Living in a New Community: A Summary of Results of a Social Survey

By CONOR K. WARD

(Read before the Society on 15 November 1968)

This paper presents a summary of the results of a social survey. The survey was one of a series of studies of social aspects of urban redevelopment and housing provision which the Department of Social Science, University College Dublin, began in 1966 with the encouragement and financial assistance of the Human Sciences Committee. It was primarily an attempt to ascertain the effects of the move to a new housing estate on the lives of the people concerned. Patterns of mobility and resettlement and difficulties encountered in living in a new area were examined in some detail and the aim was to obtain an empirically-based profile of one of the new communities which are a feature of contemporary Dublin. The survey was concerned with preferences about where to live, the implications of the move to a new area for employment, family problems in a new area, patterns of recreation, the housewives' ideas and suggestions about housing design and estate layout, aspirations regarding children's education and married women's interest and involvement in employment. The approach of the research team, the questionnaire used and details of the response obtained are given in Appendix I. Samples of the Tables prepared for the full Report are given in Appendix II.

THE SURVEY AND THE UNIVERSE OF STUDY

The survey was undertaken in a Dublin Corporation housing estate on the north side of the city. The estate was in an area developed as a major housing undertaking in recent years, but with an old village and a limited amount of pre-war and immediately post-war privately-owned dwellings nearby. It adjoined a large privately-developed estate of owner-occupied semi-detached houses built more or less simultaneously with the local authority houses. The area was from four to five miles from the city centre.

A statistically random sample of 257 housewives was selected from a sampling frame of all the addresses in the estate. Interviews were obtained with 97% of those in the sample. Three housewives refused to be interviewed, one had died and four could not be contacted throughout the period of the interviewing. A sample of this kind can be regarded, at a level of confidence of 95%, as providing results with an accuracy of within 3% to 5% of those which would have been obtained by interviewing all the housewives of the area.

All those interviewed had been living in the survey area for less than four years. Moving to a new area was therefore a recent experience for all.

1 The Report has been published by the Human Sciences Committee, 14 St. Stephen's Green, Dublin 2
of them, yet the majority were sufficiently long in the area to have settled in – 52.6% had come there between 25 months and 3 years previously, 29.3% between 13 months and 2 years previously, 7.2% between 7 and 12 months and just less than one per cent had come to the area in the six months prior to interview.

Almost half of the respondents had lived in only one other place prior to moving to the new area. More than half of the households in which interviews took place had lived in the centre city area (defined as postal districts 1 and 2 and Liffeyside as far west as Blackhall Place on the north side and Cork Street on the south side) and this was the only previous place of residence of a third of the families. One-fifth of the respondents had only lived in a flat or flats since their marriage and a further one-fifth approximately had lived only in rooms or tenements. For as many as 42.8% their present house was their first house since their marriage. Reasons for leaving their last accommodation were mainly related to the lack of or wish for more space or the fact that their last place of residence was condemned.

Forty per cent of the respondents were between six and twelve years married and the remainder were spread almost equally over the three-year groups, Over 3–6 years, Over 12–15 years, Over 15–18 years, and Over 18–21 years, with slightly smaller numbers in higher categories. Less than 3% had been married for three years or less and 6% were over 25 years married. Two-thirds of the husbands of respondents were manual workers, 25.7% being skilled, 15.2% semi-skilled, and 21.6% unskilled. Six percent of the husbands held occupations in the Census Category “Intermediate non-manual workers” and 14% were in the Census Category “Other non-manual workers.”

MOVING TO A NEW AREA

Respondents gave an overall impression of being content in their new area, both when commenting on how they felt about coming to live in the new area and when listing the main differences between the new area and that in which they had previously lived. In each case 60% of the respondents were enthusiastic about the new area and approximately a quarter were discontented.

When asked about difficulties which they had encountered on coming to live in their present area almost a third of the respondents (32.9%) said that they had had no difficulties. A little over one-third (36.9%) complained of the lack of shops and the only other large group were the 9.8% who had been lonely.

Almost two-thirds of the respondents said that the lack of or distance from shops was the main thing new residents to the area might find difficult to get used to. When asked specifically about shopping facilities in the area, 19.6% of the respondents said that they found them convenient, 13.6% described them as not too bad and 65.2% said that they found them inconvenient, one-third of these latter saying that they had to go into the city to shop. When respondents came to making suggestions...
for the planning of new estates the need for the provision of facilities at the same time as the houses was highlighted once again with over a third mentioning that shopping facilities should be provided simultaneously with and near the houses.

One-fifth of the respondents were very content with the bus service to the area and 35% were fairly content, answering in such terms as “not bad”, “alright”, “could be more frequent” One-third of the respondents complained about deficiencies in the service, almost all in extreme terms such as “hopeless”, “very bad”, “very infrequent” There was a perceptible tendency for those living near the terminus to be more content with the service than those farther from the terminus, though not far from the route General unhappiness and discontent with the area appeared, perhaps, to underlie complaints about the buses to some extent, that is to say, more of those who were unhappy than of those who were content said that the bus service was unsatisfactory, regardless of where they lived Thus, however, accounted for less than one-fifth of all the complaints about the service The fact that 55% of the complaints came from respondents who earlier in the interview had said that they “loved” living in the survey area suggested that the service itself was the grounds for complaint in these cases.

