that we are dealing here only with those respondents who do not carry on all three of their life space activities either in the neighborhood or elsewhere (the day-dwellers and the night-dwellers). For the rest, Table 3.28 indicates, full integration

into the neighborhood life space may be prevented by commuting over relatively long distances to satisfy various needs. This is particularly the case for work. Although people find the neighborhood a convenient place to shop and/or worship in, they commute relatively long rather than short distances to work. But those who work in the neighborhood may also commute relatively far in order to shop, and those shopping in the neighborhood may commute relatively far in order to go to church. On the other hand, more of those able to worship in their neighborhood may need to go only near in order to shop, and more of those finding work in the neighborhood may need to commute only a short distance to find a place of worship. A neighborhood that has good shopping facilities is not necessarily near a good place to work or a place where one's church is located; and so on. Overall, as the negative coefficients for the Life Space measure show, having the neighborhood as a convenient place for two activities may make it an inconvenient place for the third activity. The Median Commute measure summarizes the data: if the neighborhood contains a shopping area, it may be necessary to commute more than the median distance in regard to the other activities; if the neighborhood is one's place of work, one commutes overall less than the median distance; and if the neighborhood provides for worship, the overall commuting distance is just about at the median for all averaged individual distances. The bottom line is perhaps symbolized by the zero coefficient for the relationship between the composite Life Space measure and the summated Median Travel measure: if one engages in two activities in the neighborhood, the chance is that one commutes just about an average distance in

pursuing the third activity that cannot be accommodated in the neighborhood.

It is difficult to come to firm conclusions as to the validity of the life-space activity measures. Most of the relationships observed in this pilot data set "make sense," but possible sampling bias and the very small number of cases may distort actuality. As we noted in Part 2, it is unfortunate that we did not collect information on respondents' leisure-time activities. It is perhaps in the trade-off between work and how/where one spends one's leisure time that a neighborhood's impact on a person's life space becomes most significant. The shopping and church-going measures are substantively weak--church-going because it is the least-time consuming activity (and we had no measure of just how frequently a person goes to church or how committed he/she is religiously); shopping because it is an activity that is so universal that it may not yield a very discriminatory measure. Just how salient for politics these activities are will be explored later on, but we may assume that leisure-time activities might "speak more" to a person's political behavior than the three activities reviewed here.

3.3 Social Contact: The Primary Zone as Context

In order to explore respondents' "primary zone"--those of their neighbors with whom they have interpersonal relations of a face-to-face character--but also to determine a respondent's social integration in the neighborhood as such, the pilot schedule provided for a filtering question as to whether there "are people living in this neighborhood

with whom you or your family get together" socially. Respondents having such contacts, were then asked to name at least three persons, if they could, and how long they had known them. As not all respondents could name three neighbors, "Contact Number" can be used as a variable as can "Contact Years."

We shall deal with "Social Contact" as a variable in its own right in the later sections of Part 3 because construction and exploration of the primary zone is possible only for the respondents who gave an affirmative answer to the contact question. The notion of a "primary zone," it should be re-emphasized, derives from social network analysis and should not be confused with the concept or phenomenon of "primary group." The use of the concept of "primary zone" makes no assumptions about whether those named as social contacts themselves interact with each other. It is unfortunate that the only prior and major research along these lines, reported in the Erie County and Elmira studies of over twenty-five years ago, used the concept of "primary group" and interpreted the data in primary-group terms when, in fact, only respondents' primary zone was ascertained. In order to establish the existence of a primary group one would have to validate a nomination by interviewing the nominee or, as a surrogate, ask the nominator whether those he had named themselves interact with each other. We have no such data, and it would be a mistake to use this data set to explore notions derived from primary group theory. (Nevertheless, primary zone and primary group phenomena are undoubtedly related in some generic fashion at which we may hint as we go along.)

Two other measures served to explore people's interpersonal

environment--one an "affective" index of whether the respondent considers a neighbor a "close friend" or merely a "good friend" or acquaintance, called "Intimacy;" the other a "behavioral" index based on respondents' estimates of the times they get together with their social contacts (regardless of degree of intimacy), called--for lack of a better term--"Consociation." In order to present an overview of the entire interpersonal environment, we shall first present the correlation matrix for the component variables in Table 3.31. As the

TABLE 3.31 HERE

table shows, most of the relationships are positive and quite substantial or strong. The Intimacy measure, in particular, seems to harness the quality of the primary zone as a social context. But some interpretation is required for the negative relationship between the number of years social contacts have been known and the frequency of current consociation. It appears that the longer one knows one's neighbors, the less frequently one associates with them. On first thought this may seem odd, but on reflection it is plausible: if one knows a person well, as a result of many years of acquaintance, there is less need to reinforce what may be considered "friendship" by frequent consociation; friendship that is real need not be continuously reinforced by social visiting. And less well known persons may be sought out more often to get to know them better.

Table 3.31 also shows a very weak relationship ($g = .10$) between the number of contacts a person may have and the length of his/her

mutual friendship or acquaintance. Cross-tabulation showed that there is a slight tendency for a bare majority of respondents reporting contact with three neighbors to have known them on an average of nine years or more (51%), while somewhat smaller proportions of those with only one contact had such prolonged association (40%), with those reporting two contacts being more similar to the former than the latter (48%). Because a ceiling was set on the number of contacts that could be named, the range from one to three contact nominations is probably insufficient for the purpose of meaningfully ascertaining the relationship between number of contacts and years of acquaintanceship generally.

Nevertheless, the coefficients reported in Table 3.31 appear to be reassuring from the standpoint of the measures' validity. Except for the Contact Number-Contact Year relationship, the observed associations and their direction are plausible.

3.4 Communal Context and Life Space

Where people live and how they live is a social-structural phenomenon more complex than may meet the eye on first sight. That living in a community's "better" neighborhoods is equivalent with "gracious living" is a widely accepted belief and judgment. Much depends, of course, on what one means by "better neighborhood." In general, most people probably mean by it a neighborhood that is residential, where home values are high, and that is unmolested by industrial and commercial enterprises which inevitably make a neighborhood a congested traffic area. (For pilot study respondents' views of good or bad neighborhood

characteristics, see Appendix A). It is generally assumed, therefore, that if one wants to maintain or improve one's life space, one lives in or moves into an appropriate neighborhood. How one wants to live will determine, therefore, where one lives, if one can afford it. Life space opportunities would seem to underlie one's appraisal of a neighborhood.

But this "general view"--perhaps one should call it a middle-class or bourgeois view--is likely to be defective (precisely because it is so stereotypic). There are people who may like or want to work where they live or nearby, who like or want to shop in their neighborhood, or, vice versa, may want to worship elsewhere (because they encounter there people more "like" themselves, at least as concerns faith and what often goes with it, ethnic origin, than they do in the largely market-determined residential neighborhood). Different life space activities may therefore influence one's perception of a neighborhood as being "good" or "bad," as "stable" or "unstable," as "attractive" enough for one to stay there, even as one's socio-economic status improves, or "unattractive" in this respect.

The data permit us to explore these relationships between a neighborhood's communal context as it is perceived by respondents and their life space activities. Table 3.41 presents the data.

TABLE 3.41 HERE

Table 3.41 shows that, overall, life space activities have no influence on people's perceptions of their neighborhood. Regardless of whether they shop, work or worship in their own neighborhood or

elsewhere, they perceive the neighborhood in similar fashion. In no case is the percentage difference between those active in the neighborhood and those active elsewhere more than eight percent (which is the case in church-going where those going to worship elsewhere are somewhat less inclined to stay in their current neighborhood than those who are accommodated in their neighborhood). It would seem, therefore, that there is an "objectivity factor" operating in one's perception of a neighborhood's communal context that is not affected by how one currently lives. (In part the results of Table 3.41, and of the reversed Table 3.42, are of course a function of the original skewed distributions in the data for the communal context variables. With "better" data one might expect somewhat more variance in the relationships).

If one reads Table 3.41 "sideways" it appears that, though there are only the slightest differences between those active in the neighborhood and those active elsewhere, there is a consistent drop in the proportion of respondents as they interpret what they may perceive. The largest proportions see their neighborhood as a good place to live in, somewhat fewer see the neighborhood as stable, and even fewer anticipate to maintain their home in the neighborhood. In other words, even though the neighborhood is seen by most as attractive and stable, there are people who would want to move if the opportunity presented itself or who seem to expect to move if necessary.

It seems worthwhile to explore, therefore, to what extent the communal nature of the neighborhood may facilitate or impede life space activities. In other words, we shall present the same data in a

different way, making the communal context the "antecedent" variable, even though we are dealing with perceptions rather than "reality;" what encourages us to treat the context variables as "antecedent reality" is the high level of agreement on what the neighborhood looks like. Table 3.42 presents the data. They may be summarized as follows:

TABLE 3.42 HERE

1) Long residence in the neighborhood seems to have little effect on where people shop, work or go to church, though long-time residents are slightly more likely to do these things in the neighborhood. And, over-all, long-time residents are more active in the neighborhood than short-term residents.

2) The neighborhood's quality has somewhat different effects on shopping and work-place behavior, but practically none on church-going and over-all. People in high-quality neighborhoods are less likely to shop there but can find a place of work in the neighborhood.

3) People in stable neighborhoods shop and worship less in these settings, and work place is unaffected. Overall, fewer of the life space activities are carried on in stable neighborhoods than in those in which people move in and out more often.

4) Personal mobility--measured by intention to stay in the neighborhood or leave--has almost no effect on where a person shops or works, though it has some effect on his/her church-going habit: people who do not plan to leave are somewhat more likely to worship in their

neighborhood. Overall, too, residentially low mobile persons are slightly more active in their neighborhood as far as their total life space is concerned than are the high mobiles.

Communal context, it seems, has a moderate effect on life space activity. Long residence and low personal mobility are all positively, if (in this data set) weakly related to shopping, working and church-going in the neighborhood, and over-all the effect is more marked than when particular activities are considered. A neighborhood whose population is seen on the move has shopping and worship facilities and generally seems to be characterized by more activity than a stable neighborhood. The relationship may, of course, be the other way: people who are dependent on shopping and worshipping in an unstable neighborhood (as presumably are their neighbors) may wish to leave and move into a better neighborhood. Indeed, as noted, fewer people shop in the high-quality neighborhood or go to church there (though the difference in regard to the latter is minimal), but the high quality neighborhood also seems to be a more convenient place to work. And it may again be the other way round: if one can work in one's residential area and need not commute to work, this convenience may lead one to assess one's neighborhood as a good place to live.

It is also possible to explore the impact of the communal context on a person's life space by examining the behavior of those who, having reported that they are active elsewhere, indicated the mileage they are commuting in order to do their shopping, working or church-going.

Table 3.43 may provide some insight.

TABLE 3.43 HERE

Although the number of cases available for analysis is now excruciatingly small and the observed relationships are, except in one association, fairly weak, Table 3.43 shows some consistent behavior patterns. First (and as the negative signs indicate), short-term residents, those who do not find the neighborhood a good place for living, those who report population instability and those who themselves expect to move are more likely to do their shopping by commuting only a short distance in contrast to their comparison groupings. This is likely to mean that their neighborhood, though not itself a shopping area, is geographically propinquitous to one. Second, almost equally consistent, but obversely (as indicated by the positive signs of the coefficients), is the commuting of those who go to church elsewhere. Only in this case it is the long-term residents, and those finding the quality of the neighborhood attractive and see a great deal of stability, who do their church-going relatively close-by, while their opposites commute further. Similarly, with one exception, those who consider their neighborhood low in quality, see population stability as low and themselves expect to move, tend to commute only a short distance to work. (The exception: long-term residents more than short-term ones go to work nearby). Over-all, however, when all commuting is averaged, it appears that it is the long-term residents, those who judge the neighborhood good, those who see great stability, and those who themselves do not plan to move, who commute less than their counter-groupings.

What these data seem to indicate is that though, in general, more of the people living in "better" neighborhoods perform their life space

activities not far from home, there is a good deal of variation in regard to particular activities. A good neighborhood seems to be one which is not too close to shopping areas but which provides convenient access to religious worship. Only the location of one's work place seems to be rather haphazardly related to the communal context of one's neighborhood. If one inspects the data on commuting alongside those on the neighborhood's centrality in people's life space, it appears that if those in the less desirable neighborhoods cannot fall back on their neighborhood's own resources in regard to shopping, work and worship (which, however, may be unsatisfactory), they seek them elsewhere, but at the cost of time and exertion in commuting. On the other hand, people in better neighborhoods are more likely to have shopping, work and church facilities at hand or within easy travel range. The data are quite unsatisfactory from a sampling point of view and numerically, but the results are plausible. They point to considerable complexity in life space activities as these are affected by the communal context of the neighborhood, but the complexity seems to be more or less socially organized and behaviorally patterned.

3.5 Communal Context, Life Space and Social Contact

Even though the neighborhood as communal context or life space may be significant for how a person thinks or acts politically (which we will explore in Section 3.7), these conditions are probably mediated by interpersonal relations with other individuals with whom more or less intimate and frequent contacts are maintained. Before examining the primary zone as a political environment, therefore, we shall explore

here whether social contact in its various aspects is facilitated or impeded by the kind of neighborhood communal context in which political behavior occurs or by the life space activities in which people are involved. Table 3.51 presents an initial set of data about relationships between some of the neighborhood communal context variables and social contact and the number of such contacts.

TABLE 3.51 HERE

Contact with neighbors is clearly facilitated by a favorable communal context, especially if its quality is good and mobility is low, but also if residence in the neighborhood is relatively long-term. One can, of course, interpret the data in another way as well: if one has made firm contacts with neighbors, one may be more inclined to stay in the neighborhood and consider it a good neighborhood. In fact, a "friendly neighborhood" is undoubtedly a part of one's definition of a "good neighborhood."

It also appears that the number of contacts one has is related to the communal context of the neighborhood. A high quality neighborhood and one in which the population is relatively stable makes it easier to have more rather than fewer contacts ($g = .45$ and $.28$, respectively). It would seem, then, that a favorable communal context is likely to integrate people more in an interpersonal sense than a less favorable communal environment.

On the other hand, whether the neighborhood serves as the center of one's life space activities seems to have, as the coefficients in

Table 3.52 suggest, no or only marginal impact on an individual's interpersonal integration. In fact, only working in the neighborhood

TABLE 3.52 HERE

seems to make it particularly easy to have contact with one's neighbors (and this may be due to those housewives who were classed as "working" in the neighborhood even if their activity was restricted to the home).

Examining those respondents who reported doing their shopping, working or church-going outside the neighborhood reveals, as indicated in Table 3.53, that commuting (or time involved in commuting) has little effect on whether one has contacts in the neighborhood. In fact, as the positive coefficients show, those commuting short distances (on the average one to five miles) are somewhat less likely to have social contacts in the neighborhood than those commuting further away. And the somewhat stronger negative coefficients show that those commuting short distances are more likely to have more neighbors as friends or

TABLE 3.53 HERE

acquaintances than those commuting further away. We can only speculate on these results. One not altogether implausible hypothesis might be: people commuting further away do seek out social contact in their neighborhood but are satisfied to know only a few people, while those commuting nearby have less contact over-all but when they have it are in touch with more people. In any case, the consistency of the positive and negative

signs in Table 3.53 suggests that some unexplained factor may operate to produce the observed relationships.

Table 3.54 explores the relationships between the average number of years our respondents have known those whom they named as social contacts and the several measures of communal context and life space activity. For clear and economical presentation, Table 3.54 gives the proportions of respondents in the relevant table cells whose average falls above the median for all respondents as well as the gamma coefficients for each relationship. Although the percentage differences between comparison groups are often small, the strength of the relation-

TABLE 3.54 HERE

ships ranges from weak negative in the case of neighborhood church-going to, as one might expect, strong positive in the case of length of residence in the neighborhood. Without examining each variable in detail, a general conclusion might be that a favorable communal context and centralization of life space activities in or near the neighborhood breed long-term interpersonal relations and conduce to a person's integration into his/her neighborhood.

It remains to explore the relationships between the two remaining measures of interpersonal relations, Intimacy and Consociation, and the communal context and life space variables.

