Crime, the Housing Market and Reputation

A Study of some Local Authority Estates in Sheffield

Submitted

by

Polii Demeter Xanthos

VOL II

For the Degree of Ph.D.

University of Sheffield

March 1981

CHAPTER FIVE

CHH, CHL and CHM - field research on the three estates

1. The socio-geographic setting

In Chapter One of this thesis I discussed briefly the ideas emerging from urban sociology, on socio-spatial segregation within urban areas. Pahl's (1970) concept of a socio-ecological system was mentioned and the similarity between this and Harvey's (1973) analysis of the relation between social and spatial structure was noted. The three estates, CHH, CHL and CHM constitute an outstanding example of this characteristic of urban socio-spatial structure, being situated geographically adjacent to each other in an area of the city which could almost be described as an 'island' of working class housing. To the south of this area is the city centre, to east and west, belts of heavy industry and to the north council housing stretches to the city limits and beyond.[1] For the middle class inhabitants of the city this is certainly 'the other Sheffield' of which few have even scanty knowledge.[2] Social segregation expressed in spatial structure is, then, a common feature of British cities. In Sheffield the particular spatial pattern of social class residence is explicable in historical terms[3] having to do with the siting of heavy industry and prevailing winds.

The housing stock in north Sheffield is predominantly council owned, comprising mainly of pre-war estates - among which are some of the city's largest estates - but there has also been some council building in post-war years. There are some areas of terraced housing which are of a mixed tenure type of privately rented and owner-occupied,[4] but these constitute only small parts of the total area since the

corporation has cleared so much of this type of housing. Additionally, there are 'pockets' of semi-detached suburban housing in this sector which are predominantly middle class, but these are numerically small and are generally lower priced than comparable housing in west and south-west Sheffield. The overall picture in the north-east of the city remains of a predominantly working class area where the vast majority of the housing stock is council built and owned.[5]

CHH, CHM and CHL are situated adjacent to each other some three or four miles from the city centre. CHM and CHL are separated only by a small road - the houses on one side belonging to CHL and on the other to CHM, and in fact are often known under the same name, although local people are beginning to distinguish the two as CHM as an area falling into disrepute. CHH is separated from these two estates by a busy main-road shopping centre which serves all the estates. On the south-west of CHH a few roads of the cheaper type semi-detached private housing further separates it from the other two estates. CHH is in fact in geographical terms somewhat isolated from the main body of estates in this area, as it is situated on top of a hill east of the shopping centre and its other boundaries are, to the south a large expanse of waste ground, to the north a cemetary, and more recently, a sports complex, and to the east a steep hill - on which in recent years some private semi-detached dwellings have been built - separating it from the area of heavy industry and 'slum' housing in the valley below. In comparison, the shopping centre forms the eastern boundary for CHL - the estate beginning immediately behind the road of shops - to the south is CHM, to the west some private semi and detached housing and a large park, and to the north a popular pre-war council estate. CHM has CHL on its northern boundary and parks, hospital grounds and a little private housing to its other boundaries. Environmentally this

means that not only is CHH more geographically isolated from other areas of housing than CHL and CHM, it is also the case that its immediate surrounds are less pleasant. CHM and CHL have a more residential appearance which is further enhanced by a lot of greenery in the form of verges and trees and the proximity of the parks. I shall discuss the contrast in physical environment, appearance and upkeep between CHH and CHL and CHM more fully in a later section.

2. The historical origins of the three estates

Building started on CHH under the 1890 Housing Act. In 1900 the Sheffield Corporation advertised for suitable land for building 'working class' houses; as a result of this they were able to purchase a sixty acre site where CHH now stands. Two other pieces of land in west Sheffield were being considered for the housing scheme around this time, but they were abandoned in the face of opposition from local residents. In 1904 the first forty-one dwellings were started and by 1916 six hundred and seventeen houses had been built. More houses were added following the 1919 Housing Act. Under this Act CHL and CHM were built during the period 1920 to 1923. All three estates were built, then, in an era associated with high standard council housing for 'general needs' applicants when subsidies were more generous than they were for the later 1930's slum clearance estates. Housing built for slum clearance purposes was generally of a lower standard of construction and basic provisions in the dwellings were not so good as in these earlier houses. The slum clearance origins of the problem estate, so frequently alluded to in the literature, is not, therefore, applicable in the case of CHH.

CHH in particular has an interesting and unexpected history given its present day reputation and offender rate figures. As Hughes

(1959) points out "The aim throughout in this scheme was to produce an estate on garden city lines."
The actual layout and design were submitted to a national competition and the successful competitor eventually prepared house-type designs in connection with Letchworth Garden City and a number of other similar housing projects. The origins of CHH make it an exception amongst the 'problem' estates which have been focussed on in the literature. Some of the longest length residents of CHH can remember its early years. They confirm that the estate was 'really select' at this time, constituting a pioneering attempt at providing high standard housing for the skilled artisan. Rents were in fact so high in relation to other working class housing in the city that many of the houses were vacant for long periods. One criticism of the high rents of these houses was that they offered no solution to the problem of slums since slum dwellers could not afford such rents. Gaskell in Pollard and Holmes (1976) documents the history of this estate. Drastic economy measures were taken in the building of later phases of the estate in 1914. These included the reduction of plot sizes, unflagged footpaths, baths without water supply taps and waste pipes and the finishing of interiors with poorer quality materials. Despite these measures the rents precluded the ordinary working man. Gaskell quotes from the Sheffield Telegraph of April 1914:

> "The present policy was no solution for the housing problems if by that was meant the clearing of the slums and the improving of the conditions of those living in them."
> (1976 : 195).

CHH, then, was an elite working class estate.

All three estates, CHH, CHM and CHL are of the kind that the authors of the CDP Publication Whatever Happened to Council Housing argue compare still so favourably not only with the pre-war slum clearance estates but also with many of the post-war estates which were

built in the fifties and sixties.

Residents' perceptions of the early years of these three estates were verified by staff within the Sheffield Housing Department, who told me that not only were the pre-war estates built to differing standards according to their purposes under the various Housing Acts, but that the Department itself operated a selective allocation policy whereby dwellings on the best estates were let to the elite of the working class applicants of that time.[6]

3. The 'Matched Pair' : points of comparison

The original research problem was formulated in terms of a comparison between CHH and CHL which, although matching on many variables, had widely differing official offender rates. CHM has been included in this research by reason of its proximity to the two estates - in particular its proximity to CHL and its common identification with this estate - and because my field work revealed that it was a good example of an estate experiencing a transition from 'select' to 'disreputable' status. In this section, however, I am concerned with points of comparison between the original matched pair.

It has already been said that CHH and CHL are in close geographical proximity and were built in the same era of council house history. The estates are also comparable in the number and size of dwellings, the house type, estate design and rent levels.[7] Data from a survey of residents revealed that these two estates also had comparable population characteristics, such as a similar social class composition and age structure of residents.

> "The two pre-war estates had very similar composition on most population variables, e.g. sex, age, social class, size of household, age of completion of full-time education, marital status and child density. On some

> of these variables there were slight differences (in the expected direction as regards correlation with the official offender rate) but none of these separately or together could explain the huge difference in official offender rates."
> Report to the S.S.R.C. (p.21).

Two further points of comparison between CHH and CHL may be mentioned, both of which render inapplicable two further hypothesis from the literature on problem estates. Firstly, both CHH and CHL are characterised by typically long length tenancies and low residential mobility rates. Support for this comes not only from my own observations in the field, and from data collected from the Housing Department, but also from the residents' survey referred to above.[8] CHH, then, is not a 'problem' estate that is characterised by high rates of residential mobility or the 'social disorganisation' so often associated with such residence patterns. Secondly, the geographical proximity of the two estates means that the residents share a common shopping centre and entertainment facilities, and although the estates have their own youth clubs these meet regularly for inter-club competitions and sports. Any explanation for a 'problem' estate in terms of lack of facilities or lack of provision of entertainment for the young is not relevant in the case of CHH, given that these amenities, apart from the different youth clubs, are shared with the low official offender rate estate, CHL.

Mawby (1979) found no evidence of differential policing on these estates and although he undertook his police interviews in 1975, after the police division re-organisation, he maintains that the patterns of policing before 1974 remained much the same after re-organisation.

> "Nevertheless it seems that (according to the police) the overall pattern of policing remained constant over the period 1971-75, and the number of policemen involved in each area over this length of time was broadly similar."
> (p.71).

Mawby also found from his police interviews that individual policemen did not themselves see much difference in the level of criminal activity on the pre-war estates CHH, CHL and CHM.

> "The contrast between these estates is not only not recognised, but even denied."
> (p.79).

The official rates of offenders living on the three estates are given on page 14 of this thesis. It may be seen that the 1971 figures show CHH to have an offender residence rate some four times that of CHL. Mawby was also able to examine the offender rate for each estate to look for intra-estate variation. He found no such variation in offender residence on CHL. On CHM he found one road had an offender rate three times that of the rest of the area. On CHH the south-east corner of that estate had an offender rate one and a half times greater than that of the north-west section. Additionally, Mawby looked for intra-estate variations in offences. He found a concentration of offences in the south-east area of CHH, which had the high offender residence rate. The highest offence levels on CHM only partially coincided with the high offender residence road. On CHL there was a slight concentration of offences to the south of the estate, but as already stated there was no comparable concentration of offender residence.

Mawby's data also shows that TV licence evasion and phone kiosk vandalism reveal similar differences between the estates, although phone kiosk vandalism was found to be higher for all council areas. A more recent check (1975) on figures for convictions for non-indictable crime revealed no significant changes in this pattern of offender residence on the estates.

Research within the Housing Department, which is discussed fully later in this thesis, showed in non-quantifiable terms that indices of

social problems such as social care cases and deviancy such as rent arrears also followed the same pattern for these estates, that is CHH and in particular S.E CHH appears to have much higher rates of both than CHL.

4. <u>The physical appearance of the estates</u>

Although CHL and CHM have not quite the appearance which Kirkby (1971) attributes to the best of Britain's pre-war council estates,

> "as pleasant a residential environment as can be found in the private sector."
> (p.117)

they are certainly amongst the best and most residential in appearance of council estates in the city. Both are well-designed, built around a network of quiet tree-lined roads in an area well endowed with parks and green areas, and CHL has a very attractive circular road at the heart of the estate with a grassed central area encircled by houses. The houses are built in red-brick in a 'cottage' style, some in terraces of four or six, others semi-detached and all have gardens back and front.

CHH has a similar type of red-brick 'cottage' housing, although these are a little more varied than those on CHL, ranging from the very small early houses to the larger family houses. The streets, like those of CHL, are arranged in varying patterns, some straight and bordering main roads, others forming inner crescents and cul-de-sacs. CHH was, as has already been said, designed as a 'garden estate'; it also had tree-lined roads with grass verges, although today these 'garden' features have been somewhat spoilt by vandalism, rubbish and general litter, as have many of the gardens on the estate. CHH has certainly a more battered appearance than CHL or CHM, the signs of neglect are not only in litter and broken glass on the roads, verges and pavements, nor in the unkept and rubbish strewn appearance of some of the gardens,

many of the houses appear externally to have suffered neglect and a certain amount of 'unfair' wear and tear. Cardboard stuffed in broken windows is, for example, a fairly common sight - particularly in the south-east of the estate. But despite the dilapidation of some of the houses and gardens, the litter and broken glass, the vandalised phone kiosks and the occasional scrawls of graffiti and the rubbish strewn wasteground to the south of the estate, CHH still does not approach Kirkby's (1971) description of the pre-war estate which has taken on the appearance of a 'twilight zone', nor does it deserve the label of 'council slum' that is given to a number of 'problem' estates described in the literature.[9]

5. <u>The physical design and neighbour interactions</u>

It is perhaps interesting to note that the highest offender rate area of CHH is that part of the estate which consists of a small collection of inter-connecting roads which, while not all cul-de-sacs, form a more isolated section of the estate, being neither main roads nor thoroughfares. It will be remembered that a number of the sociologists of the earlier period studying council estates, for example, Kuper (1953), Morris and Mogey (1965) and Jennings (1962) found that it was the inner estate roads and cul-de-sacs where neighbour interaction and mutual influence was greatest, which had a tendency to become dominated by families of the same social type. My research supports this finding in that I did notice that those inter-estate roads of CHH, on those who did not participate in the common life style and day to day interaction of the area found living on this estate more intolerable than those who also felt 'misplaced' on such an estate but who lived in the 'better' part or on one of the main roads. Furthermore, this south-east corner of the estate was undoubtedly predominantly 'rough'. I should add here that although these findings support the idea of the influence of physical design on social relationships they do not

support the idea of a natural cultural process of selection among council house tenants that is often linked with this physical/social space relationship. In the case of south-east CHH, although I found the desire to move away most strong amongst the 'respectables' I found no evidence of obviously 'rough' families telling me they chose their tenancy because they knew that others like themselves lived there.

On both estates I received remarks from a number of informants living in cul-de-sacs and inner estate roads which suggested that there was a greater neighbour interaction on such roads, and differences in neighbours' life styles were more visible and keenly felt. If the informant lived a similar life style to the majority of the residents on his or her road the cul-de-sac design could increase satisfaction with the neighbourhood. One informant on CHL, for example, told me :

> "In this cul-de-sac you get to know everybody - it was easy to make friends".

This particular woman was pleased with her neighbours and liked the friendly atmosphere of the road. On CHH a 'respectable' family living in the S.E. area were not so happy their road was a cul-de-sac :

> "The kids they just hang around at the bottom of the road causing trouble and if you complain, well, you just get abuse."

In contrast, an informant living on the north-west of CHH on a main thoroughfare told me :

> "There is a problem family four doors down from us but we don't have anything to do with them."

Residence on a cul-de-sac is not only difficult for a 'respectable' minority on south-east CHH, it was also presenting problems for a large, rather boisterous family housed on a quiet cul-de-sac on CHL :

> "Its complaints all the time - if anything happens, if anything's wrong its always my kiddies to blame."

This informant was not suffering from an unjustified paranoia: her family were in fact the main topic of conversation and focus of discontent among the neighbours. Another similar, large rather rough and ready family I knew, who lived on a main road on CHL did not seem to incite the same interest or discontent among their neighbours, with the possible exception of the tenants immediately next door.

6. The condition of the housing

In Chapter Three I discussed some of the recent sociological work on council estates which is severely critical of much pre-war housing in terms of its lack of repair and maintenance and the failure of local authorities to bring basic amenities up to modern standards. In this respect a similar situation exists on the three estates of this study to that which is described on other pre-war estates in the literature. Complaints about the condition of the housing, its age, design and state of repair were common to tenants of all three estates. In fact, CHH, having been the subject of a modernisation programme some eight years earlier brought less complaints about the condition of the houses, except on the issue of damp, than either CHL or CHM, although in all other respects the latter two estates generated more satisfaction than CHH.