Information on respondents’ attitudes to living in Centre City Flats was elicited indirectly by asking them to indicate their preference among five areas listed on a card Two of the areas listed were from among early post-war Corporation estates, one on either side of the city The other two areas had been developed recently, one containing only Corporation housing and one containing privately-owned housing in addition to Corporation housing Among these areas was listed “Centre City Flats” Only 4% said that “Centre City Flats” would be their choice could they live in whichever of the five areas they wished.

The conclusion which appeared to emerge from the discussion about the houses in which the respondents were living was that while they appreciated their houses very much and were, in general, content with them, yet a high proportion would have liked adjustments and alterations, very many of which would be relatively easy for the designers to consider making without changing the existing house plans to any significant extent.

**RESETTLEMENT AND MEN’S EMPLOYMENT**

The impact of the move to a new area on employment was considerable Fifty-four per cent of the husbands of the respondents were said to have a longer distance to travel to work or a more awkward journey to make (It was also ascertained that the move had affected travelling time to school or work of persons other than the husbands in 22% of the households) More than half of the respondents whose husbands had a longer or more awkward journey to work said that their husbands would have

---

2 This is the subject of a separate Report which has been published by An Foras Forbartha, 4 Kildare St, Dublin 2
difficulty changing their jobs. An analysis was carried out relating whether respondents' husband had a longer or more awkward journey to work to the husband's occupation and no consistent pattern was found.

An hypothesis which was tested and confirmed in the survey was that a considerable number of men living in a new area would stay out of work to mind their wives and children when their wives were ill. When asked who would look after them and the children when they themselves were ill at home, 42.2% of the 220 respondents with children of school-going age or younger said that their husbands would do it, and 13.7% said that a working daughter would stay at home. Twenty-three per cent said that a neighbour would mind the children, 7.8% said that they would get their mother and 6.8% their sister, and 2.3% said that their mother-in-law would take care of them. Three per cent said that they would keep a daughter at home from school.

One hundred and four of the respondents (47.3% of those with children of school-going age or younger) said they had been ill in the year prior to interview and the family had been cared for by husbands in 45 instances. When wives had been hospitalised for the birth of a child, 36.8% of the husbands minded the children and the families of wife or husband almost always took responsibility in the remaining instances.

There was apparently a clear pattern of care of the sick wife and family by a considerable proportion of the husbands which involved loss of work-days by the men. The proportion was, however, less than might have occurred were each of the families in the new area isolated or friendless. The help provided by neighbours in short-term illness and that of relatives in the event of hospitalisation was considerable, nevertheless there remained over one-third of the families in which care of the sick wife and/or of the children devolved on the husbands.

MARRIED WOMEN AND EMPLOYMENT

Ninety-five per cent of the respondents said that there were employment opportunities for married women in the area. Seventy per cent had the impression that many of the married women in the area were going out to work. Forty-three per cent of the married women had worked since marriage, approximately a quarter for at least two years. Fourteen per cent were at work at the time of interview. The principal reason given by those who worked after marriage for leaving the last job held was family responsibilities (52.1%), mainly expecting a baby (35.2%).

Three-quarters of the respondents were in favour of married women working, 21.2% without qualification and 55.2% when family responsibilities permitted.

Just over half of the respondents said that their husbands did not approve of married women working, 51.6% without qualification and 64% with qualifications. Seventeen per cent said that their husbands approved without qualification and 12.4% said that they approved with qualifications. Husbands' and wives' attitudes to married women working, as reported by the wives, were similar in a little more than one-fifth of the
When husband's views on married women working and wife's employment record since marriage were compared it emerged that two-thirds of the wives whose husbands approved of married women working had worked since marriage compared with one-third of those whose husbands did not approve. The husbands of one-third of the women who were working at the time of the interview were said by their wives not to approve of married women working.

One hundred (46.9%) of the 213 women who were not working said that they would like to work, but one-third of these said that it was unrealistic to think of doing so in the near future due to family responsibilities, and all of the remainder except 5%, at the most, said that the kind of work that they would like was part-time. Participation in full-time employment seemed unlikely to increase more than a little above the 14.4% who were working and not more than 20% seemed likely to consider entering part-time employment in the near future.

EDUCATION OF CHILDREN AND ASPIRATIONS

Eighty-eight per cent of those interviewed had school-going children, all except 5% of them being under fourteen years of age. Nineteen per cent had one child at school, 22% had two children at school and there were 16% with three children, four children and five or more children at school. Sixteen per cent had sons but no daughters at school and 20.4% had daughters but not sons at school.

When the 218 respondents with children at primary school were asked whether they felt children need further education after the primary certificate almost all were in favour—only 5.9% said definitely that they did not need it, while 36% said that it depends on the child, and 27% replied that they did not know. Similarly, when respondents with school-going children were asked their opinion about raising the statutory minimum school-leaving age to fifteen only a small minority of one-tenth were opposed to it, with a further tenth uncertain.

Only 5.9% of the 219 respondents with school-going children said that they would like them all to leave school at fourteen years of age, with an additional 19% who distinguished girls, whom they would like to leave at fourteen, from boys, whom they would like to stay on after fourteen. Very many of the respondents said that they would like all their children to stay on at school two or more years beyond the statutory minimum—43.4% to sixteen years of age and 17.8% to seventeen or eighteen years of age.

When asked about the choice of school, if they were giving their children further education after the primary certificate, 55.5% of the respondents with children at primary school chose secondary education for all their children, with an additional 32% choosing it for their daughters only and 0.5% for their sons only. Twenty-eight per cent chose vocational education and 0.9% either vocational or secondary education for all their children, with a further 3.2% choosing vocational education for their
sons only and 0.5% for their daughters only. Six per cent said that their choice would depend on the child's ability.