Intimacy. Intimacy in interpersonal relations is a very demanding criterion. Not surprisingly, respondents were sparing in calling neighbors "close friends." Only 15% of the sample said that all of their social contacts were "close friends," while 52% said that all of

their social contacts were "not close." In order to present the data in economical format, the percent reporting "not close" were deducted from the percent reporting "close" for each of the comparison groups. Hence, the higher the negative value in one of the analytic categories, the less intimacy, or the lower the negative value, the more intimacy. Deducting the low value from the high value therefore produces an "index of intimacy" that summarizes the data. Table 3.55 presents the data.

TABLE 3.55 HERE

The relationships between intimacy and the communal context and life space variables are at best moderate, but the intimacy index shows which conditions in the communal context or life space are particularly conducive to intimacy in interpersonal relations. The most important of these are, in order, being engaged in more than one activity, working and church-going in the neighborhood, commuting to church at some distance and planning to stay in the neighborhood. Least favorable, evidently, to intimate interpersonal relations is the neighborhood characterized by respondents as good. People in these neighborhoods may well cherish privacy more than intimacy. On the other hand, sharing the same church, whether in the neighborhood or elsewhere, seems to be especially helpful in forming close friendships among neighbors.

Consociation. How often people get together for social purposes may be, but need not be, indicative of their "true" interpersonal relationships, especially when they are "thrown together" casually, as at

cocktail parties or other such informal gatherings, or when they are "thrown together" in "forced" situations" such as work place. Yet, one would expect that when consociation occurs, it will be affected by convenience. For instance, if one's life space is circumscribed locally or within easy reach of one's home, one should expect people to "get together" more often than under more unfavorable conditions.

In order to present the data on consociation economically, the same procedure as in connection with the intimacy index is used; that is, the percentage of respondents not getting together frequently with any of their neighbors is deducted from the percentage of those reporting frequent consociation with all of those whom they claimed to be in contact with. In turn, deducting the low value of consociation obtained for one of the analytic categories from the high value for the other yields the index of consociation. Table 3.56 presents the data.

TABLE 3.56 HERE

In general, the relationships between consociation and communal context and life space environment are weak, but the direction of the signs is plausible. Except for years of residence, consociation is favored in communal contexts where the quality of the neighborhood is judged good, where there is relatively little population movement and where people plan to stay. Shopping locally does not contribute to social intercourse but commuting to a nearby shopping area (possibly in company) does. While it does not seem to make much of a difference for consociation whether one works or worships in the neighborhood, again

commuting to a nearby place of work and especially to church maximizes social intercourse. One might infer that if people commute to places relatively far from their homes, they do so for very special reasons that are not shared but unique to every person, and hence there is less opportunity for socializing.

All of this does not mean that casual consociation may not be politically significant. On the contrary, political cues are often picked up in casual social situations, while frequent getting together with others for purely "social" purposes (say recreation) may call for avoidance of political talk. We shall explore this matter in the next section.

3.51 Neighborhood Party Organization and Social Contact

We did not include the two "party organization in neighborhood" variables of the communal context (Party Knowledge and Party Existence) in the presentation so far because the demonstration of the relationships involved, to make sense, requires a different ordering of the variables. It is hardly plausible to assume that the presence or absence of party organization "influences" or "determines" social contact or the intimacy and frequency of such contact. Rather, one must assume that people more or less integrated into their networks of interpersonal relations will have differential knowledge in regard to the existence of party organizations in the neighborhood. Similarly, one must assume that involvement in life space activities--where and how many--has an impact on one's knowing about party organization rather than vice versa. We shall therefore present and read the cross-tabulated data from left

to right rather than, as in the previous tables, from top to bottom. Table 3.57 gives the data.

The table shows some interesting results. As far as knowledge of party organization in the neighborhood is concerned, there are, with four exceptions, only small differences between the comparison groups. For some reason, those commuting to distant places for shopping are less inclined to say "don't know" than those commuting to a close shopping area; and the relationship is reversed for the church commuters. We have no hunches for these outcomes. The variable which has the greatest effect on party knowledge is the number of years one has known one's social contacts in the neighborhood, with those of long acquaintanceship being more knowledgeable than those below the median for the measure. Also, more of those naming three neighbors as social contacts claim to know than do those with only two or one contacts. These relationships are quite plausible.

TABLE 3.57 HERE

When we examine those who gave a firm answer--reporting that a party organization does or does not in fact exist in their neighborhood--the response patterns are rather astounding. The social contact variables have very little effect. For some not self-evident reason, those with fewer acquaintances (61%) and lower-average contact years (54%) report party organizations to exist as against their comparison groups. These are, of course, also the contact categories in which we noted fewer respondents giving an affirmative answer in the first place. We

are at a loss to interpret these outcomes in the data.

Rather spectacular results (spectacular, given the small numbers involved) are visible when we look at the effect of the life space variables. Six of the coefficients have negative signs, indicating that those doing their things elsewhere or at a greater distance from the neighborhood are more inclined to say that party organizations exist than do their comparison groups. The exceptions are those who report shopping and church-going in the neighborhood. We have, at the moment, no way to interpret this material. Could the results be spurious, due to respondents' socio-economic status? If those engaging in their life space activities elsewhere and at a greater distance from their neighborhood are also the more well-to-do and better-educated, one might expect SES to have a powerful influence on these results. But, as we shall see in Part 4, while higher income and better education have an effect on whether respondents claim to have knowledge of party organizations in the neighborhood, these SES variables have no further effect on whether the knowledgeable respondents assert or deny the existence of party organizations.

Conclusion. While the limited nature of the data does not permit any firm conclusion, it would seem that a person's interpersonal environment is not unrelated to the communal context of his/her neighborhood and his/her life space environment. Where people live and how they live sets constraints on their interpersonal relations. But the interpersonal relations that people form may be "independent" of communal context or life space environment precisely because they are "voluntary" and "purposive." Whether and how these three major environments in which

people find themselves affect their "political environment" will be explored after a description of the latter.

3.6 The Primary Zone as Political Environment

The political homogeneity of small face-to-face or primary groups has often been noted, but its etiology is little understood. There are any number of hypotheses concerning why it is that the members of such groups come to think and act alike, the best known being the "pressure-conformity" hypothesis and the "mutual attraction" hypothesis. The pressure-conformity model holds that people in frequent and continuing contact with each other are compelled to behave as the group as a whole behaves--be such behavior majority-imposed or leader-imposed, and that, as a result, they conform to the group's norms. The mutual attraction hypothesis holds that people who are "similar" are attracted to each other and, in seeking each other out, come to form groups which as a result are homogeneous.

Our task here cannot be to test these or other hypotheses but to explore respondents' "political primary zone." We speak of "zone" rather than "group" because we do not know whether the persons named by the respondent, in combination with him/her, do in fact constitute a "real group," that is, a group in frequent and continuing contact. However, prior to being asked the question about the partisan identification of those neighbors whom the respondent had named as "social contacts," he/she was asked whether he/she "talk about politics, political issues or candidates" with these neighbors, and whether he/she in general agrees or disagrees with these persons on political matters. These questions

yielded two measures--one of "political conversation" which permits classification of respondents into those who talk politics with all or some of his/her social contacts or do not talk with any of them; the other a measure of "political agreement" which places the respondents into three "political climates:" consensual, dissensual and antagonistic. Before exploring the political primary zone in terms of these attributes, we shall look at its internal composition.

Much as we might prefer to work with the classification which, as reported earlier (see above, 2.42) divides respondents into those with "partisan-pure" and "partisan-dominated" zones, the small number of all respondents (N=119) for whom relevant data are available forces us to simply use the Democratic, Republican and Independent categories, in addition to a "hybrid" category. For some analytic purposes, we shall combine these categories in several ways which may provide further insight into the partisan composition of the primary zone. For instance, if one sorts out whether a respondent's zone is "pure" (homogeneous) or "dominated" (majoritarian), the profile presented in Table 3.61 emerges (the hybrid zone is omitted; it cannot, by operational definition, be anything but a mixture of heterogeneous partisan characteristics). As the table shows, the overwhelming proportion of respondents report a primary zone environment that is homogeneous, though the independent zones are slightly less so than the "party-partisan" zones. If the

TABLE 3.61 HERE

political environment of the primary zone is not homogeneous, this seems to be largely due to chance. Any predictive effort would certainly be justified in suggesting that most people's political primary zone is likely to be homogeneous.

Internal analysis also permits us to say something about the "cognitive capability" of respondents with different political primary zone environments (for description of the measure, see above, 2.44). Some respondents (N=49) were unable to perceive the partisan identification of any of their neighbors whom they had named as social contacts (we shall deal with them lateron). And others could only describe the partisan identification of some but not of all the persons in their primary zone (N=44). Table 3.62 presents the distribution of those whose cognitive capability is "complete" and whose capability is "limited." For the purposes of the table, Republican and Democratic primary zone respondents have been combined into a single "partisan" type because the difference between them on the two capability categories is only 1.5 percent. The table shows that respondents whose primary zone environment is hybrid find it more difficult to specify the political identification of all of their social contacts than those whose interpersonal milieu is either homogeneous or majoritarian, whether of the independent or partisan variety.

TABLE 3.62 HERE

Morphology of the political primary zone is a first step toward discovering its etiology. The question one may ask is how it comes about that political primary zones are so overwhelmingly homogeneous, and why it is that different political primary zone respondents have different cognitive capabilities. To answer these questions, let us return to our initial variables--political conversation and political climate. It is not unreasonable to assume that before people can agree or disagree in political matters they must talk with each other. When those respondents who reported talking to their social contacts about politics, political issues or candidates were asked whether they generally agreed or disagreed politically, 69% reported agreeing with all their primary zone associates, 20% reported agreeing with some but not others, and a mere 11% reported that they disagreed with all of them. But this does not mean that political talk as such is a pre-condition for a primary zone environment's political homogeneity, for specifying all one's contacts' partisan identification is, as Table 3.63 shows, not dependent on political conversation alone. Some 28% of the 119 respondents who ventured to identify their neighbors' partisan identification reported not talking with them about politics at all! Moreover, as the table indicates, this was least so for those

TABLE 3.63 HERE

in hybrid and most so for those in the Republican environments. One may wonder, therefore, by just what mental alchemy respondents are able to specify their social contacts' partisan identification if they do not

talk about politics with them at all. What exacerbates the puzzle is the fact that those not talking politics overwhelmingly (85%) characterize all of their primary zone contacts in the same manner as either Independents, Democrats or Republicans, that is, as constituting homogeneous primary zone environments. Table 3.64 presents the data.

TABLE 3.64 HERE

One might suspect that this outcome is the result of the relationship between political conversation and respondents' cognitive capability, that is, that those who talk politics and those who do not will not differ in cognitive capability. But this, as Table 3.65 shows, is not the case. Respondents who talk politics are in fact significantly more capable of specifying the partisan identification of their social contacts.

TABLE 3.65 HERE

One possible explanation for the results of Tables 3.63 and 3.64 may lie in the consensual nature of political conversation. However it comes about, people talk politics only or mostly with those with whom they agree in the first place and avoid talking politics with those with whom they disagree. The data bear this out. As Table 3.66 reports, of the 90 respondents reporting political conversations, 69% generally agreed with all of their neighbors, 20% agreed with some but disagreed with others, and only 11% disagreed with all of them. But, as Table 3.67

shows, political agreement, unlike political conversation, does not

TABLE 3.66 HERE

markedly affect people's cognitive capabilities when it comes to identify the political composition of their primary zone environment (though persons in the dissensual climate seem to be slightly more able to perceive the partisan identification of their social contacts than do those in consensual and antagonistic climates).

TABLE 3.67 HERE

What is missing in the chain of relationships between political conversation, political agreement and the dissection of the political primary zone is knowledge of the linkage between political climate and not talking about politics; for those who said they did not talk politics with their neighbors were not asked whether they politically agreed or disagreed with them. Yet, all respondents, regardless of whether they were political conversationalists or not, were asked to specify the partisan identification of the persons in their primary zone. And this, we observed, creates the puzzle that people who do not talk about politics yet seem to be informed about their neighbors' partisan identification.

We can of course not solve the puzzle because we have no data for those persons whom the respondents had failed to name as conversation partners (the political climate measure being dependent on conversation

having occurred). We can therefore only guess or "project" what may be going on by inspecting, as in Table 3.68, the distribution of the

TABLE 3.68 HERE

respondents within their respective political primary zones in terms of the political climate measure (which, because of the missing non-conversationists for whom no climate data are available, considerably reduces the total number of cases). It appears that consensus is so overwhelming, especially in the Independent and Republican primary zone environments, that one might suspect that even non-conversationists will pick up, as by osmosis, the party identification of their social contacts. This is, of course, more likely in the Independent and Republican zones, less likely in the Democratic and quite unlikely in the Hybrid zones. But all of this is speculation.

We noted, in Table 3.61, that the Democratic and Republican primary zones are overwhelmingly homogeneous as political milieus, and the Independent zone, also, is more likely to be homogeneous than majoritarian (heterogeneity being, by definition of the partisan and independent zones, impossible). It remains therefore to explore the "mix" of political milieu and political climate, regardless of the zones' political composition (we would simply end up with too few cases in the cells of the table if we were to "control" it for the primary zone's political composition). Table 3.69 presents the data. It shows that almost half (45%) of all primary zones are homogeneous and consensual, with the other combinations spread throughout the remaining cells of

the table. We can of course not say whether political consensus makes for partisan zone homogeneity, or whether such homogeneity makes for consensus. The data do not permit one, therefore, to "test" either the pressure-conformity or the mutual-attraction hypothesis in regard to the political composition of primary zones.

TABLE 3.69 HERE

3.61 Preliminary Note on Party Identification and the Partisan Composition of the Primary Zone

We shall for a moment desist from our relentless pursuit of the morphology of the political primary zone environment and introduce respondents' own party identification as a variable. At immediate issue is, of course, whether people see their closest associates as they see themselves--the issue of projection, or whether they see themselves as others see them (or, perhaps, as they think others see them)--the issue of introjection. We shall proceed from these classical issues by first looking at the data from the perspective of projection and then of introjection.

Because of the controversy over whether so-called "leaners"--that is, "independents" who say they are close to one or the other of the two political parties--are really "more" partisan than the "weak" identifiers--we first present the entire array of distributions for the seven-point party identification scale, in spite of the fact that this makes for exceptionally small cell entries. But it may be helpful in deciding how to condense the scale for more stable analysis. Table 3.691 presents the data.

TABLE 3.691 HERE

Without looking at the table in its more important aspects, a first cursory glance shows that the "leaners"--the independents who say they are close to the Republicans or Democrats--"look more" like the pure Independents than either the strong or weak party identifiers. We are initially inclined, therefore, to combine the leaners with the pure Independents. It also appears that though there is a sharp drop-off in the Democratic zone from the strong to the weak Democrats, we can legitimately combine the strong and weak identifiers of either party. This yields a more manageable and stable distribution matrix for the purposes of analysis. Table 3.692 presents the condensed matrix.

TABLE 3.692 HERE

There are two factual observations one can make immediately. First, a very large proportion of the Democratic identifiers and half of the Republican identifiers are located in partisan primary zone environments coordinate with their party identification. And second, there is a strong "breakage effect" in favor of the Democratic environment. Two-fifths of the Independents are in Democratic environments and so are one-fifth of the Republicans. Moreover, a fifth of the Democrats and slightly more than a fifth of the Republicans are located in the heterogeneous hybrid zone. These "breakage effects" represent reality: there are simply many more Democrats in the country so that randomly selected persons, no matter what their own party identification and all other things being equal, are more likely to have more Democrats than Republicans

as their neighbors. This breakage effect in favor of the Democratic majority is evidently difficult to overcome by those who may wish to associate only with people of their own political persuasion.

This clear evidence of the breakage effect in the data permits us to suggest that a person's designation of his social contacts as partisans of one or another party, or as independents, is not just a function of projection--of his/her attributing to neighbors his/her own identification. There may be some projection here, but if it were the only psychological process operating, certainly more of the Republican identifiers should be characterized by the Republican primary zone environment and possibly more of the Independents might be characterized by an independent primary environment.

- It is also feasible to look at the same data in the perspective of introjection by treating the partisan primary zone environment as the antecedent variable. The correlation coefficient for the reversed table remains of course the same, and we cannot reach any firm conclusion about cause and effect. Table 3.693 gives the data.