Before modernisation most of the houses on CHH had baths in the kitchen and outside toilets. Modernisation plans varied according to house type, but now all have indoor bathrooms and a toilet separate from the other rooms in the house. The houses on CHM and CHL have bathrooms off the kitchen and a number still have outside toilets. Modernisation as yet on these two estates has been piecemeal - when tenants have relinquished their tenancy either through movement away or

death certain improvements have been made on an individual house basis before re-letting. This has led to some bitterness on the part of elderly tenants, who believe that the council will not modernise for them, the existing tenant, but when they die or move away their house will be improved for the succeeding tenant. Recent lettings to new tenants on CHM and CHL have been of houses of an improved standard than those of the longest length residents of the same estate.[10] This lack of standardisation of houses and the apparent arbitrariness of decisions to carry out repair work when reported leads to some resentment between neighbours. The houses on CHL and CHM have other curious features which are a source of dissatisfaction, for example, some of those built in terraces still have communal backyards and gardens. All unimproved houses on these estates have exposed gas and water pipes running through the houses, which are extremely unsightly and impossible to disguise by decoration. Residents of all three estates - including the modernised houses of CHH - also have complaints which relate more to repairs than to design: things such as damp, rotten window frames and doors. These complaints are exacerbated by the apparent length of time it takes to get repairs done by the local Public Works Department.

Damp, often giving rise to fungi, is a problem common to many of the houses on all estates. If anything, damp was even more apparent in the houses on CHH than on the other two estates. A tenant on CHH describes this problem in the following way:

> "The whole business is getting me down and making me feel quite ill. The growth is like something from a science fiction novel and appears to be indestructible." [11]

Another tenant, also from CHH, wrote to the Housing Department:

> "You could never compensate me with money for the human misery and physical illness that living here has done to all of us."

This tenant complains of damp, dry rot and fungi - he ends his letter:

> "I wish I were dead - thats how I feel about this house - is there no way we can move from here?"

Two sisters living on CHH constantly complained to the Department of damp and were told it was condensation. Eventually the floorboards rotted and the floor gave way inside the front door - which was also rotten. This prompted one of them to write the following:

> "I think there must be something terribly wrong when decent people are forced to live in this squalor ... The house was a real hovel when we took it and I've tried hard to make it liveable in spite of this awful damp."

Such letters - of which those quoted above are only representative examples - might be dismissed as the work of neurotics but my field research suggests that such complaints, although not always expressed in such emotional terms, are fairly widespread. On CHH these complaints are more serious in that the tone of these complaints are often stronger because it is often not only the house which is a source of dissatisfaction, many tenants are in other ways dissatisfied with their estate. Thus, for example, the writer of the second letter quoted above also complained at various times about his house being broken into, his neighbours' behaviour and the state of his neighbours' house which he suspects of being infested with vermin, and the delinquency of local children. On CHL, satisfaction with the estate still does appear to compensate for the deficiencies in housing conditions. Thus, for example, one tenant on CHL listed her complaints to me. These included rotten doors and window frames, broken steps, pipes coming away from the walls, an outmoded and stained kitchen sink and a faulty water heater. Despite these she stressed :

"I don't want an exchange - we like it here."

Another from CHL said to me:

> "The houses are rubbish and you can't get the Corporation to do anything but I like the estate. I wouldn't want to leave."

Complaints about the condition of the houses were, then, most bitterly expressed by tenants who were in other ways dissatisfied about their housing: more specifically they were dissatisfied with the estate outside the dwelling. Such residents I met far more frequently on CHH, despite its modernisation than on CHL.[12] Housing Department data also showed that written complaints from tenants of CHH were more voluminous than from tenants of CHL. It is unfortunately not possible to quantify this for purposes of comparison, as not all complaints reach the Housing Department, many are dealt with at the local public works depots. Also one suspects that not all complaints received are systematically filed by the Department, and that many must get lost or misplaced over time.

Until the modernisation of CHH some eight years ago the houses on this estate were of a lower standard than those built slightly later on CHM and CHL. I met a number of residents of CHL and CHM who had obtained their present tenancy by transferring from CHH. The most commonly given reason for such a move was that the houses on CHM and CHL were at that time in better condition and of a more modern standard. It seems likely that this movement away from CHH to more modern housing estates in immediate post-war years took place to other estates besides CHM and CHL. I did in fact meet a number of ex CHH residents who had moved in the 'fifties to other local estates for similar reasons. At the time of my research many tenants still wanted to leave CHH to obtain more modern housing, but this was also true of CHL and CHM. Thus a number of informants from the latter two estates told me they had applied for a transfer to a newly-built estate within the area.

7. Satisfaction and discontent with the neighbourhood

Few, therefore, on any of these estates would voice a satisfaction with the actual houses. I heard few voices of satisfaction on CHH, anyway, and those I did are well illustrated by Mrs. W's statement to me.

> "It's rough but then a lot of estates are. I was born and bred here - it's all I know. My mum lives down the road my brother on B - Road and all Terry's family is from round here abouts."

Again and again, those who were satisfied with the estate admitted its bad name and bitterly criticised the corporation for their neglect, but said despite this they liked it, 'it was home', 'it was all they knew', 'it was where their family was'. Such responses well represented the south-east corner. Dissatisfaction typically was expressed by those who had no ties with CHH, but who had accepted a tenancy there as their first chance of housing. Mrs. J. told me :

> "I didn't want to come, we none of us wanted it but what could we do. My husband didn't get on with me mum and was threatening to walk out and I was pregnant again. I'm on the transfer list. I want one at G. - that's where I'm from I can't wait to get back."

Similarly, Mrs. H. said :

> "Its a slum and nothing but a slum we had no choice but to come here. I had to leave my husband I couldn't take any more, and I had the kiddies to think of."

And Mr. W. who said:

> "We could have had the choice of two: one was on B. - the windows were broken and it was filthy, or this one. We didn't want it but it was the better of the two and the wife had her two eldest kids in a home and wanted them out."

Housing need, therefore, usually related to personal and domestic pressures was the motivation for accepting a tenancy on CHH for such people. They didn't choose the house, it was accepted as a way out of current difficulties. Such people tended to react on rehousing by

SHEFFIELD UNIVERSITY

withdrawal from their neighbours. The 'problems' of the estate were often seen exclusively in terms of the type of people living there :

> "They're so rough down this end, we've had bricks through our window after John complained about their noise and I just don't like Kevin to mix with their kids, he'll get into their ways. Their language, you've never heard anything like it .... "

and

> "They're slum dwellers they have no idea of bettering themselves. The men don't work and they spend all day in the pubs and betting shops. The women are as bad sitting in that pub hour after hour leaving a pram with a kiddie in outside until its time for the others to come out of school."

Such residents of CHH I have called 'misplaced'. I use the term to denote the process by which they came to be housed on the estate - they came through housing need not through choice.

There are, however, another group of dissatisfied residents, who typically are old, have lived on CHH a long time and who have been 'left behind', that is, they came to the estate when it was desirable and 'select' and have witnessed its deterioration. These people often feel too old to be able to make a move.

> "They've put in all types since the war - mostly slum clearance you know. They live more like animals than people .... Move? No we're too old for that, I couldn't face the upheaval."

Many, like Mrs. R., were brought up on the estate.

> "It used to be select did the - estate oh yes the rents were so high for the time in the 1930's there were houses vacant which no one could afford. It was a very select upper working class type of family who got a house up here. Now they're putting in slum clearance, problem families, they've turned the estate into a tip, the language, the state of their houses .... its everything. You couldn't leave your door open now when you go out, you could before you know, now there'd be nothing left. Move? I onlyknow this estate I've always lived here I couldn't settle anywhere else."

Others wait on the transfer list for old persons accommodation on better estates.

It will be noticed that dissatisfaction with the estate is expressed both in terms of the repair of the houses and the type of person living there. Those people who are said to have brought the estate into disrepute, ruined the environment and made it a rough and sometimes dangerous place to live are commonly characterised as 'problem families' or 'slum clearance people'. This ubiquitous contempt for slum clearance families has been noted by other researchers.[13] There is far less discontent on CHL, but what there is also is in terms of the type of people moving in - the new tenants, although these are seen as very recent arrivals:

> "It used to be select here - not any more they're putting all clearance families in here now".

This remark made to me by Mr. K. is typical of the reaction to slum clearance families expressed by other longer-length residents of this estate. On CHM discontent was more frequently expressed; Mrs. L. of CHM told me she had it on authority :

> "I'm telling you that the man from the department told me himself - he said, 'get out Mrs. L. get out - this area is for slum clearance now it won't be worth living in in five years time'. That's why we've put our name down for L. - ".

Residents of CHM seemed more unsettled about the new arrivals than those on CHL and one area of CHM was, in fact, beginning to rival CHH for notoriety and this was felt to reflect on the whole estate. Despite this anxiety over the new tenants and dissatisfaction with the houses themselves, the vast majority of residents on CHL and many on CHM had an overriding satisfaction with their estate, as Mrs. B. of CHL expressed it :

> "We're happy here, we've lived here a long time, its nice and quiet, the trees and verges and gardens make it look like the country. I couldn't live anywhere else."

and Mr. T. :

"It's always been select, its a nice environment you've always been something a little bit better in these parts if you came from CHL."

The slum clearance arrivals also appreciate the environment of the estate.

"We wanted this estate its near where we came from but its away from the works, the air's fresh and we've a garden and a bathroom."

Some have slight reservations:

"Its lovely and clean and we've a garden back and front but its not friendly like A. - . There everyone helped each other - not here they think they're a cut above."

Some slum clearance families move back to their area of origin because they can't settle in this new environment. On occasion this can be done by procuring an exchange back into the private sector, but these are a small minority. Most seem determined to stay in their new housing and the better environment is greatly appreciated :

"There's no comparison, down there it was all works, the air was filthy. The children always ill, up here there's fresh air and parks. We've got a bathroom and inside toilet now too."

I met a few long-length residents of CHL and particularly CHM who were trying to move because of their new neighbours. Mr. W. said to me:

"We've put in for L. - several people off here have got into it and it would be nice to live in a modern house on a select estate again."

All manner of misbehaviour was attributed to the slum clearance people; however it was their living standards which came under particular attack. They were accused of dumping rubbish, not cultivating gardens and being generally dirty and noisy. Children in particular were a focus of discontent, older residents complained about their language and behaviour. Conversely, families new to CHL and CHM complained there was little tolerance of their children. Mrs. W. said to me :

"The only bad thing about living here is the neighbours are always on at the children, its got so I feel I can't let them out to play."

Worries about slum clearance tenants then were expressed in terms of their day to day living standards, but another very real fear expressed by residents of CHL and CHM was that of the stigma attaching to such families would bring the whole estate into disrepute. Residents of CHH were not so worried about this - after all, the estate had no reputation to defend. Many said to me that they couldn't explain the origins of the reputation of CHH :

"Its always been rough up here - I don't know why but once a slum always a slum, that's what I say."

and Mr. K. of CHM said of CHH :

"We used to live there many years ago, mind its not so bad now, they've modernised the houses but mud sticks."

Mr. K. gave his reason for leaving CHH just after the war that he had the choice of a more modern house on CHL.

Baldwin (1974), it has already been noted, found a high rate of satisfaction with his estate Blackacre, 71.4% of his sample of residents liked living on the estate. It would seem that I found more discontent among the residents of CHH, an estate which started well and then experienced a decline, than Baldwin did on Blackacre, which started with the stigma of being a slum clearance estate. The differences may be methodological, in that Baldwin's responses were obtained by a 'one off' questionnaire interview, whereas mine were obtained over a period of time as a participant observer and so my respondents had a greater opportunity to consider the question and to reply to someone they knew at least moderately well. Nonetheless, the high rate of satisfaction on Blackacre may be related to the fact that on this estate there is much evidence of 'community'[14] stemming

from common origins, a sense of belonging, reinforced by long lengths of residence and familial links between tenants of different houses on the estate. I found on CHH, as I have already mentioned, that greatest satisfaction with the estate was expressed by those residents who had lived there a long time, and who did not want to move because of family and friendship ties within the estate, and because of general familiarity with the area.

In the interview survey, 77% of respondents on CHH answered 'yes' to the question : "Thinking about the area where you live do you feel you belong here?"
Again, this high rate of identification with CHH may be due to the methodology used. I did not meet such a high proportion of people feeling at home on CHH which is what is suggested by such a question. At the same time, I did find a substantial number of people who had links with the estate for years who would say they felt they belonged or felt at home there. Such people I describe as the "indigenous" population of CHH, compared with the 'newcomers' who had accepted tenancies out of great housing need. Even 'indigenous' people, however, expressed dissatisfaction about the actual housing conditions, which is somewhat different from a question about identification with the area itself.

Satisfaction, then, can be related to the individual characteristics of the residents as well as to the individual characteristics of the estate. The degree of satisfaction with a 'problem' estate is also related to whether the tenant chose the estate, or whether he was forced into acceptance of the tenancy by the urgency of his housing situation. In the comparison with Blackacre, CHH ~~housing~~ has undergone a transition from 'select' to 'problem' estate with corresponding fluctuations in demand, has a more mixed population than Blackacre

where residents originally all came from the same area and where the demand for the estate has remained fairly constant in terms of number and type of applicant, the estate having always held a 'problem' status.

8. Reputation

CHH has a 'dreadful' reputation in north Sheffield, but unlike Baldwin's Blackacre, it is not so widely known in other parts of the city. Nonetheless, the reputation of CHH is well-established and although residents were unable to tell me precisely when and why the reputation evolved they showed themselves acutely aware of its existence. Thus many times in the taxi I was told the 'pick up' or 'drop off' was on a neighbouring estate, only to find it was really CHH. Similarly, the confidence of one woman passenger well illustrated the attitude of many residents to their 'address'.

> "I'm ashamed to say I come from the estate, if anyone asks me I say - ".

Mrs. H. told me:

> "I always say I live on - (CHL + CHM), sounds better somehow."

But despite these evasions it was my experience that residents of 'problem' estates giving the name of a more prestigious area for their address do not deceive themselves. They seem to be well aware of the boundaries of their estate, its reputation and the status distinctions between estates. CHH, admittedly, is an estate easy to label. The names of the streets with their rural flavour became derisory when the standards of the estate fell, and the 'garden estate' character was somewhat lost. In fact the estate has its own local nick-name which nowadays, at least, is often used with a derogatory intent. Such names which are easily identified and remembered facilitate all stages in a labelling process - the acquisition, maintenance and transmission of a reputation.

Residents of a 'problem' estate do not only suffer from embarrassment as a result of their address, there can be other practical effects which may put residents at a disadvantage. Such effects have been well-documented by Shelter (1975).[15] In my experience most of the residents of CHH did not seek to deny the legitimacy of its reputation. They also showed a very accurate perception of the 'worst' part of the estate. Mrs. J. Said :

> "Its down there that's got us the name. D. - road, H, - road and C. - road. They're a rough lot down there."

At this point her husband added :

> "Its like another world down there, you just look - have you seen the state of the houses?"

Few who live on S.E. CHH would deny the label as applying if not to themselves, then to their immediate neighbours. Some, like Steve for example, actually accept the label as applicable to themselves. Steve lives on S.E. CHH. He said to me with some amusement :

> "I come from a problem family ... they're all problem familes down our way."