Sixty-two per cent of the respondents said that new schools were needed in the area, half of them specifically mentioning post-primary schools. Three-quarters of the respondents thought that accommodation in the primary schools of the area would be adequate when a school then under construction was completed.

Recreation

It emerged from the interviews that few of the respondents (22.8%) were aware of the existence in the area of any facilities for recreation. Facilities were provided by the husband's place of employment in approximately one-fifth of the households in which interviews took place and they were availed of by some member of his family in approximately half of these cases.

Almost ninety per cent indicated various recreation facilities which they felt were needed in the survey area. Those mentioned most frequently were a community hall (39.6%), a playground (25.6%), a cinema (24.8%), a youth club (23.2%) and a club for married women (14.4%).

In 43.6% of the households, husband and wife had been out together for recreation on at least one occasion in the fortnight prior to interview and one-third of the husbands and wives had been out together more than once. Both had been out, but separately, in 12.8% of the households. Forty-three per cent of the respondents had not been out during the fortnight before the interview and in 31.6% of the households neither respondents nor their husbands had been out during that time. There were only 14 households (5.6%) in which the husband had been out where the wife had not.

Respondents who had been out of their home for recreation had almost always (80%) gone out of the area for their entertainment and less than one-tenth of all respondents availed of local facilities for recreation.

Support from Family and Neighbours

Although 53.7% of those interviewed had less contact with their parents and families since moving to the new area fewer of the housewives appeared to feel lonely - loneliness or distance from their family was mentioned by only 9.8% of the respondents at the stage of the interview when they were asked about what they had found most difficult to get used to when they moved to the new area. Loneliness and discontent with the area were not necessary concomitants of seeing less of the family of origin, as evidenced by the fact that 62.1% of those who had less contact were enthusiastic about living in the new area and 54.7% of those who were enthusiastic had less contact than formerly with their families of origin.

The help of neighbours in short-term illness and that of relatives in the event of hospitalisation was impressive. Twenty-three per cent of the women with children of school-going age or younger said that a neighbour
would look after them and the children if they were ill and a neighbour had done so for 18.6% of the 104 who had been ill in bed at home in the year prior to interview. Members of the families of husband or wife had taken responsibility in half of the cases where the mother of children of school-going age or younger had been hospitalised. Nevertheless, there remained 36.8% of the families in which care of the sick wife and/or children devolved on husbands when the wife was hospitalised and in the year prior to interview husbands had taken care of the wife and children in almost half of the 104 instances of illness in bed at home of the housewives interviewed.

When those with children of school-going age or younger were asked how they would manage should they or their children have to go to the doctor, the major categories of replies were 33.8% who said that they would take all their young children with them, 15.0% who would leave their children with one of the neighbours, 13.2% who would get the doctor to come to them and 9.1% who said that their eldest child would stay at home from school to look after the others.

CONCLUSION

The picture which emerged from the survey was of families happily settled into their new homes, appreciative of advantages which had resulted from their move, with high aspirations for their children's future, surmounting difficulties and obstacles through family solidarity and community co-operation. The homes, however, while overwhelmingly better than previous accommodation, could, in the opinion of the occupants, be improved through small adjustments and alterations and a redesigning of the ground floor to provide more kitchen space. The absence of shops and the distance from church and schools emerged as a major irritant in the early days of a new area.

More than half of the housewives interviewed had less contact with their families of origin since they moved to the new area, though only about one-tenth of those interviewed complained of loneliness. Comparative isolation produced its problems, however, notably the fact that about one-third of the housewives were dependent on their husband's staying away from work when the wife was ill in bed and at childbirth and one-third of the husbands and wives had not been out for entertainment, together or separately in the fortnight prior to the interviews.

Nine per cent of the housewives interviewed appeared constantly in categories constituting a syndrome of unhappiness, difficulties and problems. Other housewives also had problems and complaints, as was clear from the tables of replies received throughout the interviews, but the picture which appeared to emerge from the overall pattern of replies of 75% was one of general contentment and happiness. These housewives, too, had difficulties and crises to face, but they appeared to be meeting them through personal sacrifice and family solidarity, with help from neighbours in approximately one-third of the families. Organised community co-operation was referred to in five per cent of the interviews and four per cent referred to voluntary social service provision.
The picture of the housewives just given might be said to be typical of that which could be seen repeatedly in the data. Generally a satisfactory situation with, at the same time, proportionately small, but real and serious, flaws in the fabric of life in a new area, which, once adverted to, could, to a considerable extent, be avoided. The deficiencies and difficulties identified were such as could at least be reduced through planning and community organisation. The housewives with the syndrome of serious problems were a small enough proportion to make a remedial programme possible, even allowing for a margin of error, the actual number involved was, however, indicative of a human problem of very considerable magnitude. The housewives who were content could have had their difficulties alleviated through community service and co-operation and some, at least, of their problems, having been identified, may now be avoided.

APPENDIX I

A NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

The conviction which lay behind this survey was that experience, attitudes, patterns of behaviour and values can be ascertained satisfactorily and described objectively through the use of the methods of sociological research and analysis. This is to assume the thoughtful and articulate participation of those interviewed. No one person has all the facts required to describe a social situation, but many aspects can be clarified and understood when the knowledge, experience and attitudes of those involved are brought together. This is what a sociologist tries to do, using established research procedures to minimise bias, carefully-planned, professionally conducted interviews to elicit relevant data and systematic analysis to present a report which is empirical and objective.