TABLE 3.693 HERE

If one analyzes the table in the perspective of introjection, what stands out are the 71% of persons with an independent primary zone environment who identify themselves as Independents and the 70% of those with a Republican environment who designate themselves as Republicans. On the other hand, although over half of the respondents with a Democratic partisan environment call themselves Democrats, as many as a

third claim to be Independents, at least on first pass (of these 18 Independents with a Democratic partisan zone environment, six or 33% are Democratic leaners, seven or 39% are pure Independents, and five or 28% are Republican leaners). Finally, respondents with a hybrid primary zone distribute more evenly across the party identification categories than the other zone types, in fact similar to the sample as a whole.

One can in fact strengthen the view in favor of introjection being operative by segregating the pure Independents and clustering the party partisans. Table 3.694 does so. It appears that the introjection argument no longer holds for the respondents with a presumably independent primary zone environment. More than half of them, it now

TABLE 3.694 HERE

appears, are Democrats of one strength or another. On the other hand, three-fourths of the respondents with a Democratic and four-fifths of the respondents with a Republican primary zone environment are now self-identified partisans of their respective parties.

But our purpose is not to explore one or another hypothesis about the psychological or structural functioning of party identification. Our objective is methodological. What the data show, no matter how presented, is that the measure of partisan zones constructed from responses concerning particular persons and aggregated to serve as a macro-contextual variable at the individual level of analysis seems to be,

indeed, a valid and reliable one, for otherwise one would not observe the rather striking and strong relationship between this novel measure and the much-tested micro-psychological index of party identification.

Before proceeding, let us summarize the main findings of this section by way of a correlation table (correlations between primary zone partisan composition, primary zone political milieu and cognitive capability are not included here because they are not genuinely independent measures but derived from the same base data). Table 3.695 presents the coefficients. In propositional format, these coefficients

TABLE 3.695 HERE

seem to say:

- 1) Political conversation occurs in primary zone environments, from most to least, in the following order: Hybrid, Independent, Democratic, Republican. ($g = .38$)
- 2) Political conversation is inversely related to primary zone milieu: there is less political talk where the primary zone is homogeneous as to party identification of its "members" than where it is majoritarian or heterogeneous. ($g = -.57$)
- 3) Political conversation is positively related to cognitive capability: people who talk politics are more capable to perceive the party identification of others than those who do not talk. ($g = .47$)
- 4) There is a weak, though positive, relationship between primary zone partisan composition and the zone's political climate: the hybrid and independent zone environments tend to be less antagonistic than

- the party-partisan environments, with consensus high in the independent zone more than in the other three environments. ($g = .15$)
- 5) There is a moderately strong relationship between political milieu and political climate: the more homogeneous in political partisanship the zone environment, the more consensual is the political climate. ($g = .29$)
 - 6) Cognitive capability is unrelated to political climate: persons agreeing with each other politically are no more or less capable of perceiving the partisan composition of their primary zone than persons disagreeing. ($g = -.04$)
 - 7) There is a strong relationship between a person's party identification and the equivalent composition of his primary zone. ($g = .59$)

3.7 The Contextual Parameters of the Political Primary Zone

Human interaction is self-generative because it is not only reactive but also purposive. There is, therefore, no reason to assume, a priori, that a person's political primary zone must necessarily vary with a neighborhood's communal context, his/her life space or interpersonal "social" relations. But as it is also likely to be influenced by these contextual parameters, the relationships that are observed may be more or less strong so that even a weak or non-existent relationship can be "politically important."

3.71. Political Primary Zone and Communal Context. It seems advisable, before proceeding, to recall the measures used to describe the communal context of the neighborhood and especially what they mean. Two of the measures--years of residence in the neighborhood and residential

mobility--tell us really only something about the respondent from which the "nature" of the neighborhood must be inferred. For instance, if there are more long-term than short-term residents and if there are more persons who plan to stay than to move, we have direct information about the individuals concerned but only indirect information about the neighborhood. On the other hand, the three measures concerning the quality, stability and party-organizational life of the neighborhood are direct respondent observations, of an evaluative or cognitive variety, which may or may not tell us anything significant about the observer: he may be correct or incorrect. But as we found in Section 3.1, most of these measures are quite strongly interrelated, suggesting that they do indeed harness a common "communal context factor." Table 3.71 presents the coefficients between the component variables of the communal context and the political primary zone variables.

TABLE 3.71 HERE

Length of residence in the neighborhood is quite unrelated to what goes on in the political primary zone, except for a moderate tendency of long-term residents to be more cognizant of the party identification of their social contacts. Neighborhood quality seems related to political conversation, party partisanship in the primary zone and cognitive capability (the coefficients for political climate and political milieu are omitted because there are only five cases altogether in the relevant columns of the original tables). However, only weak relationships at best exist between population stability and the various political primary

zone components. On the other hand, high personal mobility is negatively related to at least three components--political conversation, partisanship in the primary zone and cognitive capability. "Movers" are simply less politically involved or knowledgeable than are "stayers."

As one might expect, persons claiming to be knowledgeable about party organizational life in their neighborhood are also considerably more knowledgeable about the partisan composition of their political primary zone ($g = .43$), specify their zone as partisan ($g = .27$), engage in political conversation ($g = .18$), and find themselves in more heterogeneous milieus ($g = -.17$). Among those claiming knowledge, the conversationalists are more likely to confirm the existence of party organization ($g = .50$) and to be cognizant of their primary zone's partisan composition ($g = .49$), but the composition of the primary zone appears to be less partisan where party organization is reported to exist ($g = -.28$) and the primary zone of these knowledgeable is more heterogeneous ($g = -.20$).

While most of the relationships observed in Table 3.71 seem plausible, perhaps most interesting is the reversal of signs in the association between the partisan composition of the primary zone and party knowledge, on the one hand, and party existence, on the other hand. Because we are particularly concerned with political party matters and citizen political behavior, Table 3.72 presents the relationships between these variables in detail.

TABLE 3.72 HERE

Table 3.72 shows that, paradoxically, there is an inverse relationship between the existence of party organizations in the neighborhood and the partisan composition of the political primary zone: fifteen percent more of the knowledgeable respondents who deny the existence of party organizations in the neighborhood yet identify their primary zones as either Democratic or Republican than do those who report that party organizations exist there (76% vs. 61%). It is as if the absence of organization is compensated for by more partisanship in the political primary zone. We note this finding because it suggests that people's party identification may be quite independent of the existence of party organizations in a particular neighborhood. It may well be that people reinforcing each other's party identification in the primary zone is the effective agent influencing their political behavior rather than the party organization as such.

Summary. We can summarize the findings concerning the relationship between a neighborhood's communal context and their residents' political primary zone environment as follows: Political conversation seems to thrive in better neighborhoods among those who are relatively committed to stay there and who report that parties are active. The primary zone's political climate--whether it is consensual, dissensual or antagonistic--seems to be quite independent of the communal context as described here (unfortunately, we have no measure of whether the neighborhood itself is conflictual or not). Primary zone political composition appears to be more party-partisan in good neighborhoods, and where people expect to remain, but not in neighborhoods where parties are active. The primary zone's political milieu--whether it is more or less homo-

geneous or heterogeneous in composition--seems rather unaffected by the general communal context, but where party organizations are active, it seems, there is a tendency toward more heterogeneity. The cognitive capability of people--their ability to specify the party identification of those neighbors with whom they are in social contact--seems to be greater in relatively high-quality neighborhoods where people plan to remain and where party organizations are active. The quality of the neighborhood, low residential mobility and an active party life, it appears, shape the primary zone as a political environment as far as political conversation and partisanship as well as its perception are concerned, but they seem to have little or no effect on the primary zone's internal political climate or political milieu.

3.72. Political Primary Zone and Neighborhood as Life Space. A person's "life space" was defined as the set of activities he/she mostly engages in during his/her waking hours--shopping, working and church-going. What we failed to include, unfortunately, is a person's leisure time activity, whether he/she finds the neighborhood a good place for recreation or must go elsewhere for this purpose. We shall deal with "day-dwellers" and "night-dwellers" in more detail elsewhere but present here the data concerning the relationship between life space activities and the primary zone as a political environment.

TABLE 3.73 HERE

Table 3.73 reveals some enormously interesting results. First, it seems to make very little difference for the politics of the primary zone whether life space activities are carried on in the neighborhood or elsewhere. The coefficients are almost all near zero or weak, even though more of them are positive than negative, suggesting a mild tendency of those active in the neighborhood to have political conversation or being able to perceive the party identification of their primary zone contacts. The only remarkable exception is the primary zone's political milieu for those who work in the neighborhood; it seems to be more homogeneous than for those working elsewhere. It is also likely to be less partisan in composition, and political conversation is eschewed (perhaps with the further result that the cognitive capability of those working in the neighborhood is reduced). These results are quite consonant with what one common-sensically knows about work situations--political talk is avoided. The coefficients for the summary Life Space measure only summarize the prior observations.

On the other hand, the data on the relationship between the primary zone variables and commuting by those who shop, work or worship elsewhere are rather remarkable though, on reflection, reveal some rather plausible findings. Not only are the coefficients quite high compared with the previous set, but the direction of the signs reveals some consistent and almost "rational" patterns. Thirteen of the twenty signs are negative, suggesting that distant versus near commuting has quite different consequences for the emergent character of the primary zone as a political environment. In fact, only the partisan composition of the primary zone is positively affected by close travel, and the excep-

tion here might confirm the rule: those commuting far to work seem to be located in a primary environment that is less partisan than it is for those commuting only a short distance. The data on work place are especially consistent: those who work in their own neighborhood find themselves in a less partisan zone than those who work elsewhere; but those who go to a place nearby are in a less partisan primary zone situation than those who commute further away. Table 3.74 presents the comparisons in detail.

TABLE 3.74 HERE

Political conversation, it appears, is consistently less practiced by those commuting to nearby places than by those going further away, and the political climate of the primary zones is less consensual for the short-distance than the long-distance commuters. But going to church nearby is related to being in a partisan environment rather than in one that is hybrid or independent ($g = .67$) and conducive to being able to perceive the political composition of the primary zone ($g = .34$). Yet, nearby-church-commuters are also less likely to be in a consensual zone ($V = -.44$), even though their commuting behavior is not related to the degree to which the zone's milieu is homogeneous or heterogeneous ($g = .04$). Commuting to worship relatively far away, then, seems characteristic of persons whose primary zone is more likely to be hybrid or independent than partisan and whose zone is more consensual in political climate. Table 3.75 presents the relevant distributions.

TABLE 3.75 HERE

Summary. The neighborhood as an environment that defines people's life space does not, in general, seem significantly related to the political primary zone environment. However, whether people commute far or only near when they do carry out life space activities elsewhere appears to have some political consequences for their primary zone situation. With some notable exceptions, more distant commuting seems to make for more political conversation, a politics of consensus and cognitive capability, but also for less partisanship in the primary zone and a more heterogeneous milieu. It is as if distant travel, perhaps because it throws people together, reduces conflict. On the other hand, nearby commuters tend to have more partisan primary zone environments, with the exception of those going to work: those going to work nearby are less characterized by a partisan zone than those who go to work further away. Finally, people who go to church far away are in the least partisan and most consensual primary zone situations. (There is a good chance they belong to the "less established" denominations; but on this we can only speculate).

3.73. Political Primary Zone and Interpersonal Relations. That interpersonal relations make for low salience of politics and for political conformity has often been demonstrated. Husbands and wives tend to share political identifications and attitudes. Friends, neighbors and work associates avoid political discussion lest it create conflict. One might expect, therefore, that interpersonal relations create a slack political primary zone environment. Table 3.76 presents the data for four aspects of interpersonal relations reported by the respondents-- the number of neighbors they name as social contacts, the number of years

these neighbors had been known (averaged per person and broken at the median for the distribution of the sample), the degree of intimacy reported (all close; some close, some not; and all not close), and the frequency of consociation (all or some frequent as against not frequent).

TABLE 3.76 HERE

What stands out in Table 3.76 is the consistently negative relationship between all four measures of interpersonal relations and the political composition of the primary zone. If the number of social contacts is three (rather than two or one), the average number of years the neighbors have been known is above the median, interpersonal relations are relatively close and consociation--visiting with one's social contacts--is frequent, the political primary zone is less party-partisan than when these attributes of social interaction are the obverse. Political conversation with those one has known for long, with whom one is intimate and interacts frequently is barely more practiced than when the opposite condition prevails, though having more than one or two contacts seems to be conducive to political conversation; but this supports the notion that political conversation is avoided in valued friendships; one should expect that such conversation occurs less often if one has only one or two friends. Only consociation--seeing people frequently--has a moderate effect on political climate and suggests that if one sees people often, there is pressure to conform to the group's consensus. As to political milieu--the degree to which the primary zone is politically homogeneous or heterogeneous--the relation-

ships are ambiguous. That heterogeneity should increase as the number of one's contacts increases is plausible, just as it is plausible that long acquaintanceship might make for a more homogeneous primary zone. But it is difficult to explain why intimacy should be negatively related to milieu, for one might expect that when people feel close, their primary zone will be more homogeneous politically than when one's contacts are not close. Nevertheless, it seems that one's ability to identify the party affiliation of the persons in one's political primary zone is facilitated by the number of years one has known them and the degree of intimacy that exists between observer and observed. But cognitive ability is evidently not affected by the frequency of one's social interaction.

- Summary. Interpersonal relations tend to heighten one's perceptivity of the primary zone's political composition, but the composition itself is more likely to be non-partisan--tending toward heterogeneity. The political climate in private social relations barely tends toward consensus, but really only if social contacts are relatively frequent. Political conversation increases with the number of contacts and suggests that if there are few friends among one's social neighbors, politics as a topic is avoided. In general, the findings suggest in what ways the "primary zone" may be similar to the "primary group" but also in what ways it may be different. It seems to be similar in that political conversation is eschewed, in that there is some pressure for conformity, and cognitive capability--knowing one's social contacts' partisan identification--is facilitated. On the other hand, the primary zone seems to differ in some significant way from what is known about

the primary group. First, the primary zones are more likely to be hybrid or independent in composition (though in absolute numbers there are, of course, more partisan than other zones) and, as a result, they seem to be characterized by more heterogeneity than are primary groups. These, it seems to us, are important differences that deserve of both better data and relevant theory.

3.8 Conclusion

It is difficult to come to firm conclusions about the relationships between people's political primary zone environment and those other contexts in which they are involved. Yet, despite of the paucity of the data, most of the relationships described here are plausible and should be explored further by way of large samples. Many of the near-zero and weak correlations may also be empirically and theoretically important. They may demonstrate the autonomy of the political primary zone environment as against the pressure of the neighborhood's communal context, the opportunities or necessities of the life space, or the prophylactics of strictly social interactions. Which of the measures employed in this analysis are worth retaining or developing, and what other measures might be created and explored, will be treated in our Recommendations.

Table 3.10. The Communal Context

	<u>Quality</u>	<u>Stability</u>	<u>Mobility</u>	<u>Party Awareness</u>	<u>Party Existence</u>
Years of residence	.05	.41*	-.40*	.52*	.05
Neighborhood quality	-	.73*	-.82*	.23	-.19
Population stability		-	-.52*	.23	-.27
Personal mobility			-	-.17	.02

Table 3.11. Party Organizations, Neighborhood Quality and Stability

	<u>Quality of Neighborhood</u>		<u>Population Stability</u>	
	<u>Good</u> N=132	<u>Not so Good</u> N=17	<u>High</u> N=126	<u>Low</u> N=23
Organizations present	43%	53%	43%	57%
Organizations absent	<u>57</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>43</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	g = -.19		g = -.27	

Table 3.21. The Neighborhood as Life Space

	<u>Working</u>	<u>Church-going</u>	<u>Life Space</u>
Shopping	.23	.44*	.89*
Working	-	.31*	.85*
Church-going		-	.90*

Table 3.22. Type of Life Space Activity and Number of Activities

<u>Type of Activity</u>	<u>Number of Activities in Neighborhood</u>			
	<u>Three</u> N=27	<u>Two</u> N=51	<u>One</u> N=43	<u>None</u> N=30
Church-going	100%	77%	40%	0%
Shopping	100%	73%	35%	0%
Working	100%	51%	26%	0%

Table 3.23. Distribution of Respondents by Place and Type of Activity

<u>Place of activity</u>	<u>Church-going</u> N=198	<u>Shopping</u> N=236	<u>Working</u> N=180	<u>Working</u> [*] N=152
Neighborhood	54%	50%	40%	29%
Elsewhere	<u>46</u> 100%	<u>50</u> 100%	<u>60</u> 100%	<u>71</u> 100%

* Twenty-eight housewives omitted.