David, a married man with a young family, recently housed on one of the offending roads said to me :

> "The wife can't stick it much longer it's so rough - they're rubbish the people - we don't want our kids growing up round here."

It is interesting to note that although informants found it hard to date the decline of CHH, usually their responses were in vague terms of "after the war", or to say quite when and how the reputation evolved. They almost unanimously saw the reputation as 'earned' by the life styles of the residents themselves.

My findings, then, are slightly contrary to those of Baldwin (1974), Damer (1974) and Hole (1959), who found that on their negatively labelled estates there was an ecological equilibrium with regard to

where the 'riff-raff' lived. That is, everyone thought they lived elsewhere on the estate and not where they happened to live themselves. The residents of the estates in these studies resisted the negative label for themselves, but as an aggregate the populations of these estates were in collusion with the labels, believing that the label applied to others on the estates, and retreating from identifying themselves with other residents. Thus, residents accepted the negative reputation for the estate on which they lived, but at the same time managed to evade the label as applying to themselves. The residents of CHH on the whole did not seek to evade its reputation. Some even accepted it as applying to people like themselves, more often, in the words of the local vicar "they blame each other". Although residents from all over the estate say the south-east is the roughest part, most living away from this end will admit to also having 'rough' families in their road. A common response to questions about neighbours from the 'respectables' is well illustrated by the resident who said : "We keep ourselves to ourselves, they're too rough around here."

This may be contrasted with the small minority who accepted the label usually less with rancour than with pride, who are well represented by Eddy who said:

"Ours was the roughest family in the street."

A few people who lived in other parts of the area - notably some living on CHM sought to deny the legitimacy of the reputation of CHH. Mr. K. moved to CHH in the 1920's, he left after the war because the estate was getting so rough and the houses were in poor condition. But now, Mr. K. thought standards had improved on CHH and houses had been modernised the reputation was largely undeserved. "Mud sticks" he said, and his wife agreed it was a case of "Give a dog a bad name". The feelings of the K's on this matter were, however, bound up with their perceptions of their own estate (CHM), which they believed to be

rapidly deteriorating.

> "This estate's got a reputation almost as bad as - estate (CHH) now ... its the people they're putting in ... we're moving now ... as soon as we can."

A number of informants suggested to me that in fact CHM, and in particular one area of CHM, was in reality as bad as CHH and believed that soon this would be generally acknowledged. That is, it would gain a bad reputation. Others, such as Mrs. K felt this had already happened.

CHL was, at the time of my research, still considered select - although a few were beginning to express some fears about the 'hewcomers' and the stigma they would bring to the estate. Despite this CHL was still frequently described to me as a 'select area', a 'good estate', a 'move up in the world' - an offer of housing on this estate was taken by many as a chance "to better ourselves". A number of residents on CHH said to me they would love a house on CHL :

> "Its a much better area - more select and quiet"

said Mrs. H.

> "They don't get the roughs", said Mr. J.

If a bad reputation means first and foremost that an estate is reputed to house 'rough' people a bad reputation was also linked in the minds of my informants to the condition of the housing. A 'rough' estate houses 'rough' people, but it also has 'slumming' houses. Houses in a poor condition - particularly those which have poor and battered exteriors are associated with 'problem' estates. There were more houses of this type on CHH than on CHL where, although many were badly in need of repair and modernisation inside, the norm was well kept houses, which meant from the outside well cultivated gardens, clean windows and so on. It would seem that one defence against an estate

acquiring a bad reputation is for houses and gardens to appear well kept from the outside. CHH and Blackacre, despite modernisation, give the appearance of 'blight' to the outside observer. Thus the houses on CHH were described by non-residents as 'mucky'; the same adjective was continually used by CHH residents describing the S.E. corner. Residents were well aware of the link between overtly dilapidated housing and a stigmatised housing area. Some informants on CHL worried about this; as one said to me :

> "The council haven't touched the houses since they were built and there's no use trying to get repairs done .... soon the estate will get a bad name."

By the same reasoning another argued standards had improved on CHH since modernisation, and the same argument was applied to Blackacre.

> "Its not so rough up there now, the houses have been improved, although it still looks a mess."

In new houses, it was explained to me, you didn't get 'the roughs' - everyone took a pride in their housing. But few 'respectables' took the view that poor housing conditions fostered low housekeeping stndards. They themselves lived in old outmoded houses, but they maintained a 'decent standard of living'; they adhered to the view that 'people make slums'. Those who would have been described by their respectable co-residents as 'rough' with houses 'like tips' did often say to me that they had 'no heart for the house'; they felt it was falling apart around them and that the corporation didn't care. Most respectable respondents articulated the belief that it wasn't the houses as such which evoked low domestic standards, but rather that the corporation was using their old housing stock to house their worst and most undesirable applicants. The latter were variously referred as 'the roughs', 'clearance people' and 'problem families'. There was much consensus that the corporation used the old estates to dump unsatisfactory tenants and applicants. In this way the corporation was

seen as re-inforcing and accelerating the state of physical decay by putting in families who would not attempt to keep their homes well.

Mrs. Hall from CHM said to me :

"This estate's finished, it was good once but its the council - they're putting all sorts on here now."

Similarly, a resident of CHL told me :

"They're deliberately using this estate to rehouse slum clearance tenants that's why they won't do anything about the houses - the council are going to turn it into a slum."

Other families actually believed that they had been labelled 'rough' by their landlord and because of this had been allocated a poor house on a rough estate.

Jean told me :

"We were graded low on account of us not being married and having a baby, and I've got children by my husband. We weren't given any choice, one look at us and it was CHH or Blackacre, and that was after four years on the list."

In Chapters 8 and 9 I examine housing allocation policies in Sheffield to see how far these charges of 'dumping' are justified, and consider the slum clearance lettings on these three estates in more detail. Whatever the reality of the situations, however, the residents' belief that an estate is in decline (CHM, and to a lesser extent CHL) or that it is being used to house low status people (CHH, CHM, and again to a lesser extent CHL) will affect the reputation of that estate, mobility and even sociability patterns. In this way ultimately, the belief, whatever its foundations, may affect the social reality of the housing estate. Council tenants have their own shared stock of common knowledge and there is a popular wisdom that surrounds council housing.

9. The residents themselves

Everywhere the folk devil of the council housing world was the slum clearance tenant, and residents of all three estates were quite vehement in their condemnation of these people, and bitterly attacked the council for mixing them with residents who had awaited their time on the waiting or transfer lists. In the course of my research I have met a number of clearance families now living on CHM and CHL and a few on CHH. It is interesting to note here that despite the fact residents on CHH were as vociferous as those on CHL amd CHM in their belief that the estate was being used for clearance tenants, I noticed at this stage in my research that the number of clearance tenants on CHH appeared much smaller than those on CHM or CHL. In fact, in a number of cases I know that newcomers to CHH, described as slum clearance people by their neighbours had, in fact, been allocated their tenancy from the waiting list. The slum clearance tenants that I met did not appear to me to live up, in reality, to their reputation. In fact, with few exceptions, all the slum clearance families that I knew lived very 'respectable' life styles, having well-kept houses and well-cared for families, and their life styles in no way seemed particularly deviant. The possible exception to this was some of the children from clearance areas who appeared more destructive and delinquent than might have been predicted by their home backgrounds. This is possibly attributable to their previous 'play' opportunities in a clearance area, where there are empty houses and buildings to break into, investigate and smash up, compared with the rather restrictive environment of a housing estate, where all the houses are occupied. In contrast, quite the 'dirtiest' houses and the 'roughest' people were the indigenous population of CHH - that is the 'born and bred' CHH residents. Such tenants usually obtained their house on the death of a parent or through

the waiting list while living with their family of origin on the estate. Many other families I met who also had generally more deviant life styles than the slum clearance tenants, and for whom severe domestic and financial problems were common, were waiting list entrants to CHH, who had come from many different parts of the city.

In the following discussion of family types on these pre-war estates I use the classificatory terms as they are used in the literature on housing estates, as empirically discoverable types. Increasingly, however, I became aware that this categorisation of families by such social types as 'problem', 'rough', 'ordinary' and 'respectable' was fraught with difficulties; that not only did these terms mean different things according to who was applying them, but also even if a working definition was attempted from their use in the literature the classificatory types were still neither mutually exclusive or exhaustive categories.

Hodges and Smith (1954) make the point that classifications such as 'problem family' do not have fixed definitions in social reality, but mean different things according to who is applying the label. I found on the estates that tenants themselves had appropriated the term into everyday usage, and that neighbours whatever their life style could be termed 'problem families' if their mode of living was seen as incompatible with that of the labeller.

Morris and Mogey (1965) while referring to these classifications as ideal-types abandon the use of them because,

> "Although a few families are 'respectable' or 'ordinary' by any standard, it has proved difficult to place most individuals clearly in one or the other category."

There is some confusion in the literature as to whether these are intended as ideal or empirical types. Moreover, most of the housing

estate literature fails to make any distinction between the 'rough' working class family and the 'problem' family, or to examine the relationship of such family types to the 'ordinary' and 'respectable' working class.[16]

The acceptance of some sort of 'rough'-'respectable' dichotomy in empirical research on housing estates is essential if one is going to discuss either the social character or reputation of an estate or attempt to explain differences between housing estates. Its acceptance is also essential if one is to discuss sensibly the main hypotheses to arise out of housing estate research - the natural cultural process of selection and council allocation policy in terms of segregation and concentration or dispersal. Furthermore, for such research to be adequate at the level of meaning demands the researcher give room to subjects' own accounts and subjects themselves classified families into social types. But because I have come to believe that these family types may be more correctly used as the methodological tool of an ideal type, rather than as an empirically sound classificatory scheme for the reality, in my own discussion of family types on these estates it is to be understood that I consider they approximate to the family type, as operationally defined in the housing estate literature, rather than they represent one concrete example of a particular type. The family typologies I use, therefore, may be understood as ideal typical, forming a continuum from 'respectable' through 'ordinary', 'rough' to 'problem'families, as outlined below. The <u>respectable</u> family is typically small, lives a privatised life style, aspires to better material living standards and espouses the values and norms of middle class society. These families do not come to the notice of the social services department, the housing department, the police or other agencies of social control as deviants or in need of help, and are self-reliant and self-sufficient.

The ordinary family may have more children than the 'respectables', but like the latter they are able to bring them up without help or other involvement of outside agencies. They do not put such a value on privatised living as the 'respectable' family, but their patterns of sociability do not create 'problems' for others . Their values and norms are not in conflict with middle class society, but they more typically identify with working class life style than the 'respectable' family.

The rough family is typically large, and the children undisciplined to the extent of causing problems to 'respectable' and 'ordinary' neighbours. Often these familes are involved with outside agencies, both in terms of needing help and being the subjects of control measures. They live very sociable life style and at times their behaviour causes annoyance to neighbours. Material living standards vary, but despite some having reasonable material standards, there is no value put on keeping a show piece home. The values and norms of the rough family are often in conflict with those of middle class society, although most of the time they are not deviant in the working class milieu. These families may cause problems for other neighbouring families and outside agencies, but they are rarely 'problems' to themselves.

The problem family is again typically large, and the children not only sources of annoyance to neighbours but often 'neglected' by both middle class and working class standards of child care. This 'neglect', however, should be distinguished from 'cruelty', which is rare.even within the 'problem' family. Typically these families are poor, their homes are sparsely furnished, often dirty and being constantly in debt, Main services such as electricity are often disconnected. These families are continually in need of material help from outside agencies, and are

often the subjects of control measures. Indeed, the 'problem' family is so defined because it creates problems for significant outsiders such as neighbours, social workers, Housing Departments, police and other agencies of social control. Their life styles are very public and their activities intrude upon the life of their neighbours. The values and norms by which they live are deviant in middle class terms, and also are often in conflict with working class culture. These families often have financial and domestic situations which are problematic to themselves, as well as creating problems for others.

Hodges and Smith (1954), in their study of a Sheffield council estate, describe the signs of neglect and decay of houses inhabited by 'problem' families :

> "whose existence colours the reputation of the estate, out of all proportion to their number."
> (p.88).

From my own research experience I would say this is also true of CHH. Although I met more 'problem type' families on CHH than on either CHM or CHL, and popular opinion also holds them to be more numerous on CHH (this being the essence of its "dreadful" reputation), these families still constituted only a very small minority of residents on the estate. The exception again was the S.E. corner of CHH, where such families are rather more numerous. The 'problem' family then is an extreme type and very much a minority, even on a 'problem' estate. The majority of residents on CHH I would classify as approximating to the 'rough-ordinary' working class - the reputation of an estate such as CHH and the characterisation of the tenants appears more 'awful' than the reality. The 'respectable type' families who live on such estates as CHH, and who are usually somewhat socially isolated from their neighbours are overlooked by those who believe in the estate's 'awful' reputation.

In the literature, as amongst interested agencies in the real world, the lives of 'ordinary' and 'respectable' working class families are not subjected to criticism, but the 'rough' working class and the extreme type of 'problem' family, if not actually viewed as pathological or anti-social, are at least seen as in need of help. Even writers such as Tucker (1966) describe the way in which 'problem' families form a ghetto on a council estate suggesting that :

> "Councils do have the means to a solution if they are prepared to intervene rigorously and prevent the formation of these sad and difficult groups." (p.123)

Difficult these groups may be to the rest of society, but very few of such families, in my experience, would, despite their problems, consider themselves sad.[17] Many of these families resent outside interference, and do not accept their life styles make them suitable subjects for social rehabilitation. This is not to minimise the economic deprivations of such families, which cause much stress and can put a strain on familial relationships, but to argue that most do not want 'reform' or 'rescue' from their own chosen individual adaptations to the material conditions of their existence, nor do they seek pity. Not only would many find such prescriptions unacceptable, they would query the diagnosis of their condition. To say such families are problems to themselves carries the suggestion, albeit implicitly, that the way they live, if not creating, at least contributes to their difficulties. Most of these families would identify their problems as arising out of external imposed circumstances beyond their control, such as poverty, bad housing, ill health or plain bad luck. Families with problems occur in all social classes, but it is the socio-economic deprivations of working class 'problem' families that accentuate, if not create, their difficulties and cause them to lose autonomy in their private lives, lacking the material means to remain independent of the 'care' and 'control' of outside agencies.