The sample

Very many surveys use statistical methods to select a sample which will represent those to be surveyed. Where one is dealing with a large population such a method is necessary and by following established sampling procedures it is possible to ensure that those selected are representative of the total population with a known degree of reliability and accuracy.

The sampling frame used in the survey was a complete list of addresses of houses in a selected Dublin Corporation housing estate.

The unit for information was the housewife, defined as the female over sixteen years of age responsible for the provision of the common table of a household.

A statistically random sample of 257 was chosen using a table of random sampling numbers. The number 257 was decided on because on the basis of previous research, it was expected that if 257 interviews were attempted, 250 would be completed. The number which was completed was 249.

The sampling error of a percentage (p) of a sample (n) may be estimated.

\[ \text{Sampling error} = \frac{1.96 \times \sqrt{p \times (1-p)}}{\sqrt{n}} \]

Taken from M.G. Kendall and B.B. Smith, *Tables of random sampling numbers*, Cambridge 1951.
with sufficient accuracy at 95% confidence level by solving the following expression, in which is included a correction for a finite population (N)

\[ \text{Sampling error} = \pm 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{(p(100-p)}{n}} \times \left( \frac{1}{N} \right) \]

The margin of error for which allowance must be made when reading the results of a sample survey is, therefore, largest on percentages of fifty and smallest when there is more or less complete unanimity among respondents. In the present survey it was calculated that with the sample of 249 the maximum error would be just less than 5% and that the margin of error to be allowed for data obtained from 90% or 10% of respondents would be a little over 2.5%. This margin of error relates to estimates for the population of the survey area based on the results of the sample survey.

The response

As has been said, the sample of housewives sought for interview numbered 257. Four housewives could not be contacted—two were ill throughout the interviewing period and two were unobtainable for other reasons. One respondent was deceased and three refused to be interviewed. The total number of completed interviews was, therefore, 249, which was 96.9% of the number attempted.

Almost two-thirds of the interviews were completed on the first call and only 8% required four or more calls. The number of calls undertaken to complete interviews is shown in Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calls</th>
<th>Percentage of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n=249**

A senior research worker and a team of four interviewers were engaged on the interviewing, all of which took place in autumn 1966. The total time taken was 68 interviewer days.

The interviewers recorded the reception which they received and it is shown in the following table.

4 The lack of complete precision here is intended to prevent positive identification of the estate in which the survey was carried out. For the same reason the exact number in the sampling frame has not been given.
Table 12

RECEPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reception</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobtainable</td>
<td>1 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unco-operative/suspicious</td>
<td>3 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview difficult to get</td>
<td>6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview difficult to get, but respondent en-</td>
<td>7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thusiastic later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good reception</td>
<td>36 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good reception</td>
<td>43 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=257

The interview questionnaire

The interview questionnaire is designed to ensure consistency in eliciting information. In order to ensure comparability of data collected the stimuli which are used to elicit information must be standardised. Questions must also be worded in a way which makes their meaning clear and unambiguous and they must not suggest that any answer is the “right” answer. Yet they must not be abrupt or suggest a cross-examination. An interview, in fact, should not be thought of as asking a number of questions, but rather as learning about experiences, behaviour, attitudes and opinion through a conversation which is guided along pre-determined lines by an interviewer using a carefully-designed questionnaire. In an interview no question stands on its own, it is part of a whole which involves a professional relationship of interest and understanding between the interviewer and the respondent. The interviews in the present survey were semi-structured, that is to say an order of topics laid down had to be followed by the interviewers, some questions had to be phrased in the words given in the questionnaire and in some matters the interviewers were more free to use their own words. The Questionnaire and Notes to Interviewers follow

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE,
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN

Interviewers should emphasise that those who are interviewed remain absolutely anonymous — even the areas in which the interviews take place will be anonymous. Interviewers should also explain that the focus of the survey is on general patterns among the 300 interviewed not on the replies of particular individuals.

CAPITALS INDICATE INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS

SCHEDULE NO

INTERVIEWER DATE TIME, FROM TO
SECTION I INTRODUCTION
1 How does your present house compare with the other houses that you have lived in since you were married?

2 Are there any structural changes that you would like to see made in this house?
3a Have you had any alterations made to this house? DETAILS
3b Do you intend making any alterations in it?

4 Do you feel that there are advantages attached to having a garden? DETAILS

SECTION II INTRODUCTION
5 About how long have you been living here? (IN MONTHS)
6 Would you tell me about the other places you have lived in since you were married, please?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a PLACE</th>
<th>b LENGTH</th>
<th>c NO OF ROOMS</th>
<th>d REASONS FOR LEAVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 How do you feel about coming here to live?

8 What would you say are the main differences between here and the last place you lived in?

9 If you had a choice, in which of these areas would you prefer to live?
SHOW CARD

Centre City flats

10a Did moving out here mean that your husband would have to spend more time travelling to and from work than when you lived in?

IF YES TO 10a→10b, 10c, IF NO TO 10a→11
10b Have you any comments to make about this?
10c Would your husband have difficulty in changing his job?

11 Were any other members of the family affected by the change? (DETAILS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>PLACE OF WORK</td>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>TIME TAKEN</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Did moving out here mean that you see more or less of your own family?