Table 3.24. Type of Activity and Life Space

<u>Type of activity in neighborhood</u>	<u>The Neighborhood as Life Space</u>	
	<u>Central</u> N=78	<u>Peripheral</u> N=73
Church-going	85%	23%
Shopping	82%	21%
Working	68%	15%

Table 3.25. The Non-Neighborhood as Life Space

<u>Type of Commuting</u>	<u>Work Commute</u>	<u>Church Commute</u>	<u>Median Commute</u>
Shop commute	.60 [*]	.67 [*]	.86 [*]
Work commute	-	.27	.75 ^{*+}
Church commute		-	.89 [*]

+ Phi is used here because there are no cases in one cell of the 2x2 table which unduly inflates gamma to 1.00.

Table 3.26. Average Total Commuting and Commuting to Work, Shopping and Church

<u>Work Commute</u>	<u>Average Total Commuting</u>		
	<u>Below Median "Near"</u>	<u>Above Median "Far"</u>	
Close	36%	14%	N = 105
Distant	0%	50%	
<u>Church Commute</u>			
Close	39%	9%	N = 90
Distant	13%	39%	
<u>Shopping Commute</u>			
Close	45%	9%	N = 116
Distant	13%	34%	

Table 3.27. Place of Shopping and Commuting to Work

<u>Work Commute</u>	<u>Place of Shopping</u>	
	<u>Neighborhood</u> N=51	<u>Elsewhere</u> N=54
Close	39%	61%
Distant	<u>61</u>	<u>39</u>
	100%	100%

$$g = -.42^*$$

Table 3.28. Life Space Activities in Neighborhood and Commute Distance

<u>Type of Commuting</u>	<u>Type of Activity in Neighborhood</u>			
	<u>Shopping</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Church-going</u>	<u>Life Space</u>
Shopping commute	-	-.25	.13	-.25
Work commute	-.42*	-	-.32	-.47*
Church commute	-.26	.36	-	-.18
Median commute	-.48	.46	-.09	.00

Table 3.31. The Primary Zone as Social Context

	<u>Contact Years</u>	<u>Intimacy</u>	<u>Consociation</u>
Contact number	.10	.40*	.36
Contact years	-	.38*	-.24
Intimacy	-	-	.63*

Table 3.41. Communal Context and Life Space Activities

<u>Life Space Activity</u>	<u>Neighborhood Quality Good</u>	<u>Population Stability High</u>	<u>Personal Mobility Low</u>
<u>Shopping</u>			
Neighborhood	84% (N=114)	79% (N=107)	71% (N=116)
Elsewhere	89% (N=117)	85% (N=117)	70% (N=116)
<u>Working</u>			
Neighborhood	90% (N=69)	82% (N=67)	68% (N=72)
Elsewhere	85% (N=107)	82% (N=102)	65% (N=105)
<u>Church-going</u>			
Neighborhood	87% (N=105)	82% (N=102)	76% (N=106)
Elsewhere	88% (N=90)	87% (N=86)	68% (N=88)
<u>Life space acts</u>			
None or one	88% (N=73)	89% (N=71)	63% (N=70)
Two or three	88% (N=75)	82% (N=71)	72% (N=78)

Table 3.42. Life Space Activities as Functions of Communal Context

Life Space Activity in Neighborhood:	Residence Yrs.		Quality ¹		Stability ²		Mobility ³	
	Long	Short	High	Low	High	Low	Low	High
Shopping	51% (N=119)	49% (N=117)	48% (N=200)	58% (N=31)	46% (N=184)	55% (N=40)	50% (N=163)	49% (N=69)
	g = .05		g = -.20		g = -.17		g = .02	
Working	43% (N=83)	37% (N=97)	40% (N=153)	30% (N=23)	40% (N=139)	40% (N=30)	42% (N=117)	38% (N=60)
	g = .13		g = .22		g = .00		g = .07	
Church-going	56% (N=102)	52% (N=96)	54% (N=170)	56% (N=25)	53% (N=159)	62% (N=29)	57% (N=140)	48% (N=54)
	g = .08		g = -.04		g = -.19		g = .18	
Life Space ⁺	59% (N=70)	46% (N=81)	51% (N=130)	50% (N=18)	48% (N=121)	62% (N=21)	56% (N=100)	46% (N=48)
	g = .25		g = .02		g = -.28		g = .20	

1. High = Quality of neighborhood is judged "good"
 2. High = Little population movement seen in neighborhood
 3. Low = Respondents not planning to move but stay or undecided
- + Row percent refers to those with 2 or 3 activities in neighborhood

Table 3.43. Life Space Commuting as Function of Communal Context

Commute is relatively near:	Communal Context							
	Residence Yrs.		Quality		Stability		Mobility	
	Long	Short	High	Low	High	Low	Low	High
Shopping (1-3 miles)	49% (N=57)	58% (N=59)	52% (N=103)	67% (N=12)	52% (N=98)	59% (N=17)	53% (N=80)	59% (N=34)
	g = -.17		g = -.31		g = -.14		g = -.06	
Working (1-7 miles)	56% (N=45)	47% (N=60)	49% (N=88)	56% (N=16)	53% (N=81)	56% (N=18)	48% (N=65)	54% (N=37)
	g = .17		g = -.15		g = -.05		g = -.13	
Church-going (1-3 miles)	60% (N=45)	36% (N=45)	51% (N=79)	30% (N=10)	51% (N=74)	46% (N=11)	48% (N=60)	48% (N=27)
	g = .46*		g = .41		g = .12		g = .00	
All travel (1-5 miles)	57% (N=90)	43% (N=98)	49% (N=160)	44% (N=25)	52% (N=147)	45% (N=31)	52% (N=128)	40% (N=57)
	g = .25		g = .09		g = .13		g = .24	

Table 3.51. Interpersonal Contact and Neighborhood Communal Context

		Neighborhood Communal Context							
		<u>Residence Yrs.</u>		<u>Quality</u>		<u>Stability</u>		<u>Mobility</u>	
<u>Contact</u>		<u>Long</u> (N=119)	<u>Short</u> (N=117)	<u>High</u> (N=200)	<u>Low</u> (N=31)	<u>High</u> (N=184)	<u>Low</u> (N=40)	<u>Low</u> (N=163)	<u>High</u> (N=69)
Yes		77%	69%	78%	48%	76%	73%	77%	65%
No		<u>23</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>35</u>
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		g = .20		g = .58*		g = .09		g = .29*	

<u>Number of contacts</u>		(N=91)	(N=81)	(N=155)	(N=15)	(N=139)	(N=29)	(N=125)	(N=45)
Three		78%	77%	79%	60%	79%	69%	79%	73%
Two		18	16	16	20	17	17	14	22
One		<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		g = .06		g = .45*		g = .28*		g = .13	

Table 3.52. Interpersonal Contact and Life Space

	<u>Shopping</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Church-going</u>	<u>Life Space</u>
Contact	.02 (N=236)	.13 (N=180)	.11 (N=198)	.00 (N=151)
Number of contacts	-.12 (N=172)	.27 (N=131)	-.10 (N=151)	.09 (N=113)

Table 3.53. Commuting and Interpersonal Contact

	Commuting to			
	<u>Shopping</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Church</u>	<u>Median</u>
Social contact	.08 (N=116)	.17 (N=105)	.06 (N=90)	.06 (N=188)
Contact number	-.11 (N=84)	-.17 (N=75)	-.19 (N=68)	-.16 (N=135)

Table 3.54. Average Number of Years Contacts are Known,
Communal Context and Life Space Variables

<u>Average number of years is above median and:</u>	<u>Percent</u> *	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Table N</u>
Years in neighborhood long	77	.87*	170
Neighborhood quality good	51	.09	168
Population stability high	57	.59*	166
Personal mobility low	55	.28	168

Shopping in neighborhood	55	.19	170
Working in neighborhood	59	.35*	130
Church-going in neighborhood	50	-.10	149
Life space (2-3 activities)	54	.18	112
Shop commute close	46	-.04	84
Work commute close	44	.18	75
Church commute close	63	.28	67
Median commute close	54	.26	134

* "Percent" is the percent of those who fall into the cells created by the intersection of the named categories on the left of this table and the "above median" category produced by the distribution of "average years of contact" with persons named by respondents.

Table 3.55. Intimacy, Communal Context and Life Space Variables

<u>Intimacy and</u>	<u>Categories</u>		<u>Index of Intimacy</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Table N</u>
Years in neighborhood	Long -37	Short -38	+ 1	.03	170
Neighborhood quality	Good -38	Not Good -27	-11	-.11	168
Population stability	High -36	Low -38	+ 2	.00	166
Personal mobility	Low -34	High -47	+13	.18	168
<hr/>					
Shopping	Local -39	Away -35	- 4	-.06	170
Working	Local -24	Away -48	+24	.29	130
Church-going	Local -28	Away -50	+22	.28	149
Life space activities	Many -28	Few -53	+25	.31	112
Shop commute	Near -34	Far -36	+ 2	-.02	83
Work commute	Near -45	Far -49	+ 4	.12	75
Church commute	Near -40	Far -59	+19	.25	68
Median commute	Below -34	Above -47	+13	.18	134

Table 3.56. Consociation, Communal Context and Life Space Variables

<u>Consociation and</u>	<u>Categories</u>		<u>Index Intimacy</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Table N</u>
Years in neighborhood	Long -25	Short -22	- 3	-.04	162
Neighborhood quality	Good -22	Not Good -29	+ 7	.09	160
Population stability	High -21	Low -30	+ 9	.12	159
Personal mobility	Low -21	High -31	+10	.12	160

Shopping	Local -32	Away -16	-16	-.18	162
Working	Local -25	Away -30	+ 5	.09	121
Church-going	Local -23	Away -26	+ 3	.04	144
Life space activities	Many -29	Few -31	+ 2	.04	106
Shop commute	Near - 7	Far -27	+20	.19	80
Work commute	Near -26	Far -34	+ 8	.14	70
Church commute	Near -11	Far -41	+30	.34	63
Median commute	Below -16	Above -31	+15	.18	127

Table 3.57. Party Organization Knowledge and Party Existence, Communal Context and Life Space Variables

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Party Knowledge⁺</u> <u>(All Respondents)</u>	<u>Party Existence⁺⁺</u> <u>(Knowledgeables)</u>
Social contact yes	67% (N=173)	47% (N=116)
no	59% (N= 63) g = .18	40% (N= 37) g = .14
Contact number is three	69% (N=133)	44% (N= 92)
two	62% (N= 29) g = .22	61% (N= 18) g = -.32
one	50% (N= 10)	60% (N= 5)
Contact years above median	80% (N= 85)	43% (N= 68)
below median	54% (N= 85) g = .54*	54% (N= 46) g = -.23
Intimacy close,		
partly close	66% (N= 82)	46% (N= 54)
not close	67% (N= 88) g = -.00	47% (N= 59) g = -.00
Consociation more/less		
often	63% (N= 94)	49% (N= 51)
infrequent	69% (N= 68) g = -.14	51% (N= 55) g = -.05

Shopping in neighborhood	66% (N=118)	55% (N= 78)
elsewhere	64% (N=118) g = .06	36% (N= 75) g = .37*
Working in neighborhood	68% (N= 72)	43% (N= 49)
elsewhere	62% (N=108) g = .13	55% (N= 67) g = -.24
Church-go in neighborhood	65% (N=107)	57% (N= 70)
elsewhere	66% (N= 91) g = -.01	32% (N= 60) g = .48*
Life space with 2-3 acts	69% (N= 78)	57% (N= 54)
0-1 acts	62% (N= 73) g = .17	38% (N= 45) g = -.38*
Shop commute close	55% (N= 62)	26% (N= 34)
distant	72% (N= 54) g = -.36	44% (N= 39) g = -.36
Work commute close	64% (N= 53)	44% (N= 34)
distant	61% (N= 52) g = .06	69% (N= 32) g = -.47*
Church commute close	74% (N= 43)	19% (N= 32)
distant	60% (N= 47) g = .33	46% (N= 28) g = -.58*
Median commute close	66% (N= 92)	28% (N= 61)
distant	60% (N= 96) g = .13	55% (N= 58) g = -.52*

+ Percentages are for those respondents who did not reply "don't know."

++ Percentages are for those respondents who gave firm answer and said that, yes, one or the other of the two parties, or both, are organizationally active in neighborhood.

Table 3.61. The Political Homogeneity of the Primary Zone

Political Primary Zone			
	<u>Independent</u> N=21	<u>Democratic</u> N=54	<u>Republican</u> N=23
Homogeneous (all contacts are identically specified)	71%	80%	78%
Majoritarian (the majority of contacts are identically specified)	<u>29</u> 100%	<u>20</u> 100%	<u>22</u> 100%

Table 3.62. Cognitive Capability and Specification of Political Primary Zone

Political Primary Zone			
<u>Cognitive Capability</u>	<u>Hybrid</u> N=21	<u>Independent</u> N=21	<u>Partisan</u> N=77
Complete (all persons are politically identified)	52%	62%	66%
Limited (only some persons are identified)	<u>48</u> 100%	<u>38</u> 100%	<u>34</u> 100%

Table 3.63. Political Conversation and Partisan Identification of Social Contacts in Political Primary Zones

Partisan Composition of Primary Zone					
<u>Political Conversation</u>	<u>Hybrid</u> N=21	<u>Independent</u> N=21	<u>Democrat</u> N=54	<u>Republican</u> N=23	<u>Total</u> N=119
With all/some	86%	81%	70%	57%	72%
With none	<u>14</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>28</u>
g = .38	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 3.64. Political Conversation and Political Composition of Primary Zone

<u>Political Milieu of Primary Zone</u>	<u>Political Conversation</u>	
	<u>With All, Some</u> N=86	<u>With None</u> N=33
Homogeneous	56%	85%
Majoritarian	23	6
Heterogeneous	<u>21</u>	<u>9</u>
$g = -.57$	100%	100%

Table 3.65. Political Conversation and Cognitive Capability

<u>Cognitive Capability</u>	<u>Political Conversation</u>	
	<u>With All, Some</u> N=86	<u>With None</u> N=33
Complete (all persons are politically identified)	70%	45%
Limited (only some persons are identified)	<u>30</u>	<u>55</u>
$g = .47$	100%	100%

Table 3.66. Political Conversation and Political Climate

<u>Political Climate</u>	<u>Political Conversation</u> N = 90
Consensual (agree with all)	69%
Dissensual (agree with some, disagree with others)	20
Antagonistic (disagree with all)	<u>11</u>
	100%

Table 3.67. Political Climate and Cognitive Capability

<u>Cognitive Capability</u>	<u>Political Climate</u>		
	<u>Consensual</u> N=62	<u>Dissensual</u> N=18	<u>Antagonistic</u> N=10
Complete (all persons are politically identified)	63%	72%	60%
Limited (only some persons are identified)	32	28	20
Absent (no person is politically identified)	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>
g = -.04	100%	100%	100%

Table 3.68. Political Composition of Primary Zone and Political Climate

<u>Political Climate</u>	<u>Political Composition of Primary Zone</u>				
	<u>Hybrid</u> N=17	<u>Independent</u> N=17	<u>Democratic</u> N=39	<u>Republican</u> N=12	<u>Total</u> N=85
Consensual	53%	94%	61%	83%	69%
Dissensual	41	6	20	17	21
Antagonistic	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 3.69. Political Milieu and Political Climate of Primary Zone

Political Climate	Political Milieu			N=85
	Homogeneous	Majoritarian	Heterogeneous	
Consensual	45%	14%	11%	
Dissensual	6%	7%	8%	
Antagonistic	7%	1%	1%	

Table 3.691. Party Identification (Seven-Point) and Partisan Composition of Primary Zone

Partisan Primary Zone	Party Identification						
	Strong Dem. N=19	Weak Dem. N=24	Indep. Dem. N=18	Pure Indep. N=15	Indep. Rep. N=12	Weak Rep. N=19	Strong Rep. N=12
Democratic	89%	54%	33%	47%	42%	16%	25%
Hybrid	11	25	17	7	16	21	25
Independent	0	17	44	33	17	10	0
Republican	0	4	6	13	25	53	50
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 3.692. Party Identification (Three-Point) and Partisan Composition of Primary Zone

Partisan Primary Zone	Party Identification		
	Weak & Strong Democrats N=43	All Independents N=45	Weak & Strong Republicans N=31
Democratic	70%	40%	19%
Hybrid	19	13	23
Independent	9	33	6
Republican	2	13	52
	100%	100%	100%

g = .59

Table 3.693. Partisan Composition of Primary Zone and Political Party Identification

Partisan Composition of Primary Zone					
<u>Party Identification</u>	<u>Democratic</u> N=54	<u>Hybrid</u> N=21	<u>Independent</u> N=21	<u>Republican</u> N=23	<u>Total</u> N=119
Democrats (weak & strong)	56%	38%	19%	4%	36%
Independents (pure & leaning)	33	29	71	26	38
Republicans (weak & strong)	<u>11</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>26</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Democratic pro-percentage ratio	+45	+5	+9	-66	+10

Table 3.694. Partisan Composition of the Primary Zone and Political Party Identification Revised

Partisan Composition of Primary Zone					
<u>Party Identification</u>	<u>Democratic</u> N=54	<u>Hybrid</u> N=21	<u>Independent</u> N=21	<u>Republican</u> N=23	<u>Total</u> N=119
Democratic (leaners weak & strong)	67%	52%	57%	9%	51%
Independents (pure)	13	5	24	9	13
Republicans (leaners, weak & strong)	<u>20</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>36</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Democratic pro-percentage ratio	+47	+9	+28	-73	+15

Table 3.695. Political Primary Zone Components

	<u>Political Conversation</u>	<u>Political Climate</u>	<u>Party Identification</u>
Primary zone composition	.38	.15	.59
Primary zone milieu	-.57	.29	x
Cognitive capability	.47	-.04	x

x These relationships will be treated in Part 5.