'Problem' families are to be found on 'problem' housing estates but they consititute such a small minority that they alone cannot account for the character and reputation of the estate. On a 'select' estate, such as CHL, not all residents are of the 'respectable' type, many are ordinary working class families and some more closely resemble the 'rough', and even a few 'problem' families may be found residing there. The 'respectable' types, however, are there in sufficient number and have predominated on the estate for a sufficient length of time to give that estate a 'select' or 'respectable' status which is denied to such estates as CHH. 'Problem' type families, although a small minority, even on an estate such as CHH can be very disruptive to the life of an estate, although they cannot be held solely responsible for the character or reputation of the estate. The two examples that follow are both of families I would class as approximating to the ideal-type 'problem' family in terms of being perceived as a problem to others, and in the case of the second family, arguably a problem to themselves. I have included a brief profile of these families and the reaction of their neighbours to them to illustrate just how extreme neighbour reaction can be to such families, and to suggest that if the number of 'problem' families multiplies on an estate this reaction can plausibly change its character. Neither of these cases happen to be from CHL, but the evidence in the files of the Housing Department suggests that on a more 'respectable' estate reaction to the housing of a 'problem' family is even more severe and at times vitriolic. The tenant who wrote from CHL :

> "They are slum clearance people and have brought plenty of vermin with them."

is not unrepresentative of those residents who feel it necessary to complain of their neighbours. The writer of this particular letter claims that the house next door has changed tenancies three times in ten

years because of this particular 'problem' family. Certainly three tenancies in ten years is an uncharacteristic letting pattern for a house on CHL.

The Masons[18] came to CHM on a priority rehousing allocation after Mrs. Mason became homeless, having been 'evicted' by her cohabitee. Mrs. Mason had been living in temporary accommodation with some of her children, the others having been taken into care. The family consists of Mrs. Mason and seven children - five by her cohabitee and two by a previous marriage. One of her unmarried daughters has a child and also lives with her mother on CHM. Other occupants in the house have included the girl friends of two sons - one of which is separated from his wife, and a number of men friends of Mrs. Mason's and of her eldest daughter. While waiting for housing the Childrens' Department supported Mrs. Mason's application for priority. They described her as 'trying hard to make a home for her children and would make a good corporation tenant'.

The house offered to Mrs. Mason was in a considerable state of disrepair and on the 'worst' part of CHM. Mrs. Mason tried to refuse the offer but was told she would lose her priority if she did this. The house was at times running in damp, which was diagnosedby the Public Works Department workmen as 'condensation'. Eventually the conditions became so bad that the family had to take all the furniture out of the front room because it was saturated. Finally a leaking water pipe was found to be the cause. Mrs. Mason tried unsuccessfully to hold the Housing Department financially responsible for the damage to her carpets and furniture. Despite the rather gruesome conditions the Masons kept the house very clean and took a great interest in decorating and furnishing it. In this they have been 'good' tenants for the corporation and do not fit the stereotype 'problem' family.

In one sense, however, the Masons do meet the criteria of a 'problem' family. Their presence created severe discontent amongst neighbours - a number of whom applied for a transfer away from the estate because of the 'nuisance' caused by the Masons. Their reputation spread rapidly and must have made a significant contribution to the growing notoriety of this area. The Housing Department received a deluge of complaints from local residents, a number of whom had merely heard about this family and were warned about what they might do. Other complaints had more substance, they included noise and rowing, unauthorised people living in the house, allegations that no member of the family went to work or school, bad language from the children and fears for neighbours' own children by association, General abuse - particularly in response to complaints, filth and squalor, and taxis calling at the house throughout the night. Other allegations included one of the children lighting fires, a daughter soliciting and the entire family staying in bed all day. Local residents were contacting the Housing Department, police and Public Health Authorities - some complaints were anonymous, more were signed and many were the joint efforts of neighbours. The local M.P. was contacted and he requested that the Housing Department conducted an inquiry into this family. The Housing Department resisted this demand. An extract from a neighbour's letter illustrates the nature and intensity of the resentment.

> "Why should people like this get away with it and live better than genuine hardworking people?"

and another echoed similar sentiments :

> "Why do you house such people when there are plenty of good families homeless."

From personal knowledge of this family I can say that although some of those allegations contained an element of truth, the reaction of the neighbours seems out of all proportion to the reality of the Masons' behaviour, and to the extent they constituted a nuisance.

The Housing Visitor remained surprisingly sympathetic and sensible.[19] She wrote a very understanding summary of the situation:

> "The presence of this family because they are noisy, boisterous and far from refined is resented in the neighbourhood, and the worst construction will always be put on their activities."

Despite neighbours' attempts at having this family compulsorily transferred elsewhere they remain in the same house on CHM today. What the Masons illustrate is how just one family - and a very harmless family at that, most of their activities being of an essentially private nature - can cause extreme resentment and unrest in a neighbourhood. Understanding the case of the Masons it becomes plausible that the accidental housing of a few such families in close proximity on an estate, or part of an estate, could initiate the process by which the 'respectables' move away and only those most desperate for housing move in and the area collapses into a complete decline.

The Martins[20] live on one of the roads on the north-west of CHH - they were compulsorily transferred to this from one on the south-east so the house might be repaired. Their first house on CHH was that of Mr. Martin's father who eventually 'moved out in disgust', relinquishing his tenancy to his son. This family have long been on the regular visiting list of the Housing Department, and are well-known to various social welfare agencies. The incidents I describe here relate to their second tenancy on CHH.

The housing visitor gives the following account of a routine visit to this family. The wife was in bed, the children not at school. The house was in darkness as the electricity had been cut off. (Previously Mrs. Martin had been prosecuted for illegally re-connecting the electricity supply.) The gas had been disconnected for a long time. There was an appalling stench from the toilet, the floors were 'urine-soaked'. There was no bedding or floor coverings - only old coats,

and a dirty mattress 'crawling in lice'. The children were 'dirty', 'unwashed', 'poorly clad', 'sleeping in their clothes'. Mrs. Martin had a black eye, said to be done 'falling over the dog'. The children were 'undernourished and ill-kempt' like 'jaundiced children from the First World War'. Mrs. Martin also has had a broken arm but received no treatment for it. The family are heavily in rent arrears and have accumulated many other debts. The children are of Mrs. Martin's former relationship with a man who died 'in tragic circumstances, in front of the children'. Since then and her marriage to Mr. Martin her standards have 'taken a steep decline'. Mrs. Martin also originates from CHH, but has no family there now. Mr. Martin has T.B. He is "not bright - poor type--is belligerent and is unemployed". An unnamed niece who is pregnant is living there as an unauthorised subtenant. The house is in a state of dirt and disrepair with "more cardboard in the windows than glass".

Neighbours have barraged the Department with complaints and have actually got up a petition for the removal of this family. The Housing Visitor recommends a compulsory transfer. The Martins want to move - they claim they are "ostracised and vandalised". The Housing Visitor recommends a sundry property for this family while the house is cleaned and repaired and neighbours are given a 'respite'.

The neighbours, however, did not want this family back and no sundry property was immediately available for letting. The Department then proposed to transfer the Martins to another house on CHH. News travels fast, however, and neighbours of the proposed new house for the Martins sent in a petition demanding that the family is not housed near them. One letter from a neighbour encloses a local newspaper cutting about an incident where one of the children was badly burnt while both parents were out. Mrs. Martin allegedly refused to leave

'bingo' until the game was over, despite being told of her child's accident. The Martins have five children in all, four of whom are handicapped.

Eventually Mr. and Mrs. Martin were moved to their third tenancy on CHH and the children were taken into care. A social worker reports :

> "Parents and children are initially distressed but I am confident they will respond well."

Such optimism was, however, unwarranted. The parents behaviour actually deteriorated at this point. The family were eventually re-united because despite the 'horror' of their life style to outsiders social workers were forced to acknowledge that 'close family bonds' meant that separation brought no improvement or benefit for any member of the family. The final comment is left to the welfare visitor of the Housing Department:

> "This couple will never achieve a satisfactory domestic standard, a good rent account or a safe home for their children, and will always be a source of dismay to neighbours wherever they are housed. [21]

These two examples of ideal-type 'problem' families well illustrate the diversity of life styles that may come into the 'problem' family category. It is interesting also to note that neither the Masons nor the Martins saw themselves as in need of the type of help they were offered, although undoubtedly they would have welcomed help in the form of more money or better housing. Neither family saw itself as deserving the moral indignation or aggravation that their neighbours subjected them to. Both families saw themselves as victimised by neighbours - more sinned against than sinning - for them the 'respectable' and 'ordinary' families that surrounded them were the problem.

In my field research I certainly came across more 'problem' families on south-east CHH than anywhere else. One or two of these told me they had come 'on priority' and therefore had 'no choice' but most had at least one partner originating from the estate and after marriage had asked for and been given a tenancy near their parental home.

Not one of these families suggested to me that they had chosen CHH to be with others like themselves, or even that they had wanted an area where they thought neighbours would be friendly towards them. In this, then, I found no support for the Wilson hypothesis; rather subjects answered questions about their choice of tenancy in terms of 'Hobson's choice' or an affection for the area where they were 'born and bred'. Considering the whole of CHH, these familes only constitute a small minority and while the 'distressed respectables' constitute another minority the vast majority of CHH residents appeared to be 'ordinary' or 'rough' working class, who, while not unaffected by the 'problem' minority, could in fact continue living there without undue strain. This is well illustrated by the comments of Mrs. Hardy and her family. The Hardys are also a CHH family, Mrs. Hardy's mother is still alive and lives next door. Although her son has had one or two minor brushes with the law they certainly could not be classified as a 'problem' family. The house is very clean although poorly furnished and gives every appearance of an 'ordinary' working class home. Mrs. Hardy said to me :

> "Its rough up here, but its worse down the other end. You can't leave your door unlocked for a minute, we've had two break-ins last year and the police don't care. Still I wouldn't live anywhere else - there's roughs everywhere. I was born and bred here. Its a shame how they treat their kids though and the animals too ..."

Similarly, Mr. Jones, who lives on the south-east side of the estate said :

> "I've always lived down here - its the rough end - but if you know how to handle them it's alright. The kids can be a bit of a nuisance, they won't leave my car alone, but apart from that it's alright really."

The Jones, too, could not be described as a 'problem' family, in fact, although their house is in Mr. Jones' own words 'a bit of a tip', they espouse 'ordinary' working class values and Mr. Jones has had the same job all his working life.

10. Living standards

The following descriptions of typical living standards on the three estates are based only on my impressions of homes of people I met during my research. Such data is not, of course, in any way quantifiable. Nevertheless, excluding the 'problem' families I saw more apparent poverty on CHH than on CHL in terms of furnishings and 'aids to living'.

A high proportion of the male residents on all three estates are employed in the steel and other related industries, although it appeared to me that there was a wider range of occupations on CHL than on CHH. On none of these estates is the 'affluent' council tenant to be found. There is, in fact, nothing in the life styles of the people I met to support the embourgoisement thesis. Homes were very definitely working class. Most were fairly poorly furnished, although some had such modern accoutrements as colour television and automatic washing machines. These more often represented a debt to Wigfalls rather than consumer affluence. On CHH, disregarding the very 'slummy' houses, a lot were very poor in appearance with old fashioned, well worn furnishings. On CHL, particularly among the new slum clearance tenants, houses tended to be furnished in a more modern fashion and decorations were good. This should not necessarily be taken as evidence of more money, but perhaps is linked to awakened housing aspirations with furnishing a new house, and the contrast between the old slum dwelling and a council house on CHL generating a greater 'pride in the home'.

Also important here is the feeling of permanence slum clearance tenants of CHL spoke of, when contrasting theirpresent tenancy to past housing. The Housing Department, too, encourages this interest in a new home by their policy of cleaning up and repairing houses when vacated, before re-letting to a new tenant, and by the removal and expenses allowance granted to the clearance tenant.

On the exterior, houses on CHL are definitely better kept and the gardens more often cultivated than on CHH. The exteriors of the houses on CHH do vary according to the estate division - on the north-west side of the estate the houses look better cared for and the gardens better kept than on the south-east side of the same estate. Residents themselves remark on this difference and certainly more rubbish is in evidence in the gardens of the houses in the south-east. In addition to this, on this part of the estate many of the houses have broken windows with cardboard or some other material filling the broken panes. At the time of my research all these breakages must have been for the most part attributable to the current craze of the local children for hurling bricks and stones and shooting air rifles at all available glass. CHM, for the most part, was in outward appearance more comparable with CHL than with CHH, with the exception of a few rather neglected looking houses.

For all three estates it is true to say that the line of recent registration cars, often so conspicuous on the new council estate, is not apparent on these pre-war areas. Similarly, the decor and furnishings on the whole do not compare with the many houses I have been in on the city's newly built estates.

11. Family networks on the three estates

Although amongst the council tenants I have met during the course of my research I have found a common desire to live on the same estate as

'mum' and 'dad', it was only on CHH that I found many instances of several related families all living in close proximity. I have already discussed the demand for CHH from people who originate from the estate and have family living there. Some of the examples I have given show that some people at least are prepared to live on an 'undesirable' estate if it means they can stay near their family of origin. others, just because they originate from the estate, do not see it as undesirable. Although on CHM and CHL I met a few related families holding separate tenancies on the same estate, this did not seem as prevalent as on CHH. This may be due to availability of housing rather than different aspirations. Thus, for example, I regularly took Mrs. Gardener to visit her mum on CHL in a taxi. Mrs. Gardener is young - in her twenties, married with children, both she and her husband wanted a house on CHL but could not wait for an offer. Consequently, they accepted a house on a new estate on the other side of town. Mrs. Gardener said to me quite bitterly :

> "Its not fair we come from there but they're letting them all to the slum people."

On a high demand estate such as CHL, family network clusters do not develop easily as they do on an unpopular estate such as CHH. The grown-up children of CHL residents who want a tenancy on the same estate as their parents face a situation where the popularity of the estate with slum clearance applicants, who are awarded priority under the Sheffield housing allocation system, makes it virtually impossible to obtain a house through the waiting list. In contrast, few clearance applicants request CHH and the overall demand is low, so that not only are houses frequently allocated to waiting list applicants, but the list for this estate is comparatively short and so obtaining a tenancy on CHH in this way involves a relatively short wait.[22]

Mrs. Bell's family may be taken as an example of a family network holding several tenancies on the same estate. Mrs. Bell is a widow who lives on A. - Road, CHH, now. nearing fifty, she was in fact born on the estate on B. - Road, her husband also lived on B. - Road before marriage. She has a married daughter with two children who lives with her in her house on A. - Road. The daughter hopes to succeed to her tenancy one day. Another daughter is married and lives with her family on C. - Road. Her son is also married and lives with his wife's family on C. - Road. They are on the waiting list for their own tenancy on CHH. Mrs. Bell also has a brother-in-law living on C. - Road, and another living on E. - Road. There are other more distant relatives living on the estate.

Mrs. Bell's family might be described as an 'ordinary' working class one. Mrs. Charles' family, in contrast, also holds several tenancies on the estate but their life style is 'rough' and one or two branches of the family might be described as 'problem' families. Mrs. Charles is also a widow and lives on F. - Road. In her house she has two unauthorised sub-tenant families - her niece and four children and her daughter, husband and three children, both the latter held tenancies on CHH and were evicted for arrears. Mrs. Charles has a sister living on B. - Road, who also has 'family' on the estate and a son living on C. - Road, who is married with a family of his own.

These are just two examples of the many residents of CHH who have several relatives holding tenancies on the same estate. The family networks on CHH are inducive to a very 'close knit' way of life centred on neighbour and familial ties. Thus neighbours are often not only friends but also relatives. This, combined with the characteristically long length tenancies on this estate has encouraged the growth of a 'local way of life'.