13 What do you think of the bus services in this area?

SECTION III INTRODUCTION

14 We are interested to know if there are any opportunities for married women to get work in this area? (DETAILS)

15 Do many married women around here go out to work?

16 Have you yourself worked since you were married?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>LENGTH OF TIME</td>
<td>REASON FOR LEAVING</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17a IF NOT NOW WORKING

Would you like to go out to work now? REASONS

IF YES TO 17a→17b, IF NO TO 17a→18a

17b What kind of a job would you look for?

DETAILS HOURS ETC

18a How do you feel about married women going out to work?

18b What does your husband think about it?
SECTION IV ONLY THOSE WITH SCHOOL-GOING CHILDREN

INTRODUCTION

19 Could we talk a little now about the children who are not yet left school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a CHILDREN</th>
<th>b AGES</th>
<th>c SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20a Is there room for all the children in the school here? DETAILS

20b Do you think any other schools are needed in the area? REASONS DETAILS KINDS OF SCHOOL ETC

21 There is a lot of talk now about raising the school-leaving age to fifteen. What do you think about this?

22 At what age would you like your children to leave school?

23 Have you ever thought about what you would like the younger children to do when they leave school DETAILS

THOSE WITH CHILDREN AT PRIMARY SCHOOL

24a Do you feel children need further education after primary certificate?

24b If you wanted to give your child further education after primary certificate, what sort of education would you choose? VOCATIONAL/SECONDARY REASONS

SECTION V ALL RESPONDENTS

INTRODUCTION

25 What would you say are the main things new residents to the area may find difficult to get used to?

26 Was there anything which you yourself found particularly difficult to get used to? DETAILS

27 Is this area convenient for your shopping?

SCHOOLCHILDREN IN FAMILY OTHERS SECTION VI (NEXT PAGE)

28a If you were sick in bed who would look after you and the children?
28b Have you been sick in the past year?
   IF YES TO 28b -> 28c, IF NO -> 29

29 If you had to go to hospital, who would look after the family?

THOSE WITH CHILDREN UNDER FIVE ↓ OTHERS -> 31

30a Did you go into hospital when the children were born?
   IF YES TO 30a -> 30b, IF NO -> 30c

30b How did the family manage?

   IF NO TO 30a

30c Did anyone help with the housekeeping during or just after the birth of your last baby?

ALL WITH CHILDREN

31 If you or your children had to go to the doctor, how would you manage?

SECTION VI INTRODUCTION

32a What are the recreational facilities for the residents of this area?

32b Are there any facilities which you think are needed in this area?

33 Do you often go into the city for your amusement?

34 INTRODUCTION AND THEN ASK WHAT RESPONDENT AND HUSBAND HAVE DONE EVERY NIGHT THE PAST FORTNIGHT, STARTING WITH THE PREVIOUS EVENING, AND WORKING BACKWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NIGHT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35a Does your husband's place of employment provide any recreational facilities?
   IF YES TO 35a→35b, IF NO→36

35b Do any of the family avail of them? (DETAILS)

36 One of the purposes of the survey is to get some ideas for the planning of new housing estates. Have you any suggestions to make?

37 Regarding this particular estate, is there anything which you think might be done in it?

CONCLUDING EXPLANATION

NOTES

Tick where appropriate

A WHERE INTERVIEW TOOK PLACE
   Living-room ( ) Kitchen ( ) Hallway ( ) Doorstep ( )
   Street/Avenue ( ) Friend's house ( ) Other place outdoor ( )
   Other place indoor ( )

B TYPE OF HOUSE
   (a) Local Authority ( ) (b) Terrace house ( )
      Privately built ( ) Semi-detached ( )
      Detached ( )

C MAINTENANCE CONDITION OF HOUSE
   (a) House-front
      Paintwork faded ( ) Some cultivation ( )
      Paintwork fresh ( ) Carefully cultivated ( )
   (b) Front Garden
   D RECEPTION
      Very good ( ) Good ( ) Fair, improving later ( )
      Cool ( ) Hostile ( ) Fair, disimproving later ( )

E AMOUNT OF EXPLANATION NEEDED
   General Introduction only ( )
   General Introduction and further explanation at beginning ( )
   General Introduction and further explanation at end ( )

F ACQUAINTANCE WITH SURVEY
   Had heard of survey from person previously interviewed ( )
   Had heard of survey from friends/workmates ( )
   Had heard of survey through other source (specify) ( )

G CALL ON WHICH INTERVIEW WAS OBTAINED (CIRCLE NUMBER)
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 over 10

ADDITIONAL NOTES

NOTES TO INTERVIEWERS

I General Notes

Care should be taken to satisfy respondents with regard to the purpose of the survey as a whole, and the reasons for the inclusion of particular questions. Interviewers must, therefore, have the necessary explanations...
ready, and should, in particular, have off by heart the questionnaire and the introductions to the various sections of the interview.

Introduce Schedule in terms of remembering the things people say, and emphasise here anonymity — “Of course we don’t put any name on the sheet, and it is the way all the ideas add up that matters”, and so go on to explain why you ask questions — to get people’s opinions in some order “so that we will be able to add them all up at the end and see how many say a particular thing”.

“Why me?” We can’t ask everyone so (explain about sample and unit of information) State that the sample was drawn from addresses not names.

Unit of Information Interviewers should be completely familiar with the schedule before the first interview is undertaken.

Interviewers should fill in date of interview and time taken in the space provided at the top of the schedule.

Words in capitals are for the guidance of interviewers rather than for use.

Responses should be recorded fully and verbatim — the aim is to get the respondent to talk, not merely complete the schedule.