Table 3.71. Political Primary Zone and Neighborhood Communal Context

<u>Neighborhood Communal Context</u>	<u>Political Primary Zone</u>				
	<u>Political Conversation</u>	<u>Political Climate</u>	<u>Partisan Composition</u>	<u>Political Milieu</u>	<u>Cognitive Capability</u>
Yrs. in neighborhood	.02	.07	.07	.05	.22*
Neighborhood quality	.28 ^{*+}	MD	.47	MD	.21 ^{*+}
Population stability	-.01	.17 ⁺	.14	-.05	-.01
Personal mobility	-.34*	.00	-.20	.02	-.29*
Party knowledge	.18	-.03	.27	-.17	.43*
Party existence	.50*	.07	-.28	-.20	.49

+ Phi or Cramer's V.

Table 3.72. Partisan Composition of Primary Zone, and Party Knowledge and Party Existence

Primary Zone Composition	Party Knowledge		Party Existence	
	Firm Answer N=89	Do Not Know N=30	Yes, Exists N=48	No, Does Not Exist, N=41
Partisan (Republican and Democratic)	67%	57%	61%	76%
Hybrid (Republican and/or Democratic and/or Independent)	19	13	25	12
Independent	14	30	14	12
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	g = .27		g = -.28	

Table 3.73. Political Primary Zone and the Neighborhood as Life Space

Life Space Activity	Political Primary Zone				
	Political Conversation	Political Climate	Partisan Composition	Political Milieu	Cognitive Capability
Shopping ¹	.19	.02	.06	-.12	.15*
Working ¹	.00	-.03	-.16*	.31	.05
Church-going ¹	.13	-.13	.15	.02	.07
Life Space ²	-.06	-.08	.05	-.12	.07
Shop travel ³	-.49*	-.24	.20	.14	-.21
Work travel ³	-.02	-.07	-.33*	.27	-.16
Church travel ³	-.17	-.44*+	.67*	-.04	.34
Median travel ⁴	-.22	-.38*	.28	.30	-.03

+ Cramer's V

1. + means that primary zone variable is related to activity carried on in neighborhood; - means that activity carried on elsewhere.
2. + means that primary zone variable is related to two or three activities carried on in neighborhood; - means only 1 or no activity in neighborhood.
3. + means that primary zone variable is more characteristic of those with only short travel distance; - means it is characteristic of those with more distant travel.
4. + means that primary zone variable is more characteristic of those whose total average travel is below median for all respondents; - means that it is characteristic of those with more than median travel.

Table 3.74. Comparison of Political Primary Zones of Those who Work in Neighborhood, Nearby and Far Away

<u>Primary Zone Composition</u>	<u>Work Place Is Located</u>		
	<u>Neighborhood</u> N=38	<u>Nearby</u> N=24	<u>Far Away</u> N=27
Partisan	60%	58%	70%
Hybrid	11	17	26
Independent	<u>29</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>4</u>
	100%	100%	100%

Table 3.75. Comparison of Political Primary Zones and Political Climate of Those who Worship in Neighborhood, Nearby and Far Away

<u>Primary Zone Composition</u>	<u>Church is Located</u>		
	<u>Neighborhood</u> N=60	<u>Nearby</u> N=23	<u>Far Away</u> N=22
Partisan	58%	78%	41%
Hybrid	17	17	27
Independent	<u>15</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>32</u>
	100%	100%	100%

<u>Political Climate</u>	N=48	N=15	N=20
Consensual	65%	53%	85%
Dissensual	23	20	15
Antagonistic	<u>12</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>
	100%	100%	100%

Table 3.76. Political Primary Zone and Interpersonal Relations

<u>Interpersonal Relations</u>	Political Primary Zone				
	<u>Political Conversation</u>	<u>Political Climate</u>	<u>Partisan Composition</u>	<u>Political Milieu</u>	<u>Cognitive Capability</u>
Contact number	.31	.03	-.25	-.20 ⁺	.13 ⁺
Contact years	.02	.01	-.03	.17	.25
Intimacy	.12	.07	-.26	-.18	.33
Consociation	.09	.26	-.18	-.02	-.00

+ Cramer's V.

Part 4. Demographic Correlates of the "Network" Variables

Our main objectives in this technical report are the assessment of the validity of the measures called, for succinctness, the "network variables" of the Pilot Study, and the feasibility of using them to investigate linkages between neighborhood communal context, life space activities and interpersonal relations (including micro-political relations), on the one hand, and politics more generally, on the other hand. Analyzing the relationship between the micro context and the broader social structure, as reflected in the demographic characteristics of the respondents, is one way to attain these objectives. Unfortunately, the small size of the sample does not allow us to explore the important factor of race, for there are only 13 Blacks among the 236 Wave II respondents; and limited time forbids us to make use of the extended occupations code. But we can explore the relationships between some other demographic variables and the network variables. Table 4.1 summarizes the statistical relations, while the pages that follow emphasize those findings that seem most useful and interesting.

4.10 Years in Neighborhood

The relationship to age emerges so clearly because the longer an individual lives, the greater his/her opportunity, on average, to live in one place for an extended period. The well educated live in the neighborhood for a shorter time--only 43% of those with some college have lived in their neighborhoods for more than 8 years compared to 62% of those without a high school diploma--because they have more opportuni-

Table 4.10. Demographic Correlates of "Network" Variables

Variable	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Region		Income			Education		
	M	F	O	Y	M	NM	S	NS	H	M	L	H	M	L
Yrs. in neighborhood, above median	52% (121)	49% (115)	80% (61)	17% (82)	50% (173)	51% (63)	45% (78)	53% (158)	49% (68)	49% (78)	52% (69)	43% (96)	50% (91)	67% (49)
	g=.07		g=.69*		g=-.01		g=-.16		g=-.05			g=-.28*		
Neighborhood quality, high	88% (118)	85% (113)	88% (60)	83% (80)	86% (170)	89% (61)	88% (76)	86% (155)	94% (67)	82% (77)	87% (68)	88% (95)	89% (89)	77% (47)
	g=.14		g=.19		g=-.12		g=.10		g=.21*			g=.20		
Population stability, high	83% (116)	82% (108)	88% (60)	76% (75)	84% (164)	77% (60)	80% (74)	83% (150)	84% (64)	84% (76)	76% (66)	85% (91)	83% (87)	76% (46)
	g=.04		g=.26		g=.24		g=-.12		g=.19			g=.16		
Personal mobility, low	71% (119)	69% (113)	89% (61)	50% (80)	71% (172)	68% (60)	68% (78)	71% (154)	76% (67)	67% (76)	65% (68)	65% (93)	73% (90)	76% (49)
	g=.06		g=.50*		g=.06		g=-.08		g=.17			g=-.18		
Party knowledge, yes	68% (121)	62% (115)	79% (61)	50% (82)	67% (173)	60% (63)	73% (78)	61% (158)	69% (68)	68% (78)	58% (69)	73% (96)	59% (91)	59% (49)
	g=.13		g=.35*		g=.13		g=.27*		g=.16			g=.22*		

Table 4.10. cont.

Variable	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Region		Income			Education		
	M	F	O	Y	M	NM	S	N	H	M	L	H	M	L
Party existence, yes	45% (82)	47% (71)	33% (48)	51% (41)	47% (115)	42% (38)	46% (57)	46% (96)	43% (47)	51% (53)	40% (40)	50% (70)	39% (54)	48% (29)
	g=-.03		g=-.23		g=.10		g=.00		g=.02 ^a			g=.08 ^a		
Shopping in neighborhood	51% (121)	49% (115)	46% (61)	44% (82)	51% (173)	48% (63)	46% (78)	52% (156)	56% (68)	47% (78)	44% (69)	56% (96)	46% (91)	45% (49)
	g=.05		g=.03 ^a		g=.06		g=-.11		g=.16			g=.16		
Working in neighborhood	24% (91)	56% (89)	74% (23)	33% (76)	39% (140)	43% (40)	44% (61)	38% (119)	27% (59)	34% (64)	56% (43)	27% (79)	47% (71)	60% (30)
	g=-.60*		g=.33*		g=-.07		g=.13		g=-.36*			g=-.43*		
Church-going in neighborhood	53% (98)	55% (100)	54% (56)	46% (68)	58% (144)	43% (54)	47% (66)	58% (132)	58% (60)	61% (64)	44% (57)	47% (83)	61% (77)	55% (38)
	g=-.04		g=.11 ^a		g=.31*		g=-.21		g=.19			g=-.16		
Lifespace 2+3 acts in neighborhood	44% (73)	59% (78)	73% (22)	39% (62)	54% (117)	44% (34)	48% (52)	54% (99)	45% (53)	57% (51)	43% (35)	44% (68)	60% (60)	52% (23)
	g=-.29*		g=.35*		g=.19		g=-.11		g=-.00 ^a			g=-.18 ^a		
Shop commuting, close	53% (59)	54% (57)	61% (33)	49% (45)	50% (84)	63% (32)	65% (40)	47% (76)	52% (29)	61% (41)	45% (38)	56% (41)	44% (48)	67% (27)
	g=-.04		g=.16		g=-.25		g=.35		g=.11 ^a			g=-.08 ^a		

Table 4.10. cont.

Variable	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Region		Income			Education		
	M	F	O	Y	M	NM	S	N	H	M	L	H	M	L
Work commuting, close	39% (66)	69% (39)	17% (6)	54% (50)	44% (82)	74% (23)	49% (33)	51% (72)	43% (40)	60% (42)	53% (19)	48% (56)	51% (37)	58% (12)
	g=-.55*		g=-.18		g=-.57*		g=-.06		g=-.19			g=.10		
Church commuting, close	54% (46)	41% (44)	65% (26)	32% (37)	51% (59)	42% (31)	51% (35)	46% (55)	46% (24)	52% (25)	47% (32)	37% (43)	50% (30)	71% (17)
	g=.26		g=.44*		g=.18		g=.12		g=.00 ^a			g=-.39*		
Median commute, below median	45% (98)	53% (90)	70% (46)	38% (72)	47% (139)	55% (49)	56% (61)	46% (127)	40% (55)	60% (68)	44% (50)	42% (81)	47% (71)	69% (36)
	g=-.17		g=.33*		g=-.17		g=.20		g=-.06 ^{*a}			g=-.29*		
Social contact, yes	72% (121)	74% (115)	72% (61)	76% (82)	73% (173)	73% (63)	80% (78)	70% (158)	75% (68)	71% (78)	77% (69)	80% (96)	66% (91)	74% (49)
	g=-.07		g=-.07		g=.01		g=.24		g=-.03			g=.17 ^{*a}		
Contact number, three	76% (87)	79% (85)	79% (43)	81% (62)	76% (127)	80% (45)	67% (61)	83% (111)	75% (51)	80% (55)	76% (53)	78% (77)	80% (60)	71% (35)
	g=-.10		g=-.01		g=-.09		g=-.35*		g=.04 ^a			g=.09 ^a		
Contact years, median	46% (85)	54% (85)	79% (43)	15% (60)	48% (126)	55% (44)	53% (59)	49% (111)	50% (50)	43% (59)	58% (35)	43% (76)	52% (59)	60% (35)
	g=-.16		g=.72*		g=-.12		g=.08		g=-.10			g=-.22		

Table 4.10. cont.

Variable	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Region		Income			Education		
	M	F	O	Y	M	NM	S	N	H	M	L	H	M	L
Intimacy, low	65% (85)	39% (85)	41% (42)	57% (61)	55% (125)	42% (45)	50% (60)	53% (110)	60% (50)	48% (54)	45% (53)	53% (76)	46% (59)	60% (35)
	g=.39*		g=-.14		g=.26		g=-.18*		g=.17			g=-.00 ^a		
Consociation, frequent	51% (80)	65% (82)	61% (41)	61% (59)	54% (119)	70% (43)	60% (52)	57% (110)	49% (49)	59% (53)	63% (48)	49% (74)	67% (57)	65% (31)
	g=-.27		g=-.07		g=-.33*		g=.05		g=-.18			g=-.27*		
Political conversation, high	56% (87)	51% (85)	44% (43)	55% (62)	55% (172)	49% (45)	46% (61)	58% (111)	71% (51)	47% (55)	42% (53)	66% (77)	45% (60)	40% (35)
	g=.11		g=-.07		g=.12		g=-.23		g=.37*			g=.37*		
Political climate, consensual	67% (48)	72% (43)	84% (19)	74% (34)	67% (69)	77% (22)	74% (27)	67% (64)	59% (34)	78% (27)	86% (22)	64% (5)	74% (27)	79% (14)
	g=-.15		g=.05 ^a		g=-.23		g=.17		g=-.44			g=-.20		
Cognitive capability, all	52% (87)	37% (81)	35% (43)	36% (59)	48% (126)	33% (42)	47% (58)	44% (110)	59% (51)	44% (54)	31% (51)	57% (76)	35% (57)	34% (35)
	g=.21		g=.11 ^a		g=.23		g=.00		g=.27*			g=.32*		
Political milieu, homogeneous	59% (64)	69% (55)	72% (32)	57% (35)	62% (92)	70% (27)	68% (40)	62% (79)	50% (40)	73% (37)	70% (33)	53% (61)	77% (39)	74% (19)
	g=-.14		g=.20		g=-.09		g=.04		g=-.21*			g=-.28*		

Table 4.10. cont.

Variable	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Region		Income			Education		
	M	F	O	Y	M	NM	S	N	H	M	L	H	M	L
Primary zone, partisan	67% (64)	62% (55)	78% (32)	40% (35)	67% (92)	56% (27)	70% (40)	62% (79)	70% (40)	68% (37)	55% (33)	61% (61)	67% (39)	74% (19)
	g=.11		g=.42 [*]		g=.21		g=.23		g=.20			g=-.20		

* Relationship significant at .10 level
 a Relationship is curvilinear

ties to move and are somewhat younger. The recent migration into the South is reflected in the tendency of Northerners to live in their neighborhoods for longer time periods.

4.11 Neighborhood Quality

Although the skewed distribution of responses to this question limits the strength of any statistical measure, education and income, two variables objectively related to the quality of neighborhood, are moderately correlated with it. This indicates that the measure, although weak, taps the concept of neighborhood quality.

4.12 Population Stability

One characteristic of a "good" neighborhood is that it is stable; so the finding that the well-to-do and the better educated perceive their neighborhoods as more stable conforms to the finding that they are more likely to perceive their neighborhood as "good". Nor should one be surprised that the older and married respondents perceive more stability since they live in an environment where the ties of family and settled lifestyle are conducive to the perception of population stability.