In another section I shall discuss the context of this local way of life and its relevance to the rates of known criminal offenders living on the estate, and more generally, to the concept of cycles of disadvantage.

12. Growing up on CHH

I have not meant to give the impression that all the long standing CHH families are those which have earned the estate its reputation for being 'rough'. This is certainly not the case. Nevertheless, it does seem that the children brought up in the social milieux of a 'rough' family tend to reproduce these life styles when they produce families of their nown. Many examples of this were presented to me during the time I worked on the estate, but for the sake of brevity I give only two examples here to illustrate the point.

David Jennings is nineteen, born on C. - Road. His father has a history of criminal convictions and his mother has spent some time as an in-patient of the City Mental Hospital. David has two brothers and three sisters. All have spent a considerable time in 'care', but are at present living with their parents. David has had a criminal record since he was a boy of twelve, his 'crimes' ranging from petty thefts, joyriding in cars, to, in recent years, burglary. One brother is at present in Borstal, the other has several convictions. One sister has a conviction for shop-lifting, the others so far have escaped criminal sanctions. David's father and mother are both from CHH.

Kevin is twelve. He once attended the local youth club but was banned for bad behaviour following several incidents of vandalism and an attack on another boy. When upset he threatens to bring "my brothers to sort things out". Two brothers and the father have criminal convictions and Kevin is learning fast: he said he was going to strip

the roof of the Church Hall of lead - "it fetches a good price" - he confided to me. There has been no particular logic in my selecting these families as examples to illustrate my thesis that criminal behaviour or more often attitudes that permit criminal behaviour, are very often learned at home as is other types of human behaviour. Some, of course, choose not to adopt their families norms of conduct, or their life circumstances are such that they are drawn away from the home background. Eddy, for example, married for a second time. His second wife was from a respectable working class family and his in-laws got the couple a shop and living accommodation away from the estate. In later years he has become scornful of 'problem' families such as his brother's, and he himself subscribes to very conventional values.

The examples I have used are drawn at random from those families I have known personally. Such families cannot be taken to represent the majority of residents of CHH. They do, I would argue, constitute a significant minority. They are particularly significant in their influence on other families in the same neighbourhood. A lot of the damage and petty thefts committed in and around CHH at the time of my research may be attributed to groups of young teenage boys. Some of these come from 'notorious' families, others are from 'ordinary' homes but have been drawn into ~~new~~ friends' activities. This constitutes a real worry for those parents who have aspirations for their children. Mrs. G. told me she wouldn't let her thirteen year old son 'play' with other children on the estate, but she still fears trouble from him mixing with them at school. Mrs. L's son is on probation for theft - an act which he committed in the company of three other boys. This has caused the L's great distress, as their other children managed to reach adulthood without any brushes with the law. They feel the estate is getting worse and have put in for a transfer.

Dave also has put in for a transfer. He and his wife June have three pre-school age children. They accepted a house on CHH because they were living with in-laws and were desperate for a house. They want to return to the other side of the city, and they worry constantly in case their son reaches school age before they have left. The language and behaviour of some of the 'under 10's' on their road they say is 'shocking'. They are 'frightened for Steven'.

Housing Department data also includes letters from residents of CHH who complain of the behaviour of neighbours' children and are fearful of the influence of these children on their own. One family on B. - Road complained of victimisation by their neighbour following their complaints about their neighbour's children. They claim they have been attacked by the parents of the children, their child has been threatened by other children, their windows broken and verbal abuse is hurled at them when they go out of the house. This family called the police four or five times in as many weeks. The wife eventually tried to commit suicide and the hospital doctor recommended a priority transfer away from CHH.

Several of my male informants described to me life on CHH as a youngster. One said :

"You had to be tough to survive"

another admitting a criminal conviction before marriage :

> "Well all the boys I hung around with were doing it so I just went along - they're all in prison or Borstal now."

In the S.E. corner the situation appears to be exacerbated by the 'closed in' design of the roads and the housing of a few nefarious families there, several of which are inter-related. Dave said to me :

> "They're not all bad down there but there's a few families - and they've all got masses of kids - who run this road. Other kids are forced to mix in with them."

The very life style of the 'rough' and 'problem' family means their children are more likely to be 'on the streets' rather than in the home, and they are, therefore, more of an influence on other children - and more of a nuisance to local residents than children of families who believe in 'keeping our kids in at night'. "Our Paul knows them from school and when he goes out they're out", said Mrs. R. "And off he goes with them, That's what gets him into trouble".

Certainly the helpers at the Youth Club, both the ex-social worker, the youth worker and vicar and the two volunteer mums were very despondent about the chances of most of the kids growing into responsible teenagers or 'good citizens'. Not only was the Youth Club continually battling against the disruptive behaviour of its members that apparently wanted to turn every meeting and organised activity into chaos, but the very lack of initiative, interest or organising ability in the children was discussed in despair. All attempts at organised games were abortive. Similarly, attempts at entertaining the kids and giving them a 'good time' - in the workers' sense - were thwarted. Mrs. A. recalled for me the Christmas party when the workers spent many hours preparing the food, hanging the decorations and generally preparing the hall. The party was chaotic and the children amused themselves by throwing food at each other. Mrs. H. went on to tell me that her son, aged 9, was less literate since he'd been at the local school than he was in his pre-school years. She said she taught him elementary reading and arithmetic before going to school and now he can hardly read or write. She blamed the influence of the other children but more the standard of teaching of the school itself which she said was appalling. The teachers she told me were not interested in the children or in the area - a point affirmed by the other mothers present - and that so few parents were interested in their children's education that there was no parent group to bring pressure on the school.

Similarly, my informants stressed the influence of children in the local school - constant contact with children from homes where delinquency is not controlled or punished can lead children from conforming homes into delinquent activities. CHH does not share the same schools as CHL. The schools serving CHL are, in fact, held in far greater repute by interested parents and by 'people in the know' such as youth workers on these estates.

The idea that delinquency can be generated by the educational system of a society is contained in a number of very different American and British criminological theories. Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1961) in different ways, link delinquency to the blocked opportunities for achievement faced by working class boys in a middle class educational system. Miller (1958), in the United States, and May (1964), in Britain, explain delinquency as a manifestation of working class culture. The middle class educational system is irrelevant to working class children. Their commitment to school is initially low and this is further minimised by the school experience. Downes (1966) describes how working class boys thus dissociate themselves from school. The transactionalist approach has also contributed to the idea of schools generating delinquency - schools may increase delinquency by labelling the delinquent child and thus confirming him in his delinquent career and possibly propelling him into secondary deviation. Cicourel and Kitsuse (1963), for example, argue that casting certain pupils into the category of 'problem' pupils propels them into a certain moral career within the school.

All these theories, however, are concerned with the working class child within the middle class educational system. The schools serving CHH and CHL are undoubtedly a part of this educational system and one might expect them to be committed to middle class educational ideals. In both schools, however, the children are predominantly working class, both

being situated in catchment areas where there is little middle class housing. From this one could predict that the experience of the children attending such schools would be very different to that of working class children attending schools in mixed or predominantly middle class catchment areas. Phillipson (1971) suggests that little attention has been paid to the possibility that there may be considerable differences between overtly similar schools. Some schools may facilitate and others hinder the drift into delinquency. Michael Power (1967, 1972) attempted to research the differences among the delinquency rates of Tower Hamlet secondary schools, but he was stopped by the National Union of Teachers before he had reached an explanation. The variations in delinquency rates he found between the schools could not be explained by the size of the schools, or by the age of the building. Moreover, they were substantially independent of the delinquency rate of the school's catchment areas. Powers suggested that some schools were actively promoting and others preventing pupil deviance and delinquency. Phillipson (1971) found within any one school there was little difference in the delinquency rates of boys living in high and low rate delinquency areas. Moreover, high delinquency rate schools did not draw their pupils from enumeration districts with higher delinquency rates than the low delinquency rate schools. Other research such as that by Rutter (1973) and by Gath (1972) also suggests that different pupils ' deviancy and delinquency levels may well be connected with differences in the schools, rather than in differences in the child populations.

In the case of CHH and CHL it would be impossible for me to suggest that the two schools differed in their ability to deter delinquency. Certainly both schools had a similar social class composition of pupils, but the school serving CHH had a higher delinquency rate catchment area. The levels of delinquency within these

schools may be a reflection of their catchment areas. It is, however, necessary to note that I found among parents on CHH who were interested in their children's education a great dissatisfaction with the schools their children attended. Specific criticisms include the disinterest of the teachers, the low level of the teaching and unchecked delinquency within the school. On CHL I found no comparable dissatisfaction amongst parents. The dissatisfaction of the 'aspiring' CHH parents and their specific criticisms of the schools may be more a reflection of their general discontent with the estate than be a fair comment on the school provision. Nevertheless, as I have already stated, the general assessment of the CHH schools as poor and the CHL schools as good was not confined to the parents. This assessment was also given by social and youth workers.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

I have not meant to suggest, in discussing the process of growing up on CHH and CHL, that delinquency and crime are simply the result of association with 'rough' and 'problem' families, either through familial or friendship ties, or through association in the schools and the neighbourhood. This is certainly part of the picture, but it should not be forgotten that each successive generation growing up on CHH faces a life characterised by material deprivations in a disadvantaged area. Some escape from the cycle of poverty and deprivation, but more become ensnared in the poverty trap.[23] Much of the crime and delinquency associated with such people is best understood as the rational responses of a person to a particular set of material conditions which form his life experience - a response which is often endorsed by neighbourhood norms. Informants, themselves, explained the 'local way of life' in terms of a 'culture of poverty', a shared life style which is undeniably 'rough'. By 'rough' my informants did not mean just the extreme 'problem'

families but really all those local residents who participate in the neighbourhood social life. Most informants, however, mentioned particular 'problem' families by name, explaining their influence in the neighbourhood, particularly referring to the time when they were young and mixed with children from those families. The very conduct norms of such people encourage neighbour contact, and as I have pointed out the children spend much of their time 'on the street'. This contrasts with the life style of middle class housing areas, and the 'respectable' working class who put a value on a privatised family life and keeping 'oneself to oneself'.

In Chapter Seven I consider in more detail the 'local way of life' on CHH in relation to sociological theories of subculture, reputation, secondary deviance and to the idea of a natural cultural process of selection. Here it may be noted that my research supports the findings of other housing estate studies which suggest that social networks form more easily in housing areas that facilitate social contact and in areas where the prevalent value is on sociability. My findings are in fact similar to those of Jephcott and Carter (1955) who wrote :

> "The ways of life of the people of the 'black' subculture are re-inforced and supported by their constant contact with each other."

Association, however, is not an adequate explanation for the continuance of high delinquency and crime areas, the relation between 'the ways of life' and the material conditions of life of the subjects needs to be brought out, as does the processes by which housing areas can remain 'black' or 'white' over successive generations of tenants.

13. <u>Residents perceptions of the police and attitudes to crime</u>

A lot of locally committed offences are attributed by residents to "the kids". Residents of CHH did appear to feel themselves more often

victimised than residents of CHL. CHM is again rather a mixed estate in this respect, but residents of the 'bad' area of the estate also frequently complained of the delinquent behaviour of the local children. The necessity of taking precautions against theft was a frequently mentioned issue amongst CHH residents and from the latter I heared far more frequently that they had suffered petty thefts, such as milk from the doorstep or items from the garden or more serious break-ins and thefts in the home - meters appeared particularly vulnerable. Another common complaint was windows broken by missiles - bricks, stones, air gun pellets, etc. - said to be the work of local children. Also on CHH I received more frequent reports of child and animal cruelty. The latter again was mainly attributed to the kids. Reports of crime and delinquency from residents of CHL were less frequently made to me and the delinquency that was mentioned seemed to be of a less serious nature - garden fences for example, being broken compared with the many on CHH who had been on the receiving end of bricks through the window. Residents of CHL and CHM did report fights and disturbances at night between local teenagers, but this was said to happen outside the pubs and 'take-away' food shops in the shopping areawhich serves all three estates. Residents of CHH reported fights between all ages of residents actually on the estate, and there was a consensus of opinion that domestic disputes which often erupted into violence were frequent.

From the impressionistic data, therefore, that one obtains as a participant observer I would say that a far higher proportion of the residents I met living on CHH had been victims of crime on the estate than had the residents I met on CHL. Moreover, residents of CHH seemed more fearful of offences being carried out against them or their property than did residents of CHL. The threat of crime seemed more real to these people living on a high crime rate estate.

The adult victim and self report study carried out as part of the wide ranging interview survey for the Sheffield study also supported the official offence statistics for the two estates showing a significant difference between the proportion of residents of the two estates reporting themselves as victims of a criminal offence. Mawby's (1979B) juvenile victimisation study, however, administered to adolescents at the two secondary schools serving the estates did not support this pattern of higher offence levels on CHH than on CHL. Mawby (1979A) shows that according to the official statistics offences on CHH in 1975 were 85.1 per 1,000 households compared with 23.1 per 1,000 households on CHL (p.62). His own victimisation study suggests that although police data considerably understates juvenile victimisation there was no significant difference between the two estates in terms of offences against juveniles. On CHH, 69.4% of the male respondents and 63.6% of the female respondents claimed they had been the victim of at least one criminal incident in the past year compared with 67.4% of the male and 69.2% of the female respondents from CHL. Mawby suggests this difference between the official statistics, the survey data and his victimisation study may be due to the fact that his study is concerned with offences against the individual, rather than against households:

> "In the household survey in Sheffield, and from police data, a clear difference emerged in victimisation rates in areas with different offender rates; in the juvenile survey, the victim-offender relationship is based on the persons involved rather than on the surrounding environment."
> (p.110).

Returning to my own study, a number of informants on CHH actually condoned a degree of violence amongst the young - several men suggested to me that a boy became a man through learning to fight. Similarly, such informants did not actually condemn certain types of property theft - a fairly commonly held idea amongst such people was expressed to me by David :

"Everyone is at it, only the unlucky get caught."

These families were, I found, fairly consistent in their actions and attitudes to crime. When they were themselves victims they rarely reported to the police, but preferred to sort things out themselves, or to take no action at all. Attitudes to the police being somewhat hostile, such people closed ranks when victimised and held people who did report offences in great contempt. Those on CHH who were only victims rather than contributors to local crime were also often reluctant to report to the police, or to take positive action. Often this reluctance stemmed from the idea that this was 'not done' round their way and sometimes from fear of retaliation and physical and verbal abuse. Those who were not antagonistic to the police as authority figures were often antagonistic in their assessment of police efficiency. Common responses were that police were just not interested, never came even if a crime was reported, or took so long to come all hope of catching the culprit was lost.

Residents on CHL and CHM also had generally low opinions of the efficiency of the police. Many tales were told of trouble at the "take-away" when the police took half an hour to arrive, after they had been contacted, by which time everyone had dispersed.