In all questions, if sufficient writing space is not available on the schedule, turn up the page, note number of question, and continue writing.

The interview number should be inserted on each page of the schedule in the top right-hand corner.

Questions in which the number or letters are bracketed, e.g. (1) must be asked in the exact words given on the schedule. Should the respondent fail to understand the question, interviewers may only repeat the question again in the exact words given.

At the end of the interview, check your schedule and make sure there is some answer to each question.

II Notes to Questions

Q 2 Get information about size of rooms.
Q 6 A careful introduction is necessary before this question. Explain the relevance of experience of other parts of the city and other houses and flats.
Number of rooms — excluding hall, bathroom and toilet.
Q 11 Get husband’s occupation here if the information has not already emerged from Q 10.
Q 12 “Family” here means respondent’s family of origin.
Q 24b VOC = Vocational School.
SEC = Secondary School.
Q 27 Probe here for information concerning
(1) “Travelling shops”
(2) Hire purchase goods.
(3) The purchasing of heavy goods.
Q 34 Again explain here that you are not interested in the answers given by any particular individual but that you are going to add them up in order to get a general pattern.
BEFORE YOU LEAVE MAKE SURE THAT YOUR RESPONDENT IS HAPPY ABOUT WHAT YOU ARE DOING, AND AS CLEAR AS POSSIBLE ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE SURVEY

III Procedure

Control Card All details of calls, contacts, difficulties in arranging interviews, etc should be entered on the control card and on the duplicate card, immediately on return to the office

Appointments If an appointment has to be made, get one within the week, if possible ALL APPOINTMENTS TO BE WRITTEN INTO THE APPOINTMENTS BOOK

Recalls After four calls without success leave an interval of about a week (using appointments book), then call again four times If no contract has then been made transfer to Duplicate Card as uncontacted

APPENDIX II

SOME SAMPLE TABLES

These are samples of the Tables which were prepared for the Report and do not have particular significance or relevance to the content of the paper

TABLE II

DIFFICULTIES NEW RESIDENTS TO THE AREA MIGHT ENCOUNTER (Q 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>1st answer</th>
<th>2nd answer</th>
<th>3rd answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of/distance from shops</td>
<td>60 6</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New neighbours</td>
<td>11 6</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness, lack of company</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from the city</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>0 8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know a strange area</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting accustomed to living outside the city centre</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having to go into town to shop</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of schooling facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of dispensary, hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't think there is anything they would find difficult to get used to</td>
<td>6 4 6 4 6 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answer</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>10 0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer, no second or third answer given</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>69 1</td>
<td>90 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=249
Table 12

DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED ON COMING TO PRESENT AREA
(Q 26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of shops</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New neighbours</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from the city</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from family</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No chapel in the vicinity</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of privacy</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awkward school hours</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent did not find anything particularly difficult to get used to</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answer</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No second answer given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=249

Table 45

PATTERN OF RESPONDENT’S AND HUSBAND’S ENTERTAINMENT DURING FORTNIGHT PRIOR TO INTERVIEW
(Q 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both had gone out together once</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both had gone out together twice</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both had gone out together three times</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both had gone out together four times</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both had gone out together five times</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both had gone out together six times or more</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent and husband went out separately</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband alone went out</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither respondent nor husband went out during the fortnight prior to interview</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable - husband works late at night/works night shift/deceased</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answer</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s and husband’s entertainment not recorded</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=249
## Table 5.6

RELATION OF HUSBAND'S AND WIFE'S ATTITUDES TO MARRIED WOMEN WORKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husband's Attitudes</th>
<th>Unqualified disapproval</th>
<th>Qualified disapproval</th>
<th>Qualified approval</th>
<th>Unqualified approval</th>
<th>Approval of part-time only</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unqualified disapproval</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified disapproval</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified approval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unqualified approval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's Attitude</td>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>Employed when interviewed</td>
<td>Employed since marriage but not when interviewed</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unqualified disapproval</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified disapproval</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified approval</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unqualified approval</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Mr J Raven Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure you will all wish to join me in thanking Fr Ward for carrying out such a worthwhile and potentially useful study I say potentially useful study because what is to me so staggering is that so many of Fr Ward's results have been obtained in a whole series of studies carried out over the last 30 years or so without any notice being taken by those in a position to implement them

Some of the complaints - such as the shortage of space in kitchens and the unpopularity of flats come up time and again and one cannot see why action has not been taken (In the case of flats I had better mention that it is, in fact, cheaper to build houses than it is to build flats and that, in Great Britain at least (owing to the daylighting regulations), just as high densities can be achieved by building houses with gardens as can be achieved by building blocks of flats)

In view of the general failure to implement the policies which suggest themselves as a result of surveys of this sort it seems to me that the best thing I can do is to stress the support that some of Fr Ward's findings obtain from studies in the literature Having done that I would like to emphasise one or two areas in which further research is needed

Firstly Fr Ward remarks that most people had moved from their previous accommodation due to lack of space

Additional pressure on space is, in fact, by far the most important factor causing people to move house People differ very much in the amount of space they think they need, and there is in fact no correlation between number of persons per room and desire to move But felt shortage of space is closely associated with desire to move

Furthermore a very high proportion of people who move into new houses in fact set about adding more space to their houses as soon as they can afford it

(In passing one may note that this is one of the things you can't do with a flat - and very serious problems it causes too)

The fact that the dominant demand in housing is for more space doesn't in fact mean that we should build bigger houses This is because an almost equally large section of the population has too much space This section of the population is, of course, made up largely of older people whose families have left home

Furthermore, not only do they have too much space and not only do they live in houses with gardens (which people with young families want) they themselves want to live in the city centres - where the young people who want more space are at present living because they can't afford to move to a house in the suburbs

So the problem is not so much one of physical planning but of social planning We need to build a social institution to facilitate housing exchange and flexibility in the housing market

The next point is also economic and social Fr Ward must be at least the 20th researcher to have found that people complain about the lack of shops and amenities during the first few years of the existence of new
estates At least his informants were apparently spared the indignity and inconvenience of having to move in amid a sea of mud.