4.13 Personal Mobility

As a person's career becomes more stable, and as he develops closer ties to his/her community, the more reluctant he/she should be to move. The finding that only 50% of those between 19-35 would stay, compared to 89% of those over 60, confirms the hypothesis and validates the measure. Education and income operate in contradictory fashions--high income people are more likely to stay while the highly educated

are less likely to stay--because different social processes are involved. The well-to-do are more likely to be middle aged and married and thus likely to be integrated into the community and settled into careers. The well educated, by contrast, are likely to be relatively young and upwardly mobile. Although they are likely to think they live in a "good" neighborhood, they are also more likely to be interested in a still better one.

4.14 Party Knowledge

Comparison of those who are certain in their knowledge about party organizations with those who don't know one way or the other, the results conform to expectations. The 19 to 35 year olds, as befits their lower partisanship and their shorter period of involvement in the political system, are less likely to be sure of their opinions than their elders. As expected, given their greater knowledge about politics, the well educated are more likely to be sure in their views. Finally, Southerners are more likely to be sure in their opinions than Northerners. This difference may be a function of the historical difference between the Southern and Northern party systems.

4.15 Party Existence

Examination of the differences between respondents who reported a party organization and those who did not, confounds expectations. Given their lower levels of partisanship, the young should be less likely to know of party organizations. Just the opposite emerged in the data; only one third of those over 60 knew of a party organization compared to more than 50% of the young and middle aged. One also might expect education

and income to be powerful predictors, but the relationship is curvilinear and weak. Those with middle incomes and/or a high school education were less likely to know of a party organization than either the well-educated/well-off or the poorly-educated/poorly-off.

4.16 Shopping

One expects the place where a person shops to be related to physical mobility--in which case the young and the well off should do more shopping outside the neighborhood. This is not the case. Both the young and the old are more likely to shop outside their neighborhood, although the magnitude of the difference between them and the middle aged may be an artifact of the cutting points. Contrary to initial expectation, high income respondents and those with some college are more likely to shop in the neighborhood. Perhaps they do not need to go outside the neighborhood for bargains but can afford to shop at the smaller, more expensive neighborhood stores. Without further knowledge of respondents' neighborhoods this inference can only be most tentative.

4.17 Working

Where people work is strongly related to their social-economic status; the higher an individual's income or education the more likely he/she is to work outside their neighborhood. Since upper middle class people in the United States commute to work from the suburbs, this relationship can be expected and validates the measure. Although the relationship to sex is inflated because of the twenty-eight housewives we included as working, when they are omitted 36% of women work in the neighborhood compared to 24% of men. Finally, as a person ages his

physical mobility declines and he/she is more likely to live where he/she works, or so the data imply. Slightly more than 32% of those between 19 and 49 work in the neighborhood compared to 44% of those between 50 and 59, and 74% of those over 60. Taken together these findings suggest that working is the element of a person's life space most related to the larger social structure.

4.18 Church-going

Lacking the incentives of family and permanence which are conducive to the formation of religious ties in the neighborhood the young and the unmarried are more likely to attend church outside the neighborhood. Perhaps they still attend church where they grew up. The greater neighborliness of Northern churchgoing may be a function of differences in the kinds of religious denominations in the two regions, or it may be a function of differing levels of urbanization. High income people are more likely to find worship facilities in their neighborhood, but educational level presents an ambiguous pattern.

4.19 Life Space Activities

The elderly and women are more likely to be integrated into the neighborhood than other groups because of their strong tendency to work in the neighborhood. The greater integration of married persons and Northerners appears to be a result of the greater amount of churchgoing they do in the neighborhood. Finally, the curvilinear relationship between education, income, and number of life space activities--the least and best educated and the lowest and highest income groups have more activity in the neighborhood--indicates that commuting to work does not prevent upper-status individuals from taking part in the communal

life of their neighborhoods.

4.20 Shop Commuting

Once a person decides to shop outside his/her neighborhood, physical capacity is not a major determinant of how far they will go. Thus, the elderly are likely to commute a somewhat shorter distance than the young but the difference is not great. Income and education are related in a curvilinear fashion--the middle income and high school graduates commute shorter distances than others. Only region and marital status have a straightforward relationship to this variable. Southerners do not commute as far as Northerners and the married travel further than the non-married. The reasons for these differences are not immediately clear and merit further exploration.

4.21 Work Commuting

Women who work outside a neighborhood are less likely to travel far than are men; 40% of men commute less than 7 miles compared to 69% of women. The unmarried are less likely to travel a fair distance--74% of the unmarried who work outside the neighborhood commute less than 8 miles compared to 44% of the married. But this relationship may be confounded with sex since women, in this sample, are more likely to be unmarried than men. Education and income, our two measures of socio-economic status, are only weakly related to this variable. But more of the well educated tend to commute at a greater distance, while income makes for a more ambiguous pattern. This result stands in strong contrast to our findings on the relationship between socio-economic status and the choice of working in the neighborhood or elsewhere. Apparently, once a decision is made to work outside the neighborhood all social

classes find the means to reach the place of work.

4.22 Church Commuting

The distance a person commutes to church is related to education and age. The older a churchgoer, the more he/she is to commute a short distance--65% of those over 60 travel 3 miles or less compared to 32% of those between 19 and 35. Education is also strongly related--71% of those with no high school travel 3 miles or less while only 37% of those with some college travel such a short distance. The fact that the young are more likely to be well educated makes it difficult to isolate the independent effect of the variables. However, we might infer, ceteris paribus, that the young travel further because they still attend services at home (see Church-going), while the better educated are more likely to belong to elite congregations drawing their membership from the whole community rather than from a cluster of associated neighborhoods.

4.23 Median Commute

Dichotomizing the average distance respondents commute, wherever they commute to, education and age are clearly related to the measure. The older and less educated travel, on average, a relatively short distance beyond their neighborhood. For instance, 69% of those with no high school diploma fall below the median as against 42% of those with some college. Similarly, there is a thirty point difference between the very young and those over 60 in the percentage commuting further than the median distance. Region and marital status are both weakly related to travel: Southerners and the married commute shorter distances. These findings conform to expectations, although education and

age emerge more clearly as correlates than might be expected given their relationship to the individual components of commuting.

4.24 Social Contact

Only region is significantly related to the existence of neighborhood contacts; 80% of Southerners report such contacts compared to 70% of Northerners. This partially confirms the stereotypical picture of the neighborly South. Although 80% of those with some college reported contacts, 74% of those with no high school diploma report them, and there is a decline to only 66% of high school graduates reporting contacts. This lack of systematic relationship to education and the absolute lack of a relationship to income is plausible since there is no a priori reason to expect neighborliness to be related to social status.

4.25 Contact Number

Since most respondents gave three names, the generally low correlations are not surprising and they confirm our previous finding that neighborliness is not systematically related to social position. Surprisingly, Southerners, who report some contact in the neighborhood, report fewer contacts than their Northern counterparts. This patterning may be due to urban-rural differences which the data do not permit us to explore.

4.26 Contact Years

Because the elderly have lived in their neighborhoods for a longer period of time (see Years in Neighborhood), they have had a greater opportunity to know their contacts for a sustained period of time. The

finding of a strong relationship between age and contact years supports this common sense assertion and validates the measure. The direct relation between education and contact length--60% of those with no high school diploma know their contacts longer than the median compared to 43% of those with some education--and the lack of a similar relation involving income can be expected because of earlier findings that the well educated, but not the well-to-do, live in their neighborhoods a shorter period of time and are more likely to move than other respondents. The slight tendency of women and the unmarried to know their contacts longer than the median is the first of many differences in this respect we shall present; all of which point to greater involvement in inter-personal relations among these groups.

4.27 Intimacy

The traditionally greater intimacy of women in their inter-personal relations is captured very well by our measure--65% of men said none of their contacts were close, while only 39% of women said this--thus confirming expectations and validating the measure. The unmarried report greater intimacy in their personal relations to accompany their longer periods of interaction with their contacts. The Southerners are only slightly on more intimate terms than Northerners. Although the elderly and the low income are somewhat more likely to engage in intimate relations, these findings do not detract significantly from the general conclusion that all classes and ages are equally capable of carrying on at least some intimate relations.

4.28 Consociation

Women and the unmarried report more frequent contacts than men

and the married. This is consistent with previous findings concerning intimacy and contact years. The tendency of the better educated and the higher income to report less frequent contacts may be partly a result of their tendency to work outside the neighborhood. Since more time is spent commuting to work than to other activities this significantly lowers their opportunity for interaction in the neighborhood. High status individuals also have more opportunity to interact with people outside the neighborhood and therefore may be less dependent on neighborhood contacts for social relations.

4.29 Political Conversation

Engaging in political conversation requires a fairly high level of information, a tolerance of possible disagreement, and an involvement in the world of politics. The well educated and the well-to-do, who are more likely to meet these requirements, engage in more political conversation than do the less well educated and those with lower incomes. For instances, only 34% of those with some college fail to talk politics with their contacts, while 60% of those at the lowest educational level fail to talk politics with any of their contacts. Men and the married are more likely to discuss politics, leading to the inference that the greater intimacy and frequency of contact among the women and the unmarried may impel the suppression of political conversation. Finally, Southerners, possibly because of their slightly greater intimacy, are less likely to talk politics than Northerners. This also tends to support the hypothesis that intimacy may lead to less discussion of politics.

4.30 Political Climate

The better educated and the well-to-do perceive less consensus in their primary zone for two reasons: First, they are more likely to possess the cognitive ability and the political interest necessary to perceive differences between themselves and their friends. Second, because they are of higher status they are more likely, all else being equal, to engage in political persuasion and therefore more likely to encounter opposing views. Age is related in a curvilinear fashion to the perception of consensus; the youngest group (19 to 35) and the oldest (over 60) are more likely to perceive consensus than the middle aged. This pattern is probably due to the lesser salience of politics among the young and the lower education of those over 60. Once again the unmarried differ from the married, this time they are more likely to see the political climate of their personal relations as consensual. When combined with other differences already noted this points to a fundamental difference in the social lives of the unmarried when compared to the married. Lacking the intimate dyad of marriage, the unmarried must seek friendship and affection in their interpersonal contacts, leading to greater intimacy, consociation, the neglect of politics as a subject of conversation, and greater perception of consensus when politics is discussed. Married people experience none of these constraints, since intimate relations with contacts outside of the family are not as crucial to them.

4.31 Cognitive Capability

An individual's ability to perceive the partisan identification of his/her contacts depends on his cognitive ability, interest in

politics, and on the extent to which he/she discusses politics with them. Thus, we expected the well-to-do and the better educated to perceive more clearly the partisan identification of their contacts. The data confirm our expectations; the well-to-do and the better educated perceive more of their contacts' partisan identifications. Once again men and the married are more politicized than women or the unmarried. A life cycle effect similar to that noted in the discussion of political climate manifests itself here: the young, those 19 to 35, and the old, those over 60, are less likely to perceive the party identification of their contacts than the middle-aged.

4.32 Political Milieu

The partisan milieu of the primary zone is related to education and income--the primary zones of those with no college or at most a middling income are more homogeneous, probably because these characteristics are related to cognitive ability, in the case of education, and other forms of interpersonal activities, such as the discussion of politics, which are likely to lead to the perception of differences among contacts. Homogeneous milieus are more likely for women and for unmarried persons because these groups generally tend to perceive less political conflict in their interpersonal relationships. Finally, age appears to be related to the political milieu in two ways. First, those over 50 are more likely to live in homogenous zones than those under 50 and, secondly, those under 35 are more likely to receive a variety of partisan cues from their environment--25% of them are located in mixed zones compared to under 15% for the rest.

4.33 Primary Zone Political Composition

Primary zones can be classified according to their partisan

direction--Republican, Independent, Democratic, or Mixed--as well as by their degree of homogeneity. Since summary statistics are not very enlightening for this variable, Tables 4.2 to 4.7 present the more important relationships in depth. The most interesting relationships are those involving education and income. Those with higher education and high income are predisposed to Republicanism, yet they are not noticeably more likely to be in contact with Republicans. Although respondents with some college are less likely to be in contact with Democrats--under 40% report their contacts as mainly Democratic compared to 63% of those with no high school diploma--they are not significantly more likely to be in touch with Republicans--one fifth of them report mainly Republican friends, but as many high school graduates report such primary zones and close to 11% of those with no high school diploma also report such contacts. The picture for income is even more confused; high income people are more likely to live among Democrats but they are also more likely to live among Republicans than low income people, although those with middle incomes are most likely to live among Republicans. The consequences of this "breakage effect" for the political system clearly merit further exploration. The partisan imbalance of the South is reflected in the higher percentage of Democratic primary zones among Southerners. Finally, the 19-35 year olds are more likely to report Independent primary zones--31% of them report such zones compared to slightly over 10% for their elders--indicating that their lesser partisanship is a social experience reinforced by personal interaction and not simply a personal attribute.

4.34 Primary Zone Partisanship

If the Democratic and Republican primary zones are combined into a "partisan" category, we can view the composition of primary zones in yet another way. The young emerge as less partisan and more independent, a finding noted previously. Income and education work in exactly opposite directions. Education leads to less partisanship in the primary zone while high income leads to more partisanship. Men and the married differ from women and the unmarried in the way one can expect--they are involved in more partisan contexts. Finally, the primary zones of Southerners are more partisan than those of Northerners. This may be a result of the gradual emergence of a two party system in the South and the recent decline in party organizations in the North.

Table 4.11. Political Composition of Primary Zone by Education

<u>Composition of Zone</u>	<u>Some College N=61</u>	<u>High School Graduate N=39</u>	<u>No High School Diploma N=19</u>
Hybrid	16%	20%	16%
Independent	23	13	10
Democratic	39	46	63
Republican	<u>21</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>11</u>
	100%	100%	100%

Table 4.12. Political Composition of Primary Zone by Income

<u>Composition of Zone</u>	<u>High N=40</u>	<u>Medium N=37</u>	<u>Low N=33</u>
Hybrid	20%	8%	24%
Independent	10	24	21
Democratic	53	41	42
Republican	<u>17</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>12</u>
	100%	100%	100%

Table 4.13. Political Composition of Primary Zone by Region

<u>Composition of Zone</u>	<u>South N=40</u>	<u>Non-South N=79</u>
Hybrid	23%	15%
Independent	8	23
Democratic	55	41
Republican.	<u>15</u>	<u>21</u>
	100%	100%

Table 4.14. Political Composition of Primary Zone by Age

<u>Composition of Zone</u>	<u>Under 35</u> N=35	<u>35 to 49</u> N=27	<u>50 to 59</u> N=25	<u>Over 60</u> N=32
Hybrid	26%	15%	12%	16%
Independent	34	11	16	6
Democratic	31	56	48	50
Republican	<u>9</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>28</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 4.15. Political Composition of Primary Zone by Sex

<u>Composition of Zone</u>	<u>Male</u> N=62	<u>Female</u> N=55
Hybrid	17%	18%
Independent	16	20
Democratic	52	38
Republican	<u>16</u>	<u>24</u>
	100%	100%

Table 4.16. Political Composition of Primary Zone by Marital Status

<u>Composition of Zone</u>	<u>Married</u> N=92	<u>Unmarried</u> N=27
Hybrid	16%	22%
Independent	16	22
Democratic	47	41
Republican	<u>21</u>	<u>15</u>
	100%	100%

Part 5. Validation through Dependent Variable Analysis

5.1 The Primary Zone as Context for Political Conversation and Political Behavior

Along with the broad ecological environments of city, state, and nation, the communal and interpersonal contexts enfolding the individual constrain his spheres of political and social action. The workplace, the quality of the neighborhood, personal commitment to the neighborhood, and the frequency and intimacy of personal relations influence the perspectives and abilities men and women bring to the political world.

Precisely because these influences are so pervasive, it is extremely difficult to separate out patterns of political behavior which can be specifically attributed to, say, the individual's personal commitment to the neighborhood. At any rate, such an attempt is beyond the scope of this report, although we hope to explore some of these relations in our paper to be prepared for the Pilot Study panel to be held in connection with the 1979 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. At this time all we shall do is examine the effects of political conversation in the primary zone; a variable which along the extended causal path linking social life and politics lies close to the latter while it is also part of the social life of the individual.