The most common offences appeared to be of a largely non-violent nature, being mainly property thefts and handling stolen goods. On CHH there were more instances cited of child and animal cruelty. Additionally on CHH more domestic disputes were reported to me than on CHL, and violence arising out of these on CHH were mentioned frequently. In fact, Mawby (1978), found a significant difference in domestic disputes reported to the police on the three estates. From data for the period March to December 1974 he estimated the annual rate of reported domestic disputes for the three estates. His data, shown below,

is presented on two bases, the estimated annual rates of disputes per 1,000 households and the estimated annual rates of separate households involved in disputes per 1,000 households.

	CHH	CHM	CHL
Disputes	58.9	29.6	17.9
Disputants	48.5	26.3	13.5

The boys I met who had criminal convictions had usually got these for property thefts - house breaking and stealing cars being most common. Interestingly to all those I mentioned drugs, the reaction was a unanimous one of knowing little about them and not wanting to, holding a considerable contempt for the idea of drug addiction. Many of the 'problem' and 'rough' families I knew had more than one family member committing criminal acts, but many 'ordinary' families had members who did not pass up the opportunity of making a little money illegally, or acquiring a desired good from an illegal source when they could. Such behaviour was not frowned upon by most local people on CHH.

The reluctance to involve the police when a crime is suspected or discovered that I found among a number of respondents on CHH really suggests that the difference in the offence and offender rates between the two estates may well be under-recorded in the official statistics. Similarly, Mawby's (1978) data on domestic disputes is confined to those incidents reported to the police. As the prevalent attitude on CHH was 'sorting things out ourselves' and not involving the police, it would be reasonable to suspect the differences between CHH and CHL in terms of domestic disputes could be even greater.

Those residents of CHH who are concerned with crime rates on the estate believe that the police are not active enough and even the adolescent age group tend to joke about the slowness of the police to react to reports of the street fights which are not infrequent in the

area. The data suggests, then, that the differences in crime rates between CHH and CHL might well be greater than is in fact officially recorded

14. Police perceptions of the residents

I was fortunate enough to be able to talk to one or two local policemen informally in the course of my research, and a few ex-policemen that I met through the taxi office. CHM has a number of police houses situated on the estate and CHH has two, although originally there were more but these proved so unpopular with police families that they were turned over for letting by the corporation. None of the police who lived on the estates - to my knowledge - actually worked the estate. In fact, in the course of one incident on CHM a policeman living locally was called in by a resident to a street fight and he was very reluctant to interfere, being in the role of 'neighbour' rather than 'policeman on duty'.

The individual policeman that I talked to said nothing to suggest that CHH was more actively patrolled than the other two estates, nor that its residents fell under greater suspicion. All estates appeared to suffer from an under-manning, and in both cases the division head-quarters were some way away - a few miles from the estate. Individual policemen who knew CHH told me they thought they were more often called into domestic disputes on this estate than on any neighbouring council estates, and they were also aware of the reputation of CHH as being a high offender rate area. In so far as they felt this reputation justified they stressed that really it was only 'a handful' of families who 'caused the trouble', and that the vast majority of residents were law-abiding citizens. This said, they could not explain why a number of these families should be found in a small areaof CHH but suggested, as the residents themselves did, that some youngsters were drawn into

delinquency and criminal activity by living in close proximity to these families and going to school and forming friendships with their children. They also pointed out that successive generations of these families had settled on CHH and expanded with time. Thus in the 1930's one particularly notorious family held one tenancy on CHH; by 1970 there were three different households on the estate related to this family, all of which were 'known' to the police. My police informants were also quick to point out that CHH had improved in recent years and that the problem area now lay in their opinion, on CHM. This they also could not explain, except for falling back on the idea of an influx of slum clearance families.

Policing, as described to me by these informants was, on all three estates, reactive rather than proactive.

The police, then, have to be considered as both possible re-actors to and creators of an estate's reputation: for a high offender rate is a high arrest rate. I have no evidence that the police are affected by the reputation of CHH, that is, that they are more active in policing the estate than they would be if it did not have such a reputation.

The vast majority of residents I spoke to, and the police themselves denied any'abnormal' level of police activity, it was commonly thought that the police did not patrol the estate over-much, and the police themselves denied any exceptional interest in policing the area, and a few defended it 'as not being so bad' ..... 'only a handful of families causing the trouble'. It might be true, however, that the police use their discretion in such a way with certain 'known' families that they tend to prosecute rather than caution when members of these families are caught breaking the law. I have some evidence that this is the the case through first-hand involvement in certain

incidents in which the police took action against some boys resident on the estate. The official attitude of the police was that these boys came from families with other criminal members and they themselves had a history of offences and therefore the only course open was to prosecute every time they were caught. Mawby (1979A), however, shows that on a gross statistical level there is no evidence of a difference in caution rates between these areas that could 'create' the different offender rates.

> "There is no evidence here or elsewhere in the research that differential areal offender rates were 'created' by the law enforcement process, up to and including a finding of guilt."
> (p.176).

The second possible way that the use of police discretion might create the high offender rate on CHH is through 'the method of suspicion'. Again on an individual level I found some evidence of this when crimes were committed locally police interviewed certain residents known to them for other offences. Additionally, those families that I knew had continuous contact with the police in this way were obviously antagonistic towards them and claimed 'persecution'. The number of families involved is, however, so small that even if police are more vigilant with them and more eager to charge than to caution offenders from such families, this would not explain the offender differentials between CHH and CHL, nor why there appear to be more of these families living on CHH than on CHL.[24]

Mawby (1979A) found that police proactivity was greater in the offender sample than the offence sample. Nevertheless it was still only in a very small number of cases that an arrest was made where the basis of police discretion appeared to be the prior criminal history of the suspect. Mawby also found area constables operating a 'method of suspicion', but due to police organization, men in the position of area constable are limited in their potential, as they are 'on the

perimeter of the detection process' (p.77). From his very thorough considerations of offence and offender data, Mawby found no evidence to suggest

> "that police involvement in any way creates differences in crime rates between different residential areas." (p.125).

Bottoms, in his preface to Mawby's (1979A) Policing the City points out that Mawby's work shows that :

> "the apparently greater enthusiasm for questioning offenders from high rate areas about their alleged other crimes resulted in more admissions from high rate area residents about crimes already reported to the police by other methods, but this did not affect either the official offence rate for the area (since the reporting was being done already by others) or the official offender rate for the area (since each offender only counts once in this rate, however many crimes he admits)." (p.viii).

In the case of levels of policing on the estates, my data supports that of Mawby. However, my data appears to conflict with that of Mawby on the police knowledge of the reputation of the three estates, CHH, CHL and CHM. Mawby reports that the policemen he talked to had vague and sometimes conflicting ideas of the reputations of the areas they covered.

> "The contrast between the estates is not only not recognised, but even denied. The area constable for CHH, who had previously worked in CHM and CHL, while aware of the reputation of the area was eager to repudiate it. On the other hand, the area constable who was looking after CHM and CHL saw no difference between the two areas, and like the panda patrol men, who covered these areas and other estates, contrasted them with the better areas to the North West." (p.79).

The difference between the knowledge held by the policemen I spoke to about the reputation and official crimes rates of the three estates and those to whom Mawby spoke may not be so great as it first appears. Firstly, Mawby was speaking to policemen in their official

capacity, and I was speaking to them in an 'out of hours' social context. Secondly, Mawby's police were those actually concerned with policing the estates at that time; my police respondents more often lived on the estates or in the vicinity and did not actually police them. Others had policed them in the past, but were no longer directly concerned with them. Additionally, if the statements given to Mawby by the police are examined closely, some do seem aware of the specific problems of the estates. The area constable of CHH, for example, refers to the delinquency problem on that estate:

> "the problem on CHH is youngsters causing damage and annoyance."

He admits the reputation of CHH, explaining :

> "Its got a name because of the criminals who live on the estate, not the crime committed there". (p.79).

The policemen I spoke to also contrasted crime levels on the three estates with the less criminal council estates in the North Western areas of the city. When limited to considering the three estates with which the research was concerned, they were, however, quite emphatic that CHH had the highest offender and offence levels, although some felt that CHM was rapidly catching up in this respect. Again there was a consensus of opinion that crime-wise CHL was the quietist estate of the three, and enjoyed the most favourable reputation.

CHAPTER FIVE

Notes:

1. Council housing outside the city's limits to the north of this area was until recently the responsibility of various rural authorities - these have now been taken over by Sheffield City Housing Department.

2. I base this statement on the numerous conversations I have had with middle class people from south and west Sheffield to ascertain their knowledge of north Sheffield. The majority had never been in this part of Sheffield, and only a few could claim to be familiar with any part of the area.

3. See Baldwin and Bottoms (1976) The Urban Criminal, London, Tavistock, p.49.

4. The trend to owner-occupation is general in Britain and may be attributed to a number of factors, such as changing housing aspirations and the disincentive to letting property by private landlords following successive Rent Acts. Also important is that those terraced housing areas left free from the blight of clearance schemes are usually of the better type of housing which attract young buyers at the lowest price, and of the owner-occupier market offering opportunities for modernisation and improvement.

5. Although in Sheffield the proportion of the city's housing stock owned by the council is approximately 40%, in the northern sector this proportion must be much higher.

6. A newspaper clipping from the year 1904 stated in connection with another of the city's earliest housing schemes that there was a great demand for these dwellings but a number of the applicants were considered 'unsuitable'.

7. See Chapter One of this thesis.

8. The S.S.R.C. survey report states a finding of 60% in residence for ten years or more for both estates.

9. See, for example, descriptions of pre-war estates in the Shelter publication "Homes fit for Heroes" (1975).

10. A thoroughgoing modernisation programme is now in the pipeline for CHM and CHL.

11. Extract from a letter to the Housing Department.

12. I leave CHM out of my analysis here, as I found this to be an estate in transition as such complaints about many facets of life on the estate - including the condition of the housing - were even more acrimonous than those from CHH.

13. See, for example, Tuckers (1966) Honourable Estates, London, Gollancz.

14. See Hodges and Smith (1954) in G.D. Mitchell et al, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.

15. One of the practical effects of living on a stigmatised estate was brought home to me in my work as a taxi driver. If the firm had a call from an address on such an estate I was told to ask for the fare first. (This, I think, was essentially a joke and I certainly never had any problem with payment from anyone living on such an estate.) More serious perhaps is the effect of addresses in finance applications. Friends in the motor trade used to look with scepticism on H.P. applicants from CHH - sometimes they passed on the application to a finance company, more often they sold the vehicle to another customer with better credentials without passing on the application of the CHH applicant. This attitude was re-inforced by several refusals from finance companies of applicants from CHH. One in particular rang the garage and told the owner to stop wasting his time on obviously useless applications. He went on to describe the exterior of the house of the applicant in graphic detail.

16. In fact, although the use of these terms varies as much in the literature as it does in everyday life, there seems to be some consensus on the characteristics of the two extreme types - the 'problem' family and the 'respectables'. The empirically based descriptions tally.

17. For a sympathetic understanding of the everyday life of a 'problem' family I would recommend Lassell's Wellington Road. The author herself does not use this label.

18. This family were personal friends of mine, who I met originally through my work as a taxi driver. Subsequently I read their housing records at the Department.

19. 'Surprising' when one considers the criticisms of these visitors in the literature, and also 'surprising' when the pressure put on such a worker, by the volume and frequency of complaints, is considered.

20. This family I knew only indirectly through friends on CHH - consequently most information comes from the Housing Department.

21. A number of neighbours of the Martins in their third CHH tenancy have already applied for a transfer.

22. See Chapters Eight and Nine of this thesis.

23. This is discussed more fully in Chapter Seven.

24. Having spent some time getting to know residents of both estates I believe that if there had been a comparable collection of families on CHL I would have got to know them, if not personally, at least through neighbour gossip.

CHAPTER SIX

CFH and CFL : field research on the two estates

1. The historical origins of the two estates

Both estates were built in the early sixties, at a time of rapid council house building expansion, to meet the demands of a long waiting list and the renewal of slum clearance programmes after the war. CFL was the first to be completed, the first flats being let in 1959 and the final lettings taking place in 1962. CFH followed immediately, and was known as stage two of the same housing project, the first flats on this development being let in 1962 and the final ones in 1965. Both estates are of the 'medium' rise slab type, having lifts, outside staircases and landings for access, based on the idea of the reproduction of 'streets' built above ground level. The 1960's was a period when central government subsidies encouraged the building of 'high rise' housing and Sheffield, like other local authorities, accepted this 'new' type of building to alleviate the great housing shortage in the city. The City Council obviously felt great satisfaction at the rate of building and the fact that on the completion of CFH the waiting list had been reduced to an all time low of six months, from an earlier high, when CFL was completed, of twelve to fifteen years. In these early years foreign visitors were shown around these 'show piece' estates, the Department of the Environment included CFL in a study of high flats, and the Housing Department itself produced a very satisfying survey (from its own point of view) on tenant satisfaction with CFL. (Damers 1962.) Rents were high for the time on both CFL and CFH - although they included a heating and hot water charge - and the flats were not at this stage of their history likely to be offered to low income applicants, nor indeed those with low domestic standards.

Until recently the Housing Department has not openly differentiated between the two estates, which are often known by the same name. As early as 1967 the Housing Department, through its annual reports, has acknowledged that the residential mobility on these two estates, taken together, has been higher than is normal for other more conventional type council housing in the city; and the actual demand for transfers and exchanges is even higher. By the time of my research within the Department (1976-1977) the staff were well aware of differences between the two estates in terms of 'problems' for the management.

Firstly, CFH has been in much lower demand than CFL really from first lettings, but this trend has increased with the years, and so by 1976, CFH had come to be considered 'a great letting difficulty'. Demand was low and the numbers requesting transfers were high. In 1977 the Department produced a report on four of the city's estates of this particular architectural design - 'the concrete jungles' as they are commonly known. In this Report, although both CFL and CFH are included as estates with problems, CFH is singled out as particularly problematic, the transfer request rate being almost twice as high as that on CFL. The Report gives the average rates of transfers to total tenancies on the two estates as follows :

CFH	22.2%
CFL	10.3%

It states that the average rate of transfer to total tenancies in Sheffield is approximately 11%. Although the Report does not make the basis of the figures any too clear it may be assumed that the figures refer to current transfer requests as a percentage of total dwellings on each estate. This figure, however, excludes families without children. In Chapter Nine of this thesis I present further data on transfer requests which I collected from the Housing Department.

Another difference in the two estates experienced by the Housing Department is the level of rent arrears. Informally, I was told that CFH accounted for at least two thirds of the outstanding rent arrears on the two estates taken together. Other problems were particularly associated with CFH, such as tenancy absconding~~s~~, vandalism, tenant complaints, welfare involvement, occurred to a much great extent than on CFL. It would seem, therefore, that the picture given by the official offender rate statistics for the two estates, of CFH being the problem estate, is also upheld by the experience of the Housing Department.

Mawby (1979A) shows that there is not as great a difference in the offence rates for CFH and CFL as there is in the offender rates. The rates for 1971 per 1,000 households for the two estates are as follows :

	CFH	CFL
Indictable Offender Rate	76.7	22.2
Residential Indictable Offence Rate	31.2	20.2

(p.62)

The victim survey also showed that while there is a small difference in the predicted direction in the self report victimisation rates for the two estates, both CFH and CFL had high victimisation rates compared with other council areas. However, when the type of offences claimed by the respondents in the victim survey are considered, many of these seem to be of a trivial nature, such as thefts of milk from the doorstep. It may be that the design of such flatted developments is conducive to such offences being committed, regardless of the social characteristics of the resident population.