There are two reasons for the characteristic failure to co-ordinate the provision of amenities and houses.

One is that if the amenities were provided to begin with the proprietors would complain that they had no trade.

The other reason is one I have never quite understood. It is argued that the provision of amenities would slow down the drive to provide the more essential housing. That could well be true in the short run but since the shops and amenities seem to turn up after about three or four years they must then be slowing down some other housing drive.

If shops were to be provided at the same time as the houses were built some form of subsidy would be required and this again would require social rather than planning reform.

Moving on now to Fr Ward's findings about social activities on the estates—the fact that 10 per cent of his informants were unhappy, dissatisfied, and miserable—it should first be pointed out that this will be an underestimate because no specific questions were asked about loneliness and isolation. In fact general population surveys in Great Britain show that about 20 per cent of the population complain of being lonely.

Although 10-20 per cent is low as a percentage, it does, as Fr Ward says, amount to a substantial number of people: it would amount to several hundred people even on a relatively small estate.

This situation is by no means confined to new housing estates (as the idea of "New Town Blues" would have us believe) but is widespread in well established towns.

So far as I am aware the only large scale social experiment that has attempted to deal with this problem is the Peckham experiment which was carried out before the war.

Although I think the Peckham experiment should be repeated I also think that this problem of loneliness and dissatisfaction requires much more investigation.

In one study I carried out myself we found only one difference between the way lonely and non-lonely people spent their time—and no difference between the way bored and not bored people spent their time. The only characteristic which correlated with non-loneliness was that the non-lonely people had more relatives to see them in their own home. There was no relationship with contact with friends and no relationship with going out to visit relatives.

These results suggest that loneliness (or at least desolation, in contrast to isolation) and boredom may be states of mind that are unlikely to be easily influenced by engagement in social activities.

Before leaving these social problems of housing estates there is one further point I would like to make and that is this. We city dwellers have in our midst important social problems such as those we have been discussing with others live vandalism, violence, and the dreariness of much of our town planning. We don't seem to be very good at dealing with them although many of them could, as Fr Ward has said, be reduced by plann-
ing and co-operation Yet this does not happen We are just like the rural population who tend not to co-operate to solve their problems (when we can see that they should)

Since this is such a widespread problem I think it is worth asking why it is that we tend not to do more about such problems

One reason is that there is a situation of pluralistic ignorance in which we are unaware of others in the same plight as ourselves or thinking the same way as ourselves Studies such as Fr Ward’s can go a long way to remedy this situation

Another reason is that we have a low opinion of our neighbours – they wouldn’t be interested, wouldn’t play their part, and couldn’t be trusted to pay their share

Another is that we lack sensitivity to such problems: we simply do not recognise them as problems to which a solution can be found

A fourth reason is that we lack willingness to take the responsibility for organising the changes we know are needed in our society upon ourselves

And fifthly we lack the self-confidence required to set about tackling them

Now these things – trust for others, sensitivity to social problems, willingness to initiate action, and self-confidence – are all qualities of character which education could do a great deal to develop

And this brings me to the last of Fr Ward’s findings that I will have time to comment upon – namely the rising educational aspirations parents have for their children

These aspirations are still a long way behind British aspirations. In 1964, at the time of a survey carried out for the Plowden committee, 50 per cent of mothers whose husbands were non-manual workers wanted their children to stay on beyond age 18, and 35 per cent of mothers whose husbands were manual workers wanted their children to stay on till aged 17 Only about 5 per cent of mothers of primary school children wanted their children to leave at the minimum school leaving age which would be 15 for the older children and was expected to be 16 for the younger children

In spite of this universal tide I would like at this point to question whether extension of the duration of education is really the top priority in the educational world

I cannot help feeling that much more effort should go into improving the quality of education – into increasing the teacher-pupil ratio, into modernising the teaching methods of older teachers, into making a more explicit attempt to develop qualities of character like those I mentioned a few minutes ago and into a complete overhaul of the examination system so that attempts are made to develop and assess real human resources rather than knowledge of trivia like Boyle’s law, quotations from literature, and the dates of various battles

This discussion may seem to have wandered a long way off Fr Ward’s paper but I don’t think it has As far as I am concerned one of the functions of studies like his is to bring important matters up for discussion It is important to know of a trend before it hits the system, but what should be
done about it is quite a different matter — about which the present survey says nothing.

Before sitting down I would now just like to indicate one or two areas in which further research is needed in the housing and town planning field just in case there is anyone here who can be enticed into them.

Fr. Ward said in his introduction that the study was primarily an attempt to study the effects of the move to a new housing estate on the lives of the individuals concerned. He must be as aware as anyone else of how far short of that objective he has come.