We shall focus on four traditional areas of political research: political participation--specifically turnout in the 1976 and 1978 general elections; partisan choice--in 1976 and 1978; interest in politics and attention to political media; and partisan identification--as

measured by the standard CPS seven point scale. Some of these dependent variables are themselves related, for instance partisan identification and partisan choice, and we shall endeavor to be sensitive to this in our analysis. However, given the small sample and our modest goals we shall be satisfied with simple tables rather than complex multivariate analysis.

Because of its close ties to education, that most powerful determinant of political behavior, the question to ask of political conversation is not whether it relates to political behavior, but whether it retains its power after controlling for education. All the tables which follow control for education, although we only distinguish between two comparison groupings--those with some college and those with a high school diploma or less.

Political Participation and the Conversational Context. Regardless of education, political conversation in the primary zone stimulates turnout in both Congressional and Presidential elections. As Tables 5.10 and 5.11 show, within educational groups, the respondents in primary zones where politics is discussed are more likely to vote than respondents who are not in such zones. However, the conversational context variable does not eliminate the effects of education. The highly educated individual in a non-conversational zone is still more likely to vote than a respondent who never went to college but discusses politics with his neighbors. The conversational context remains powerful after education is controlled for.

TABLES 5.10 AND 5.11 HERE

Partisan Choice and the Conversational Context. The simple relationship of political conversation in the primary zone to partisan choice is not strong; for instance, 51% of those in conversational zones report voting for Ford in 1976 compared to 48% of respondents in zones where politics is not discussed. However, once we control for education, political conversation emerges as an important factor in partisan choice, as Tables 5.12 and 5.13 make clear

Traditionally, the Republican party has represented the better educated, better off, middle class while the Democratic party represented the less educated, less well off, working class. This difference ought to be reflected in the voting behavior of individuals; people with some college education should be more likely to vote Republican than people who never attended college. The conversational context substantially affects this prediction. Reading across the rows of Tables 5.12 and 5.13, a striking difference emerges between educational groups when respondents are in the conversational primary zones: respondents who did not attend college are markedly more likely to vote Democratic than their better educated counterparts. When politics is not discussed in the primary zone respondents of differing education are equally likely to vote Democratic.

TABLES 5.12 AND 5.13 HERE

When we examine differences within educational groups the effects of political conversation are again clear. Examining those who went to college first, we see that those who do not talk politics with their

contacts are more likely to vote for the Democratic congressional candidates in 1978 and for Jimmy Carter in 1976. The pattern for those who did not go to college is reversed; those who are in the conversational zones are more likely to vote Democratic.

The conversational context of the primary zone either reinforces the partisan predispositions of individuals resulting from their socio-economic status or it is one of the crucial factors creating such a partisan predisposition in the first place. Clearly future research should investigate in greater detail the dynamics of this phenomenon.

Interest in Politics, Attention to Media and the Conversational Context. As Tables 5.14 thru 5.16 show, the discussion of politics in the primary zone is correlated with a wider interest in government and the politically relevant components of the media. Although differences between educational groups remain, within educational groups respondents who discuss politics are more likely to give responses indicating a high level of involvement and interest in political affairs. The unusually high amount of attention paid to newspaper news by respondents who did not attend college and report no political conversation in their primary zones is anomalous. It is a deviant outcome in an otherwise consistent pattern of results for these variables.

The general discussion of politics in the primary zone is related by respondents to more specific discussions about politics. Regardless of education, respondents who are in conversational zones are substantially more likely to talk about national problems and possible presidential candidates than are those who do not talk politics with

their contacts. (The gammas range from .47 to .84)

TABLES 5.14 - 5.16 HERE

Partisan Identification and the Conversational Context. The discussion of politics in the primary zone leads one to chose political sides--Democratic or Republican--and to move away from Independence. At least that is what Table 5.17 implies. Of course, an alternative explanation is possible; partisanship may lead to conversation in the primary zone. At this time it is not possible to choose between the two explanations because the data are too thin and contain no dynamic element.

TABLE 5.17 HERE

The conversational context affects the direction of partisanship for those who did not attend college. In this group respondents in conversational primary zones are twice as likely to be Democrats and half as likely to be Republicans as respondents whose primary zone conversations are not political.¹ The pattern among the college educated is not as clear-cut. Among college-educated talkers the proportion of Democrats exactly equals the proportion of Republicans, and a similar pattern appears among non-talkers. The major effect of political

1. The predominance of Republican sentiments among respondents with less education and primary zones where politics is not discussed is surprising since lower education should predispose them to identify with the Democratic party. It may be that they come from rural areas but, lacking a suitable measure, this cannot be demonstrated.

conversation in the primary zone among the fairly well educated is to reduce the number of Independents.

As Table 5.18 shows, the disproportionate partisanship of people in the conversational primary zones is not a result of the partisan composition of those primary zones because respondents in the conversational zones are more likely to report that their primary zones are Hybrid or Independent. Nor can differences in the partisan direction of conversationalists and non-conversationalists be easily inferred from the partisan composition of their primary zones. Among the college educated, conversationalists are less likely to report Democratic primary zones than are their non-conversational counterparts; but they are no less Democratic in their own partisan orientations. Although, among the less educated, conversationalists report a higher percentage of Democratic zones and a lower percentage of Republican zones than their non-conversational counterparts, as expected, the

TABLE 5.18 HERE

cell percentages are so unstable and the size of the marginal distributions so small that any inference is extremely hazardous. At this point it is only possible to say that the effects of political conversation in primary zones on personal partisanship is not clearly attributable to influences deriving from the partisan composition of the primary zone.

The findings suggest the importance of exploring, in a larger data set, the relationships between partisan identification, partisan

choice, and relevant political characteristics of the primary zone. It may well be that the effects of political conversation in the primary zone on partisan choices disappear once we control for partisan identification. We should note, however, that this merely requires an explanation of the relationship between political conversation and partisan identification. When added to the findings presented in Part 3: 3.61, the findings of this section suggest that partisan identification is related to the political composition of the interpersonal context.

Implications and Conclusions. Political conversation in the primary zone is related to several crucial aspects of political behavior and belief. But unlike the distribution of news through the institutionalized media, its content is not the same for all individuals and systematically varies with education. If we make the reasonable inference that primary zones where politics is discussed are more likely to be areas of personal influence and opinion formation, than the conversational context is conducive to the existence of such diverse political behaviors as class voting, the reassertion of partisanship during campaigns, the effects of media on mass attitudes, and the long term stability of the party system. The importance of political conversation in the primary zone is not limited to specific, narrowly defined political acts; nor can it be classed simply as another variable deriving its power from its relation to social class. Rather, it is an independent factor affecting people and their relationship to politics.

Furthermore, political conversation is not simply an isolated aspect of the communal and interpersonal contexts of the individual.

As we have shown, it is related to such diverse aspects of daily life as the quality of the neighborhood, personal commitment to the neighborhood, and the intimacy of personal relations. These variables condition the likelihood of political conversation occurring and its probable effect when it does take place. Thus, it is political conversation as part of the broader and interrelated contexts of neighborhood and interpersonal relations which is important, not simply political conversation as an isolated attribute of the individual.

Table 5.10. Voter Turnout in 1978 and the Conversational Context

<u>Conversational Context of Primary Zone</u>	<u>Education: Voters Only</u>	
	<u>Some College</u>	<u>High School or Less</u>
Politics talked	90% (N=51)	65% (N=40)
Politics not talked	69% (N=26)	48% (N=54)

Table 5.11. Voter Turnout in 1976 and the Conversation Context

<u>Conversational Context of Primary Zone</u>	<u>Education: Voters Only</u>	
	<u>Some College</u>	<u>High School or Less</u>
Politics talked	98% (N=50)	80% (N=39)
Politics not talked	85% (N=26)	61% (N=51)

Table 5.12. Partisan Choice in 1978 and the Conversational Context

<u>Conversational Context of Primary Zone</u>	<u>Education and Democratic Vote</u>		
	<u>Some College</u>	<u>High School or Less</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Politics talked	38% (N=40)	76% (N=21)	-38%
Politics not talked	59% (N=17)	61% (N=21)	- 3%

Table 5.13. Partisan Choice in 1976 and the Conversational Context

<u>Conversational Context of Primary Zone</u>	<u>Education and Democratic Vote</u>		
	<u>Some College</u>	<u>High School or Less</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Politics talked	40% (N=47)	64% (N=28)	-24%
Politics not talked	52% (N=21)	52% (N=29)	0%

Table 5.14. Political Interest and the Conversational Context^{*}

<u>Conversational Context of Primary Zone</u>	<u>Some College</u>	<u>High School or Less</u>
Politics talked	73% (N=51)	42% (N=41)
Politics not talked	58% (N=26)	32% (N=53)

* The question on which this table is built is: "Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. Would you say that you follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, some of the time, only now and then, or hardly at all?" Cell entries are the percentage in each cell who "follow" government "most of the time."

Table 5.15. Attention to TV News and the Conversational Context *

<u>Conversational Context of Primary Zone</u>	<u>Some College</u>	<u>High School or Less</u>
Politics talked	73% (N=48)	48% (N=40)
Politics not talked	64% (N=25)	37% (N=54)

* The question on which this table is built is: "When you watch the news on TV, do you pay a great deal of attention to national news and what the government does, do you pay some attention, or don't you pay much attention to national news?" Cell entries are the percentage in each cell who "pay a great deal of attention" to TV news.

Table 5.16. Attention to Newspaper News and the Conversational Context *

<u>Conversational Context of Primary Zone</u>	<u>Some College</u>	<u>High School or Less</u>
Politics talked	48% (N=42)	32% (N=22)
Politics not talked	32% (N=23)	43% (N=28)

* The question on which this table is built is: "In general, when you read the newspapers, do you pay a great deal of attention to national news and what the government does, do you pay some attention, or don't you pay much attention to national news?" Cell entries are the percentage in each cell who "pay a great deal of attention" to newspaper news.

Table 5.17. Partisan Identification and the Conversational Context

<u>Party Identification *</u>	Some College		High School or Less	
	<u>Politics Talked in PZ</u>	<u>Politics Not Talked in PZ</u>	<u>Politics Talked in PZ</u>	<u>Politics Not Talked in PZ</u>
	N=51	N=26	N=41	N=53
Democratic	45%	38%	66%	30%
Independent	10	27	12	26
Republican	<u>45</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>44</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

* The three-fold party identification measure is created by combining "strong" partisans, "weak" partisans, and "leaners." Independents are only the respondents who indicated no partisan inclinations at all.

Table 5.18. Partisan Composition of Primary Zone and the Conversational Context

<u>Partisan Composition of Primary Zone</u>	Some College		High School or Less	
	<u>Politics Talked in PZ</u>	<u>Politics Not Talked in PZ</u>	<u>Politics Talked in PZ</u>	<u>Politics Not Talked in PZ</u>
	N=48	N=13	N=38	N=20
Hybrid	21%	0%	21%	15%
Independent	23	23	16	5
Democratic	35	54	55	45
Republican	<u>21</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>35</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Appendix A. The "Neighborhood Quality" Variable: What People Mean by "Good" and "Not so Good" Neighborhoods

On several occasions in the text we speculated about the meaning of "neighborhood quality" which may mean one thing to political scientists and another to the people living in a neighborhood. Because of press of time, we used only the closed item (Q. F2, VAR 48) which offered respondents merely the choice of "good" or "not so good" to describe the quality of their neighborhood (see Part 2: 2.11), rather than also building a more substantive index for the variable from the open-ended question which followed: "What makes you say this?" (Q. F2a. VAR 49, 50, 51). We are therefore presenting here the marginal distribution of the responses by respondents who categorized their neighborhood as "good" and "not so good" (including in the latter a handful who were coded "depends"). In doing so, we are reporting first the distributions in the broad code categories used by the Center for Political Studies, and then single out the seven categories which included at least 5% or more of all responses (for the latter purpose we are combining "good" and "bad" responses because the latter are so small and, moreover, simply the negative reciprocals of the former). We shall then regroup all responses into more manageable and politically salient categories.

There were 200 respondents who gave 410 positive or neutral answers and 31 respondents who gave 66 negative answers. Although respondents were invited to give three answers, the average for both groups was two (2.05 and 2.13, respectively). For the purpose of tabulation, we are using the response totals and not the respondents

in percentaging. Table A1 gives the data.

Table A1. Distribution of Responses in Broad CPS Code Categories Concerning Neighborhood Quality

<u>Broad CPS Code Categories</u>	<u>Neighborhood Quality</u>	
	<u>Good</u> N=410	<u>Not so Good</u> N=66
Physical qualities of neighborhood	21%	21%
Demographic characteristics of neighborhood	11	29
Subjective judgments of neighbors	41	18
Quality of life judgments	22	29
General	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>
	100%	100%

What stands out in Table A1 is that by far the largest proportion of responses for a definition of the neighborhood as "good" refers to "subjective judgments of neighbors," but the negative aspects of this judgment are not characteristic of the "not so good" comparison group (41% vs. 18%). On the other hand, "demographic characteristics of neighborhood" appear more frequently in the "not so good" than in the "good" (29% vs. 11%). Looking at Table A2, we note that the seven detailed judgment categories with 5% or more responses account for about 55% of all responses, and some 29% of all responses deal with qualities of neighbors, followed by 16% quality of life judgment responses and 10% responses dealing with the physical quality of the

neighborhood.

Table A2. Distribution of Responses in Detailed CPS Code Categories in Which Responses Concerning Neighborhood Quality were Five Percent or More

<u>Most Frequent Detailed Categories</u>	<u>Distribution</u> N=476	<u>Broad Category</u>
Neighbors friendly, congenial, understanding, etc., or opposites	13.0%	Subjective judgment of neighbors
Free from crime, vandalism, safe, trust neighbors, etc., or opposites	10.2	Quality of life judgment
Generally neighbors are good, nice people, respectable, etc., or opposites	9.4	Subjective judgment of neighbors
People mind own business, privacy, etc., or opposites	6.3	Subjective judgment of neighbors
It's quiet, peaceful, etc., or opposites	5.6	Quality of life judgment
Pretty area, generally attractive, parks, etc., or opposites	5.2	Physical quality of neighborhood
Close to hospital, schools, shops, good location, etc., or opposites	5.0	Physical quality of neighborhood
	<u>54.7%</u>	
All others	<u>45.3</u>	

It is quite clear that when people think of their neighborhood, they think first of their neighbors and secondly of the quality of life they find there. One wonders what the responses might have been if respondents were asked about their "community" or "city?" Whatever the impli-

cations of these response patterns, as political scientists we would want to use somewhat different, if also broad, categories. We therefore recombined the detailed response categories (which also seemed feasible because some of the CPS detailed categories strike us as redundant). Table A3 presents the distribution for these recoded categories (we are again combining the "good" and "not so good" groups because we are more interested here in the criteria which respondents use rather than in the evaluative direction of the responses--which is so overwhelmingly on the positive side anyway; the base for percentaging is the 431 responses used in the recombination).

Table A3. Distribution of Responses Concerning Quality of Neighborhood, Recoded Categories

<u>Recoded Combinations of Responses</u>	<u>Distribution</u> N=431
Statements concerning types of neighbors	41.7%
Statements concerning physical characteristics of neighborhood	16.0
Statements concerning privacy and peacefulness	14.2
Statements concerning crime and physical safety	12.8
Statements concerning location of neighborhood	6.3
Statements concerning population sub-groups (ethnics, children)	3.9
Statements concerning <u>public amenities</u>	3.2
Statements concerning <u>public services</u>	<u>1.9</u>
	100.0%

The recombination does not drastically change the profile of criteria but simply accentuates some of the values people seem to cherish. Neighbors again stand out, followed by statements concerning safety and privacy (together some 27% of the responses). But what we wish to emphasize is the very low response rate concerning public amenities and services (together only slightly more than 5% of all recoded responses). The neighborhood is clearly not perceived as an area of governmental facilitation or intervention--as a significant political unit (unless one assumes that safety and privacy are provided by a governmental authority--the police). Politics is probably seen as conflictual and divisive for neighborliness, but, interestingly, it is not mentioned--as if mentioning it, whether positively or negatively, might itself be the beginning of trouble. The neighborhood is essentially seen as a private place, an extension of the home.