2. Points of comparison

Initially CFL and CFH were selected for comparison because they had, according to the official criminal statistics, ~~unduly~~ widely different offender rates, but at the same time, matched on other variables. They are of the

same architectural type, situated adjacent to each other, separated only by a main road and some blocks of pre-war council flats. They are comparable in terms of age and size of estates, types of dwelling and rents. Census data revealed that the estates also had a similar social class composition. Further examination of the population characteristics of the estates has, however, revealed a difference that was not initially realised. The residents' survey revealed that CFH had twice as many residents aged under 35, and half as many aged over 55, as against CFL. CFH also had a markedly higher child density for young children (but not for those in the juvenile offending age group of 10-16) and a slightly larger average household size. Length of stay also revealed a marked difference, with 2½ times as many recent residents (under 2 years) on CFH, and correspondingly more long-stay residents on CFL. Both these variables, age structure of the population and length of tenancies are obviously relevant to an understanding of the differences in offender rate for the two estates.

The age structure of the population of an estate is an important variable to be considered when explaining differences in rate of offenders residing on the estates. The greater the number of old people in a population the lower the number at risk in terms of offending, and vice versa. However, the situation on CFL and CFH is not as simple as this. Information gained from the Housing Department revealed that there was no greater provision of old persons dwellings on CFL than on CFH. Of the total number of dwellings on CFL, 29.9% were for old persons, and the percentage for old people on CFH is 30.1% It is, therefore, necessary to explain why CFH has a younger population than CFL if a thorough understanding of the estates' differentials is to be obtained.

Similarly, with the greater residential mobility revealed on CFH it is not enough to fall back on a Jones (1958) type explanation of the

high offender rate in terms of social disorganisation through high residential mobility, even if the empirical field research reveals characteristics associated with social disorganisation. Rather, on two such similar estates the reason for the differences in residential mobility also demands explanation. Thus, my research has pushed the explanation of the differential offender rates of the two estates back a stage. Differences between the two estates in terms of age structure, rate of residential mobility and rates of offender residence all demand explanation and cannot be taken, in themselves, as sufficient cause and effect variables.

3. The socio-geographic setting

It has already been noted that both CFL and CFH are of the medium rise block type of development, as opposed to high rise towers which have internal access only through lifts and internal staircases. Much of the popular wisdom on high flats suggests there is something about high living per se which fosters criminal and delinquent behaviour amongst its residents. There is also the idea associated with Newman's thesis that the design of such buildings can make crime commission easier and therefore more tempting, with the result that such blocks may have higher crime rates than some traditional types of housing. Both these types of explanation in terms of the quality of life of high living and the architectural design of the buildings is immediately inadequate for the present research problem, just because the two estates are of similar building type, in close physical proximity and yet have different offender rates. Moreover, Newman was concerned with offence rates rather than offender residence rates, which are the primary concern of this research.

CFL is the more central to the city of the two blocks, and contains a busy shopping centre within the estate, its boundaries are formed by a railway line and main roads. CFH is also bounded by main roads

on two sides and the other boundaries of the estate are formed by Blackacre and the greyhound track. CFH has one or two unpleasant environmental features not shared by CFL, primarily the proximity of the abbattoir, which is the cause of a very unpleasant smell, particularly in the summer. The greyhound track is also a source of great dissatisfaction with many on account of the noise.

To the passing stranger, CFL is quite obviously the more 'alive' of the two estates - the local shopping centre serves as a social mecca for residents and much use is made of the outside seats in fine weather. The CFL shops include clothes, shoes, chemist, snack bar, greengrocer, confectionary, fish and chips. The precinct also contains the estate office, a travel agency, a betting shop and a couple of pubs. CFH, in contrast, has a rather desolate air and much more apparent vandalism. There are a few shops on the estate, but these are not comparable with the selection on CFL, and little ~~care~~ use appears to be ~~given to~~ made the public space. Although both estates are noisy by the standards of suburban housing - council or private - it is the noise on CFH which is most immediately noticeable. In fact, CFH is typical of the more dismal of the 'concrete jungles' - litter everywhere blowing around one's feet in the wind, vandalised telephone boxes and ubiquitous graffiti scrawls. On one part of the estate a graveyard has been ~~broken~~ taken into and the tombstones laid flat - on these graffiti was particularly prominent. The confusion of noise seemed to be mainly people shouting, children screaming and dogs barking. Progress around the estate is rather hazardous, due to the fact that missiles - particularly bottles - are constantly thrown from the balconies and consequently the ground is strewn with broken glass. In the summer all these discomforts are added to by the particularly nauseating stench from the abbattoir. The estate is overrun by dogs - although the keeping of dogs is prohibited by the corporation - and although I did not witness them

myself a number of residents reported seeing rats amongst the rubbish in the estate surrounds.

On CFL there are some signs of graffiti and a bit of litter, but nothing on the scale of CFH. Although noisy, it is considerably less so than CFH. Another difference in appearance between the two estates is on the balconies - on CFH these are generally littered with rubbish and washing is on display. On CFL washing is less apparent, and many balconies are adorned with pot plants and the like. CFH, then, has all the outward appearance of the council-slum, so graphically depicted in the more recent sociological literature on council housing. CFL, in contrast, although also of the less popular 'concrete jungle' type of council housing, does not share the 'slummy' appearance of CFH.

4. Reputations

While to outsiders the two estates are often seen as one 'dreadful enclosure', known by one or other of the estates' names, to those on the 'inside' - tenants, applicants, Housing Department staff, social workers and such like - the two estates have become very different in terms of their social character, and thus their reputation. CFL is referred to as a 'community', the residents are perceived as mainly 'decent', 'respectable' people. CFH is seen as a hot bed of 'problem' families coming from "all over". Such descriptions I have picked up from residents and officials alike. I was told by Housing Department staff that I would notice the difference on CFH, a social worker said you could 'feel' the difference. Another staff member invited me to watch the tenants coming into the office on rent day: he predicted I would be able to tell their estate with a high degree of accuracy.[2] Residents, themselves, also made the distinction between the estates. Many residents of CFL said they would not consider a tenancy on CFH, some said they had turned down such an offer prior to

accepting their present tenancy. In contrast, a number of residents of CFH told me that they would like a transfer to CFL. "It's quieter and friendlier there", said Mrs. G., and her sentiments were shared by many.

In more recent times the local press has begun to pick up the emerging different social character of the two estates, and thus contributed to the growing notoriety of CFH. In a spate of incidents, ranging from a murder, an attack in the lifts, pets thrown off balconies and three indecent assaults on children,[3] CFH has been singled out as the archetypal 'problem' estate.[4] The reputation of CFH, and CFL, when these are lumped together by outsiders, is not only horrendous, but also widely known. While CHH is "locally notorious", the reputation of CFH is common knowledge in Sheffield. Part of the prominence of this reputation at least must be attributable to the geographical location of CFH and CFL, and their architectural prominence which makes them much more visible and identifiable than CHH.

Everyone in the Housing Department appeared condemnatory of CFH - both of the residents themselves and of an allocation policy that had let such a situation arise. One housing assistant referred to it as a 'ghetto for problem families'. A lady clerk remarked - 'I wouldn't live there rent free'. Her husband is a rent collector on CFH. She mentioned the rent collector on a similar estate in Glasgow who was murdered.

> "I tell my husband if he gets stopped to let them have the money."

All present in the room showed agreement when she said :

> "No self-respecting person would live on that estate."

The residents of CFH are well aware of its dreadful reputation, and few seek to deny its justification. Again, most residents I spoke to saw its notoriety as earned by other residents on the estate. There is not

so much emphasis here as in the northern estates on slum clearance families as 'problem' families.[5] Most also believed that in the end the corporation is culpable for the situation on CFH - both through its allocation policy and also because in the first place it should never have built such a 'monstrosity' for people to live in. Many informants appeared to be frightened by the very reputation of the estate. Thus, a number of residents told me that although they had never actually been mugged or raped on the estate themselves they were fearful of walking about, using the lifts and stairs, especially at night. Some, of course, had had unpleasant experiences in the communal areas, and most had experienced missiles being thrown from the balconies. CFH, then, for some at least represented a physical threat, and to such people living on the estate is 'a never-ending nightmare'.[6] Some of this fear had doubtless been encouraged by wide reporting of the murder of an elderly woman on the estate by a teenage boy, and by other acts of violence. How realistic such personal fears were - that is, the mathematical probability of a resident being a victim of a violent crime by virtue of the fact of residence on that estate is unimportant. The fact that more than a few felt physically threatened , and that in more extreme cases people, particularly women, could be 'marooned' in their flats by this fear mean that the reputation had affected some people's everyday life.

Most people in the area, and certainly the staff of the Housing Department, acknowledged that CFH had a better part. The high rise block of CFH was unanimously considered the worst part of the estate, but two rows of maisonettes, built before the rest of CFH but after CFL were considered the better part of the estate and even 'not really CFH'. In fact, within the Department these maisonettes were often referred to as CFL. When informants described high rise CFH as the worst part of the estate this was not usually predominantly in terms of its design - although one got the impression this went without saying - it was thought that there

were real differences in the behaviour of the residents of high rise CFH. They were described as 'noisier', 'rougher' and so on, in fact these are amongst the most mild descriptions given of the residents of this part of the estate. Rent collectors, social workers, maintenance men, a great variety of staff from the estate office, all perceived the problem as CFH high rise. The residents endorsed this situation. Informants living on the maisonettes said nothing would have got them to accept a tenancy on the high rise blocks, whereas many living on this unenviable block said they would really like a maisonette on CFH. For these people, as for many others, it was not the area they objected to, nor the flats themselves - although many expressed a preference for a traditional type house and garden given the choice - but the estate itself. On high rise CFH there was no getting away from traversing the estate when going to and from the dwelling. Some of the most popular flats on CFH were the highest ones, called 'penthouses'. These enjoyed a fantastic view and were reputed to be more select - a reputation no doubt aided by their name. Even so, tenants of penthouses had to face the problem of 'getting out' and 'coming in' before they could forget the estate, isolated in their home in the sky.

5. <u>The residents</u>

The first impression of difference between these post-war flats and the pre-war estates as a participant observer was the initial friendliness of the people. In particular on CFH strangers were quite ready and willing to talk on meeting me in public places, such as the launderette and the shops. In this the estate was more reminiscent of one of the old twilight areas of a city where a highly mobile population and multiple occupation has thrown strangers together, and the barriers to social intercourse are at least partially removed. On CHH, CHL, and CHM in contrast, the neighbourhood is 'more clannish', and I had to work at being accepted by the residents.

On CFL my first hint of a local community came when a number of informants told me they had asked for CFL because they were 'local' people. They seemed to have come from the area that was cleared to build the flats and from a nearby clearance area, others had transferred to a new flat from the old pre-war estates in the vicinity.[7] These people seemed well-satisfied with their housing, they knew many people on the estate, had family and friends as neighbours, and appreciated the amenities of a modern flat with central heating and hot water in with the rent. They appreciated its position, vis-a-vis the city centre and its good local shopping centre. Some reported they had put in with their neighbours or other members of their family for a transfer to CFL when it was being built, wanting to move together. There did not seem to be the same split in the estate between slum clearance tenants and the rest that I had noticed on the pre-war estates, rather the qualification for acceptance was being a " .... person".[8] The area it is true must have changed out of all recognition for these people, but they have managed to reproduce a community, albeit in a very different physical environment.

I also, however, met people from CFH low rise who had transferred to these maisonettes from surrounding estates with old neighbours, family or friends. Thus, for example, a friend I made during the days of informal observation, Barbara, had a tenancy on CFH low rise. Married, with two children, she had until recently been living with in-laws on a neighbouring estate. The CFH maisonettes were her first choice for housing, as it was not far from her in-laws, and her mother and father already lived there. Her parents, the Owens, had in fact moved in the early sixties when the maisonettes were new, motivated by the desire to be nearer town and have more modern accommodation. The Owen's friends and neighbours, the Wrights, had already moved to the maisonettes and suggested to the Owens that they asked for a transfer there as well. Today all three families are quite

happy on the maisonettes, although they regret the reputation of CFH high rise has cast a shadow on them too.

> "The trouble is, people say "Oh CFH" when I give my address, and I know what they're thinking 'That's a bad area'. Its not though its not a bit like CFH".

Similarly, Mrs. Jones told me :

> "I was lucky I got a transfer off - Row (CFH high rise) before everybody was trying to get off. I wanted to be near my sister's family, they already had one of these maisonettes ... but as the estate's turned out I would have wanted off anyway. I couldn't live there now ."

On CFL and CFH low rise I met residents who had wanted to live on their estate whether they had come under clearance schemes or had obtained a transfer from other corporation property, or had waited on the list for a tenancy. In the case of the clearance families a few I met on CFL had come from another clearance area and had accepted a tenancy on CFL as the second best to staying in their own area. One or two, like Mrs. Jones, told me that they had asked at the time to be transferred back to their area of origin when building there was completed. When the time came, however, as Mrs. Jones put it :

> "We'd got used to it and didn't want to move again. Knowing a few from - helped, it made you feel more at home."

The Smiths had, in fact, accepted a transfer back to their old area but only stayed a couple of years.

> "It was a mistake;we had got settled at - and never realised it so we went for an exchange."

One family had come from Blackacre and then put in for a transfer to a house (because they wanted a garden) and were offered a relet on Blackacre again. This they refused, saying they had come to CFL, "to better ourselves. The very name of Blackacre carries a stigma and to move back there would be a step backwards." This family eventually accepted a transfer to a post-war estate on the periphery of the city, but within eighteen months

they had got back by exchange. "We made a terrible mistake in leaving."

The first signs of inter-generational continuities in community are emerging on CFL and CFH low rise. The flats being now some fifteen to eighteen years old, young couples brought up from being young children on the estate are requesting a tenancy there after marriage. I met a few very young couples who saw CFL or CFH low rise as their home and had no desire to leave after marriage.

In contrast, my informants on CFH stressed their lack of choice of housing which had brought them to their present tenancy. Many of them told me that they had been advised that CFH, along with another block of post-war flats in the city, would be their first chance of housing, and out of desperation they had said they would accept an offer on one of these estates. Mrs. Andrews is typical, separated from her husband she had returned to her parents, who live on a pre-war estate in the city. She had two children and a baby and was given a room in her parents' house. As her parents had not approved of the marriage , and because they were indeed very overcrowded, having five sons living at home, Mrs. Andrews felt very unwelcome and in the way. She told me she felt 'just a failure'. When the chance of CFH came up she jumped at it.

> "It was CFH or - . I chose CFH because it was that bit nearer town."

Now, like other residents, she complains of the dirt, noise and rowdiness on the estate. She worries constantly about the children, she doesn't dare let them out to play on their own and above all she is lonely and isolated.