In point of fact we would like to know a great deal more than we do about the effects that housing and town planning have, directly or indirectly, on patterns of visiting, patterns of friendship and mutual aid, patterns of juvenile delinquency, patterns of life-satisfaction, patterns of intra-family life, (when I say patterns of intra-family life I mean such things as patterns of conflict [do small or open plan houses lead to conflict between family members, to psychological strains and tensions etc.], patterns of division of labour, [Do housing layouts which facilitate isolation lead to greater independence of family members, etc.] and patterns of family activity.)

We need to know whether there are different groups of families in the population that require quite different forms of housing: are there families who have a strong urge to be together all the time and are frustrated through absence of a large enough room, while are there other families which value more the individual development of the family members and are frustrated because they cannot have a room each in which to go their own ways. We need to know what special provisions are required by old people — for example small flats in city centres and perhaps with special community facilities, we need to know whether young people living away from home require special types of accommodation and, if so, of what type. We need to know the proportion of people to whom the suburban way of life is the ideal and the proportion who hate it but are forced into it by economic factors or the absence of special facilities for child-care in other urban areas.

And so on. The field is vast. I think I have said enough. It remains to thank Fr. Ward once again very much indeed for having opened up this area for research and discussion in Ireland.

Dr. M.E.J. O'Kelly If the findings of social research projects such as those pioneered in Ireland by Fr. Ward and his group take shape in the planners' blueprint, we are going to see a welcome and hopefully a permanent departure from a system which uprooted people and transplanted them elsewhere without taking into consideration the social problems involved. In these days of rapid social and technological change there is increased concurrence in the view that social progress need not be divorced from economic advancement, the traditional gap between material prosperity and social welfare shows evidence of narrowing, although there is still some leeway to be made up.

There are signs already of a growing awareness of the need to meet the social requirements of people who are obliged to change from one environ-
ment to another. It is being accepted that the rehousing of people is not of itself sufficient to initiate and promote a flourishing community spirit. There is a need for schools, shops, buses etc; the lack of which often bedevils the situation in which many new households find themselves. Why should new communities have to endure hardship over a period of years before these essential amenities come to exist?

Surveys, such as we have been discussing this evening, are useful not only in evidencing the difficulties faced by people being rehoused and in helping to suggest remedial measures but also in indicating certain priorities which planners of future housing estates would do well to consider. Research and analysis is a prerequisite of sound planning in any sphere. The planning and structuring of communities is no exception. Clearly there is need for a dialogue between the planners and the sociologists. This type of dialogue already exists in the more advanced industrial organisations, in which sociologists, psychologists, economists, engineers and operational research analysts pool their talents in an effort to optimise the design of the workplace. Human engineering, as this interdisciplinary area is sometimes called, is considerably more than the sum of its constituent parts would suggest.

I trust that this is only the beginning of a programme of surveys which would embrace every sort of problem which social change brings. For example, every year people leave the land to work in our cities and towns and increasingly in the growth centres around industrial estates. This gives rise to two issues—first, the identification of the social needs of people from the rural areas who have to adapt themselves to life in a new urban/industrial environment—what are the problems they are likely to encounter? The second issue is one in which I am especially interested. How do rural workers fit into their new industrial work situation? What sort of difficulties arise? What correlation is there between a worker's output and the time it takes him to adapt to his new industrial environment? There is something more than a traditional learning curve involved here. The answers to these questions could have far-reaching social and economic consequences. After all the two major factors which tend to influence the functions of industry are (1) changing social needs and (2) the more efficient operation of the productive unit. The focus of efficient operation has tended to be on those factors which affect production and sales, which in turn can affect or can be affected by the creation of employment and the stemming of emigration. Social change and industrial efficiency have, it would appear, a functional relationship. An investigation of this would give plenty of food for thought to industrialists, educationalists and those responsible for industrial training alike.

We are at a new and highly interesting stage in the development of our society. But we need to know where we are going and what our objectives and priorities are. Research into and analysis of existing needs can help us plan to meet future requirements. Fr. Ward's study is a step in that direction. I have pleasure in seconding the vote of thanks to Fr. Ward.

Mr. R. O. Brolcháin, in congratulating Doctor Ward on his excellent
paper, said that he happened to know, from other sources, the area covered in the survey and he considered the general picture to be very accurate. The area consisted of decent people settling into new houses with none of the sensational features that some wished to attribute to such areas. He said that he was unable to understand Mr. Raven's approach to the figures for those suffering from loneliness. It was rather unscientific to take the survey figures and double them, as Mr. Raven suggested, and to accept the doubled figures as correct because it then agreed with British figures.

While there was general agreement on the preference for houses as against flats for family tenancy, the choice was not so simple. Flats were used for central city sites to achieve the density of 100 rooms to the acre which was the standard in Dublin. Until quite recently housing layouts were not designed either here or elsewhere, to achieve this standard without a reversion to the 19th century back to backs. New designs were, however, now being created which gave greater promise of the economy of land combined with the much greater convenience of houses. Until these new designs were developed the choice the housing applicants had was between the central city flat as against perimeter houses. The difficulties in providing shopping and other amenities contemporaneously with houses arose from a type of chicken and egg situation. Shops depended on customers and they normally followed the growth of customers. There was a need for further research on the growth and nourishing of a community spirit. Was this something that could be created from the outside by trained personnel, or did it need to grow from the inside? Though there had been sporadic inquiry into this a lot more required to be done. In this, as in many other of the facets of new communities it was not sufficient to take foreign experience and apply it to Irish conditions. It was essential to carry out Irish surveys to validate solutions for Irish conditions. Doctor Ward was again to be congratulated for undertaking this type of investigation.