This is not to say that the neighborhood is not a political environment. In fact it is so precisely because overt politics is eschewed in favor of the covert and latent; as overt political expression and conduct are suppressed, covert and latent opinions, perceptions and attitudes concerning politics can have all the more impact on political behavior, making for conformity and often intolerance of the "stranger." These are among the reasons why neighborhoods tend to maintain themselves and change only very slowly, why they are protective against inroads from the environment but also can become ghettos or slums. But these are hardly issues to be pursued in this connection.

Appendix B. Comparison of the Correlation Coefficients for the Associations of "Working" (in Neighborhood or Elsewhere), and Communal Context, Life Space, Social Contact, Political Primary Zone and Demographic Variables, for Sample which Includes Housewives as "Working in Neighborhood" and Sample Omitting Them

It will be recalled that, in computing the measurement of "Working" (in neighborhood or elsewhere), we included 28 housewives as "workers" in the sample in order to retain as many cases as possible for analysis (see Part 2: 2.20). As we stated the justification for doing so, "a separate check on the variable with these cases omitted indicated that there is no significant difference between the two measures and that the direction and strength of the associations for "working in the neighborhood or elsewhere" remain about the same." In order to permit the reader to make his own judgment in the matter, we present, in Table B1, the respective gamma correlation coefficients as well as the value of the differences between the two measurements.

Table B1 shows, that for the measurements involving the Communal Context, Life Space, Social Contact and Political Primary Zone variables, the differences range from +28, for the Party Knowledge relationship with Working, thus "favoring" the sample without housewives, to -13, in the Consociation relationship with Working, thus "favoring" the sample with the 28 housewives included. But this range does not tell the story: of the 22 coefficients, four other comparisons yielded differences above 10 points, while 16 were below this level, the average difference being 7.7. And, more important, in no comparison was there a change in the direction of the coefficient signs.

By way of contrast, the correlation coefficients differed con-

Table B1. Comparison of Correlation Coefficients for Sample that Includes and Sample that Omits Housewives from Analysis

<u>Analytic Variables</u>	<u>Samples</u>		<u>Value of Difference</u>
	<u>Housewives Omitted</u>	<u>Housewives Included</u>	
Years in neighborhood	.17	.13	+ 4
Neighborhood quality	.24	.22	+ 2
Population stability	.11	.00	+11
Personal mobility	-.13	-.07	+ 6
Party knowledge	.41	.13	+28
Party existence	-.19	-.24	- 5
Shopping	.40	.23	+17
Church-going	.33	.31	+ 2
Life space activities	.82	.84	- 2
Shop commute	-.28	-.25	+ 3
Church commute	.32	.36	- 4
Median commute	.60	.46	+14
Social contact	.15	.13	+ 2
Contact years	.44	.35	+ 9
Contact number *	.20	.17	+ 3
Intimacy	.35	.29	+ 6
Consociation	.04	.17	-13
Political conversation	.00	.06	- 6
Political climate	-.07	-.03	+ 4
Primary zone partisanship	-.16	-.16	0
Political milieu	.24	.31	- 7
Cognitive capability	.18	.05	+13
<hr/>			
Sex (male vs. female)	-.28	-.60	-32
Region (South vs. rest)	.29	.13	+16
Status (married vs. unmarried)	-.16	-.07	+ 9
Education (high to low)	-.28	-.43	-15
Income (high to low)	-.22	-.36	-14
Age (young to old)	-.23	-.33	-10

* Cramer's V.

siderably more for the relationships between the variable "Working" and the demographic characteristics of the two samples, ranging from +16 to -32 (the latter a function, of course, of the operational definition of housewife as one who "works" in the neighborhood). The average point difference in this connection is 16. But these not unexpected differences--one should expect the "housewives omitted" sample to be "biased" toward males working elsewhere just as toward the unmarried, better educated, more well-to-do and younger persons--make the on the average lower coefficients for the neighborhood and primary zone variables all the more trustworthy.

Appendix C. Choice of Cutting Points in Constructing the Measures of Intimacy and Consociation: The Consequence of Contextual Composition for Measurement

In the course of using the Intimacy and Consociation measures in the analysis, we developed a sense of discomfort to the effect that these group-level measures might be unduly distorting the "true" relationships between the original two variables at the individual level. This discomfort heightened when, for the purposes of analysis, we collapsed the initially trichotomized grouped measures into dichotomies. For instance, while our grouped measure of Intimacy placed only 15% of the respondents into a primary zone called "close" (all nominees considered "close" friends by R), the marginal percentage at the individual level for the 460 persons whose names had been given and who had been designated as "close friends" was 32% (see Part 2: 2.33). Similarly, the group-level measure of Consociation located 19% of the respondents in a primary zone in which the respondent was getting together with all his social contacts more than once a week; yet, at the individual level, of the 437 names given 39% had been described as being in frequent contact with the respondent (see Part 2: 3.34).

Our original cutting points had been based on the marginal totals and seemed to make sense, though we also noted that, in terms of salience, respondents seemed to evaluate their first-named social contacts as being "closer" or more frequently in contact with them than the second-named neighbor, and the latter more than the third-named. In order to appraise the distributions obtained for the group-level measurements, we are presenting, in Table C1, the original cross-

tabulations for the individual persons named, with a focus only on the "high" categories of the two variables (VAR 65, 69, 73 for Intimacy and VAR 66, 70 and 74 for Consociation).

Table C1. Cross-tabulations of Individual-Level Data for Variables Out of Which the Measures of Intimacy and Consociation were Constructed

	Person Named Considered		
	<u>Close</u>	<u>Not Close</u>	
<u>Consociation with Name #1</u>			
Frequent	27%	20%	
Not frequent	13%	40%	N = 159
<u>Consociation with Name #2</u>			
Frequent	22%	18%	
Not frequent	10%	50%	N = 151
<u>Consociation with Name #3</u>			
Frequent	15%	13%	
Not frequent	7%	65%	N = 124

We observe, first, that as we move from Name #1 to Name #3, the percentage of persons named as close and frequent contacts systematically decreases (from 27% to 22% to 15%), as the original marginals for each separate variable had already suggested; and we note that the percentage of those with neighbors who are considered not close and infrequent social contacts correspondingly increases (from 40% to 50% to 65%). But, more important, we can now compare these individual-level

cross-tabulated as well as the aggregated distributions with the distributions for the group-level relationship between the two variables. Table C2 presents the data.

Table C2. Comparison of the Relationship between Intimacy and Consociation (Frequency of Contact) at Individual Level, Aggregate Level and Grouped Level

<u>Contact is</u>	<u>Name #1</u> N=159	<u>Name #2</u> N=151	<u>Name #3</u> N=124	<u>All Names</u> N=434	<u>Grouped</u> N=161
Close & frequent	27%	22%	15%	22%	11%
Close & infrequent/ Not close & frequent	33	28	20	28	50
Not close & infrequent	<u>40</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>39</u>
-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table C2 suggests that at the grouped level the relationship between Intimacy and Consociation is deflated in the two "extreme" categories and inflated in the middle category. This is evident when we compare the group-level result with the individual distributions for each person named as well as for the individual-level aggregate distribution. What we are observing here is, of course, the familiar phenomenon sometimes called the "contextual fallacy:" it means that even at the same level of analysis (as represented here by the grouped Intimacy and Consociation measures) the contextual quality of the variables may considerably alter the strength of statistical, not to say causal, relationships. There is really nothing we can do about

this other than to be aware of what is going on in the data when we construct group-level measures of a compositional kind—measures descriptive of, say, what we call the "primary zone" as against individual-level measures that are handled either distributively or aggregatively.

Appendix D. The Day Dwellers and the Night Dwellers: A Comparison

On several occasions throughout the text, we referred to what we called the "day dwellers" and the "night-dwellers," those whose "life space" seems to be defined by the neighborhood in that they do all three of their "life space activities"--shopping, working and church-going--in the neighborhood, and those whose life space is defined by their doing all three outside the neighborhood (see, especially, Part 2:2.21). We are particularly interested in these persons because contextual analysis making use of aggregate demographic characteristics of areas of residence, usually census tracts, assume that the area of residence is a meaningful context for understanding or explaining a person's political attitudes, perceptions and behavior. But if it should be that the area of residence is not where a person spends most of his waking hours--that he/she is at best a night-dweller--the use of such aggregate statistics in defining the person's "social environment" may at least be partly misplaced. It may of course be the case that the "night-time environment" is relevant in such contextual analysis for the simple reason that areas of residence are often highly segregated--ranging from the "restricted" neighborhoods of the rich to the slum neighborhoods of the poor (but also granting the existence of many "mixed" residential areas), so that aggregate areal data may yet be appropriate for the description of contexts. But unless there is a very high correlation between the aggregate characteristics of an area and the demographic characteristics of the individuals who live in it, there is always the possibility of one's committing the

"ecological fallacy"--generalizing from areal characteristics to the characteristics of individual persons.

Sorting out the day dwellers and the night-dwellers may therefore be useful in shedding light on this issue. Needless to say, the Pilot Study data are limited in this respect and can be used for the purpose only in a most tentative fashion, not only because of the "small-n problem" but also because the three life-space activities chosen for data collection in the interview instrument may not be the most salient ones for discriminating between day-dwellers and night dwellers. As we mentioned in the text on several occasions, we should have asked where the respondent spends most or all of his time in the pursuit of leisure, and there may be other indicators of a person's life space. We must do with the data at hand.

The small-n problem is a severe handicap. Of the 236 Wave II respondents, only 151 cases could be used for the life space analysis, even though we included housewives as "working in the neighborhood." The loss of usable cases is due to the following code categories:

Respondent does not work	22
Respondent DK/NA re work	6
Respondent in some other "non-work" category (re- tired, disabled, student)	19
Respondent does not go to church	37
Respondent DK re church	<u>1</u>
Total missing cases	85

Of the 151 remaining cases, the distribution on the life space index is as follows:

	N=	
No activity in neighborhood (the night-dwellers)	30	20%
One activity in neighborhood	43	28
Two activities in neighborhood	51	34
Three activities in neighborhood (the day-dwellers)	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>
Total	151	100%

The following inspection of how the day dwellers and night dwellers are distributed on the analytic variables is, therefore, numerically highly impoverished. Nevertheless, as we shall see, many of the observed relationships, even though they are statistically weak, make sense. This is particularly the case in connection with the "social contact" measures. Table D1 gives the data.

Table D1. Social Contacts of Day-Dwellers and Night-Dwellers

<u>Variable</u>	<u>D-D</u>	<u>N-D</u>	<u>% Dif.</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Table N</u>
Social contact in neighborhood, yes	78%	73%	+ 5	.12	57
Number of contacts, three	80%	77%	+ 3	.08	42
Contact length, above median	58%	45%	+13	.24	41
Intimacy, close and partly close	84%	46%	+38	.69	41
Consociation, contact with all/some frequent	68%	62%	+ 6	.14	40

Given the paucity of the data, it behooves us not to overinterpret them. On three of the variables the difference is minimal, but in the "right" direction. Day-dwellers' social contacts are of somewhat longer duration than those of night-dwellers. Intimacy is the variable that most discriminates between the two groups, and it is of political interest perhaps more than the other variables. As we know that intimacy is not conducive to political discussion (because of its potential for conflict), the relatively large difference in the distribution between day-dwellers and night-dwellers is suggestive for the argument presented earlier: involvement in the neighborhood where one resides is not necessarily conducive to contextually-defined political behavior. We can examine this hypothesis by looking at the distribution of day-dwellers and night-dwellers on the several "political primary zone" variables. Table D2 presents the data.

Table D2. Political Primary Zone of Day-Dwellers and Night-Dwellers

<u>Variable</u>	<u>D-D</u>	<u>N-D</u>	<u>% Dif.</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Table N</u>
Political conversation with all	70%	64%	+ 6	.14	42
Political climate is consensual (conversationalists only)	54%	71%	-17	-.31	27
Cognitive capability, identify party of all	58%	62%	- 4	-.03	40
Political milieu is homogeneous	53%	44%	+ 9	.21	33
Composition of PZ is partisan	59%	50%	+ 9	.18	33
Composition of PZ is hybrid	23%	37%	-14	-.32	33

Limited as the data are, the outcomes of the comparisons in Table D2 are enormously interesting from the perspective of the hypothesis. For the day-dwellers, there is more political conversation, and their political environment is more likely to be partisan and homogeneous, as aggregate-contextual analysts would be inclined to assume. But, and this is the significance of this analysis, this is not so for the night-dwellers. Most significant is that the night-dwellers' primary zone is more likely to be consensual than the day-dwellers', and this in spite the fact that the former's primary zone is more likely to be hybrid, that is, peopled by partisans of different party persuasions. And given this more politically "mixed" personal environment, the night-dwellers are more capable (however small the difference in this limited data set) of specifying the party identification of the neighbors with whom they are in social contact. One can only assume that the night-dwellers, being absent from their homes a good deal of time, are exposed to political influences unrelated to the neighborhood's communal context. They are evidently more tolerant of having persons in their primary zone (which, of course, is in the neighborhood by virtue of the question that was asked) who are of a different party identification than themselves; yet, this very tolerance makes it possible for them to reach more consensus when engaged in political conversation than do the day-dwellers. The day-dwellers, we noted, are more likely to be in intimate contact with each other, but when they do converse they are more likely to generate a dissensual political climate. Although we cannot do an adequate analysis here, which would require us to examine the relationships between the three

relevant variables--political climate, political conversation and intimacy--for both day-dwellers and night-dwellers, we would expect that intimacy would make for the suppression of political conversation and, as a result, for possibly covert dissensual environment. In the original two-variable relationship, 56% (of 25 respondents), all of whose social contacts were "close", reported that they had no political conversation in their primary zone. But we cannot pursue the relationship between political conversation and political climate because non-conversationalists were not asked the question which yielded the measure of political climate. Future research ought to obtain such a measure.

We suggested that the night-dwellers would be less exposed to their neighborhood's communal context than the day-dwellers, an almost tautological expression, were it not for the fact that we do have some independent, if indirect, measures of exposure in the form of the communal context variables. Table D3 presents the data.

Table D3. Communal Context of Day-Dwellers and Night-Dwellers

<u>Variable</u>	<u>D-D</u>	<u>N-D</u>	<u>% Dif.</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Table N</u>
Years in neighborhood above median (long)	52%	47%	+ 5	.10	57
Neighborhood quality is good	88%	87%	+ 1	.08	56
Population stability is high	76%	87%	-11	-.34	55
Personal mobility is low	74%	61%	+13	.30	55
Party knowledge, yes	70%	73%	- 3	-.07	57
Party organization is present	68%	59%	+ 9	.20	41

Both day-dwellers and night-dwellers are agreed on the high quality of their neighborhood (but this variable, we noted repeatedly, allows for little variance because of skewness); and a few more night-dwellers claim to know something about party organization in their neighborhood (a claim of dubious merit). But day-dwellers have lived somewhat longer than night-dwellers in the neighborhood. Being so exposed for a longer period of time, they perceive more population movement into and from their neighborhood (having more opportunity for such observation) but are themselves less likely to move out of the neighborhood. Moreover, day-dwellers claiming knowledge are more likely to report the existence of party organization than do the night-dwellers. Over-all, it is clear that day-dwellers are more likely to be exposed to communal and, therefore, communal-context determined political effects than are the night-dwellers.

We complete this analysis by a quick glance at the demographic characteristics of the two groups. Table D4 gives the data. The

Table D4. Demographic Characteristics of Day-Dwellers and Night-Dwellers

<u>Variable</u>	<u>D-D</u>	<u>N-D</u>	<u>% Dif.</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Table N</u>
Sex (male)	37%	60%	-23	-.44	57
Age (19-35)	30%	53%	-23	-.41	57
Status (married)	67%	70%	- 3	-.08	57
Education (some college)	33%	60%	-27	-.37	57
Income (high)	41%	28%	+13	.21	50
Region (South)	48%	43%	+ 5	.10	57

night-dwellers--those presumably less exposed to communal-context influences--are men, the young and the best-educated, and to a much smaller extent the married. On the other hand, there is a tendency for night-dwellers also to include less well-to-do persons (which is a function, probably, of these people being the young and, as a result, better educated, though it may also include some lower-class persons of low income). The data on demographics eminently make sense.

We shall leave it at that. We are persuaded to believe that the distinction between day-dwellers and night-dwellers is an important one for contextual analysis, and we suggest that it warrants the collection of better data in the form of new and more relevant questions and the creation of more sophisticated measures.