Mrs. Andrews, I have said, is typical, and like many other residents she accepted the CFH tenancy, not because she wanted it, but because she needed housing. She saw it as a short-term expedient, a quick way to getting a council tenancy, but she has learnt that what she had seen as temporary accommodation has a certain permanence about it.

"I've been here five years. I never thought I'd have to stay that long. I've tried for an exchange, but who'd want to come here, I'm down for a transfer but its a long wait for anywhere decent. Sometimes I think I'll go out of my mind - it's the loneliness, you know, that and the roughness of the people. It's not good for the kids either you know."

Mrs. Andrews' parents actually live on CHH, she said:

"They say its rough up here (CHH) but at least you know the people, they speak to you - I say go and try CFH then you'll know what a rough estate is .... No, I don't want a house on CHH. I want to better myself, why should I always have to live on a problem estate?"

The Hawkins were similarly desperate for housing;at the time they were offered CFH they were living in an attic room with three children and another expected. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hawkins were under 25 years old. Mr. Hawkins said :

"We couldn't go on like that it was damp and cold. There was three flights of stairs for the wife to climb with the pram and shopping. We had all the kiddies in one bed and us in the other, and to cap it all, the landlord wanted us out and kept threatening to put our things out. They offered us this, it seemed the answer."

The exceptions to this picture of dissatisfaction and despondency were the few Blackacre families I met. CFH, being adjacent to Blackacre, it was the obvious choice for young couples from this estate who could not wait for a Blackacre tenancy. Jane, a young girl of nineteen, with two children told me :

"We were living with his mum and dad on - Road (Blackacre) we got on alright but there were too many of us, anyway we wanted our own place. Well we were offered this flat and although the place has got a bad name its near to his parents and not far from mine and we knew people already on the estate. We want to get off now because we need a house and garden for the kids, but its not been that bad. The flat's modern, the heating's in with the rent and there's good and bad everywhere ... we want Blackacre ... well its what we've always known, it's where our friends are."

Jimmy Parkin also came from Blackacre to live with his brother and family who have a tenancy on CFH. He told me he was not bothered about the estate,

he was after all living in an area he knew and where most of his friends lived nearby.

> "Its alright, I've got friends and family here, I wouldn't knock it."

The residents quoted and described in this section have been chosen to illustrate the impression of the estates gained from informal observation. At the time of this fieldwork I thought them to be representative of the residents of these estates in general, and subsequent work within the estates' office has supported this. Additional support comes from the findings of the interview survey. The differences between the two estates in terms of the residents' feeling at home on their estate and identifying with the area are brought out by the question 'Thinking about the area where you live do you feel you belong here?'. On CFH only 42% of respondents answered yes to this, compared with 75% on CFL. If it is remembered that CFH for this survey will include the more popular maisonettes on this estate, and that this type of research method appears to record more satisfaction generally than the deeper probing of a participant observer, this in itself would seem to show a staggering discontent with CFH. It is perhaps worth repeating here that on the other 'problem' estate with which this research is concerned, CHH, 77% of respondents said they felt they belonged in the area.

6. Living on CFL and CFH

CFL, as I have already indicated, gives the appearance of a fairly happy estate. Residents told me they liked it because it was a community, others told me they had always lived in the area. Many appreciated the easy access to the city centre and the good transport facilities. This was financially beneficial, giving them a wider choice of shops, easy access to the markets and savings on bus fare. These flats also saved residents

money in terms of heating. Some had exchanged from peripheral estates for these reasons. Many residents told me they missed not having a garden and that the estate was noisy, and there were many complaints about children, in particular, playing around the lifts and on the landings. Nevertheless, for most the 'friendliness' of CFL compensated for this and for the ' - people' the fact of living in their own area was the main consideration. Where I encountered dissatisfaction on CFL it seemed to focus on being a flat dweller, that is, the feeling of living in a highly populated area in a dwelling which lacked individuality and, above all, had not the private garden space that traditional housing offers. People who were dissatisfied at this aspect of life on CFL would have felt the same on any 'flat estate'. These were the residents who yearned for a house on a conventional estate. Others did complain of vandalism and the general estate environment outside the dwelling.

These findings on CFL are very similar to those on CFH low rise. On these maisonettes, however, there was less emphasis on claustrophobia arising from the building design, but residents have often showed themselves worried by the proximity of high rise CFH, both in terms of sharing its stigma and the reality of living so close to the type of people found on this part of the estate.

The quality of life on high rise CFH, as experienced by the residents, is very different from that on CFH low rise and CFL. Certainly to the outsider this estate is noisier, dirtier and shabbier. Broken glass, rubbish and dogs' excreta are everywhere, the estate resounds with a cacophony of children screaming, adults shouting and dogs barking. The walls are daubed with graffiti, and everywhere there is evidence of vandalism. Nearly all the residents I spoke with emphasised the physically threatening nature of the complex. The lifts and staircases were seen as likely places to be attacked at night, and missiles of all sorts thrown

from the landings have to be dodged by day as well as by night. CFL, of course, has lifts and landings, but such dark corners are more frightening on an estate where neighbours are seen as 'rough' than on an estate where most people are thought to be 'friendly and decent'. Residents of both estates were worried by the activities of children playing on the estate, but on CFH high rise these children were more typically seen as 'villains and vandals', rather than 'naughty', as some of the children on CFL were described to me. An additional problem for CFH high rise is that it makes an interesting 'playground' for children off neighbouring Blackacre. Thus residents suspected that many of the kids who take a delight in throwing bottles from the landings or vandalising cars were not all, in fact, from CFH itself but many were 'outsiders' from Blackacre.

Residents of both estates would appear to have welcomed police patrolling of the estate on the ground and on the landings. Even the more 'deviant' residents of CFH that I met would not have objected to such a police presence, as it was generally agreed that everyone suffered from the activities of the kids.[9] Jimmy Parkin, for example, had several convictions to his name for various sorts of theft, as had his brother and other members of his family, but although basically antagonistic to the police he, too, would have welcomed intervention to prevent all the bottle throwing.

"Its daft and its dangerous" he said to me one night after having narrowly escaped being hit by a television set dropped over a landing. I did meet a couple of self-confessed missile throwers. One told me his parents didn't know what he did, the other lived with his father and three brothers - his mother having deserted them - and his father was too harrassed to care. The latter also had a penchant for lighting fires among his other sins. He was, however, a very likeable boy, with a very engaging line of chat.

"Its the area", he said to me, explaining all his sins away, but as he continually complained of his boredom I felt that this was probably the more influential cause.[10] Being bored on a complex such as CFH offers a boy like this several opportunities of action that probably would be denied him in an ordinary street with no lifts and balconies, and where the ~~role~~ mask of identification would be more of a deterrent. Even on CFL I noticed that residents could more easily identify the kids than on CFH high rise, where the anonymity extended to the kids too. Thus, my informants on CFL could name a few troublesome families, but on CFH high rise, although there were the usual specific complaints about neighbours, few of the offending children could be identifiable to the victim. To some extent, then, in a residential area where there is a community of ordinary more or less conforming people, typically holding long length tenancies, that community can exercise some social control over deviants. Parents of troublesome children are sought out, or complaints about specific children are made to the estates office or porter. In contrast, on CFH high rise, the feeling of being surrounded by nameless delinquents and unidentifiable aggressors is prevalent.

On CFH high rise, there is some satisfaction with the flats themselves, their modern amenities and the rents being inclusive of hot water and heating. CFH high rise is also fairly central and I met one or two people who had moved there to be near to town. The general feeling, however, with a few ex-Blackacre exceptions, was that life on the estate was intolerable, and its particular advantages of relatively low cost living and convenience factors were far outweighed by the many miseries of living on the estate.

On both estates there was a consensus of opinion that flats are not suited to families with young children. This belief was articulated both by parents of young children who had the problem of where to let their

play and how to keep them supervised, and by parents of older children who were often on the receiving end of complaints. Similarly, those without children found their neighbours' children a considerable nuisance in buildings which had no outside private space to which children could be confined or from which other peoples' children could be excluded.

7. Crime on the two estates

Residents on both estates complained of petty thefts and vandalism, and juveniles were held largely responsible. On CFL these complaints, however, tended to be 'by the way', whereas in conversations with residents of CFH, these complaints were in the forefront. The residents of CFH blamed both residents of the estate and 'outsiders', particularly it was thought teenagers lounging around the estate who came from the neighbouring Blackacre. The majority of informants from both estates wanted the police to patrol the corridors and surrounds of the blocks. Most also gave the impression that they found the environment of these blocks, their design and layout more physically threatening than traditional type housing estates. Women, in particular, on CFH feared the lifts and dark corners where potential aggressors might wait, and nearly everyone on CFH disliked walking under the landings because of the danger of flying missiles. The architectural design of these blocks are seen as offering more opportunity to criminals and more temptation to juvenile delinquents than traditional type housing does. But on an estate such as CFL, where most people feel at home and secure and believe the estate to be quite safe and relatively crime free, the design is not as threatening as on CFH, where most people believe that the chance of physical attack is not remote, and where neighbours, being unknown, are perceived as threatening rather than supportive.

The other obvious difference between the two estates as perceived by the residents was that informants from CFL seemed to believe that there

could be a few 'villains' among them, but on CFH everybody's neighbour was suspected of "villainous behaviour". In fact, offenders on CFH might be split into two broad categories. Firstly, the vandals and bottle throwers who appeared to spend much time on the estate and made it the focus of their delinquent activities, and secondly, those residents who committed crimes of a less public, more acquisitive nature. In the former category I met mostly juveniles involved mainly in non-acquisitive delinquencies who terrorise the estate generally. In the latter category I met a few people with criminal convictions, or who had a member of the family with a criminal conviction - usually for thefts, the offence very often committed off the estate. I have already indicated the relationship between debt and crime in the context of the pre-war estates, and one or two of my informants suggested that financial worry had prompted them into committing thefts. Interestingly, I also met one or two more continual offenders with a number of convictions for a variety of larceny and burglary offences who had originated from Blackacre. Having met in the course of my research a number of Blackacre residents, I would suggest that a very similar situation pertains on this estate as on CHH, that is, the estate has a flourishing deviant subculture, into which children are socialised from a young age.[11] CFH, as I have suggested, has become a popular choice of estate for young couples from Blackacre, who cannot wait for an offer on their estate of origin. CFH is also the recipient of many young couples who come not from Blackacre but from other areas where certain types of criminal behaviour are 'normal'. Through the intergenerational continuities I discuss in the next chapter, the children of 'problem' families are quite likely to experience housing difficulties when they start a family of their own.

Typically, they will not organise and secure a home before starting a family. These young couples will be housed on the estates involving the shortest waiting time, and in Sheffield the shortest wait is for CFH. ~~Po~~

To reiterate, it is certainly not the case that all people in great housing need are 'problem' families. However, many of the adult children of 'problem' families will reproduce these problems in their own lives, and so become people in great housing need. The children of 'respectable' families on select estates do not so often find themselves in the position of being forced to ask for the quickest form of housing from the council. Residents of both estates are quick to point out why CFH has so many "villains". As one respondent put it :

> "Its an estate for all sorts of people with all sorts of problems from all sorts of places."

Most felt that the Housing Department had deliberately made CFH into such an estate by its allocation policy.

One or two informants from CFH thought it was, in fact, less the people of CFH themselves and more the intrusion of their Blackacre neighbours which made the estate so rough.

In contrast, CFL was described as 'a good community', housing mainly local people who led essentially normal, conforming lives.

Mawby's (1978) data on domestic disputes also supports the differences shown by the official crime statistics for the two estates, and ~~supported~~ suggested by my own observations. Using data from March to December 1974 on domestic disputes reported to the police, Mawby estimates firstly an annual rate of disputes per 1,000 households, and secondly, an annual rate of separate households involved in disputes.

	CFH	CFL
Disputes	41.9	16.9
Disputants	33.9	10.9

A high level of domestic disputes on CFH would be predicted from my observations of the population structure of CFH, the high proportion of young families housed here, most of whom had previously been in great need of housing. In Chapters Eight and Nine I examine more closely from Housing Department records some population characteristics of the two estates.

NOTES :

1. See Baldwin, J. (1974), Problem Housing Estates - Perceptions of Tenants, City Officials and Criminologists. Social and Economic Administration 8, pp.116-35.

2. Certainly the tenants of CFH generally looked poorer than those on CFL. The bedraggled, bedroom slippered women in the launderette of CFH, for example, contrast sharply with the smartly turned out women I saw in the shops and launderettes of CFL.

3. The indecent assaults occurred on CFL also.This led to the formation of vigilante groups.

4. A policeman was quoted in the local press as saying the problem with policing such a block was the danger of being hit by bottles thrown from the balconies. Since the research a child has actually been killed by a flying missile on CFH.

5. This letter to the 'Star' is typical :-

   "wouldn't it be better and cheaper to re-house the decent tenants of (CFH) and leave the vandals and their families (there are more of them than there are of us) to complete the mess they have made in this vast monstrosity?"

6. Words of a friend of mine housed on CFH.

7. There are a number of pre-war estates in the immediate vicinity of CFL and CFH. This is an area of the city which is also almost exclusively council housing with some six or seven major estates being in juxtaposition, covering an area of some two square miles.

8. That is a person local to the area. The name cannot be revealed for reasons of confidentiality. Slum clearance areas, as I point out elsewhere in this thesis, should not be assumed to be homogeneous, either in terms of population characteristics, or in terms of reputation. The area where CFL now stands was always thought to be a highly respectable working class area. In contrast, the area where the slum clearance families 'invading' CHL and CHM came from has always been notorious in the city. Even now, this area is thought by many to be the worst in Sheffield, both in terms of the houses and the environment, and in terms of the people living there.

9. At the time of the field research the police were not able to patrol the estates, as it was corporation property. In the last year, however, several of the landings on CFH have been redefined as highways, and the police are able to patrol those.

10. Eventually his father re-married and they went to live in his wife's tenancy on another estate. I never did follow up Andrew to find out whether the new area had 'changed his ways'.

11. I have not enough empirical evidence on the 'Blackacre' tenants of CFH to warrant a discussion on how much of the crime and, in particular, delinquency associated with CFH residents is attributable

to their subcultural history. In the next chapter, however, I discuss the subcultural links of deviancy on CHH, and from the little knowledge I have of 'ex-Blackacre' tenants on CFH, combined with discussions on this with housing officials, I believe that much of this is relevant to the Blackacre group on CFH.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Towards an explanation - some ideas and conclusions from the field research

1. Reputations

1.1 The importance of a reputation

From the first days in the field the reputation of the housing estates I was concerned with and those of other council estates in the city was continually brought to my notice, and I came to see this as of the greatest importance in understanding and thus being able to offer an explanation for differences in social character between estates. The high offender rate estates did have undesirable reputations, but this did not immediately show the way to point the causal arrow. I began to trace out the links between the reputation of a housing estate and other important themes that kept recurring, such as tenant satisfaction with dwellings, estate and environment, the differences in popularity of areas of the city in which estates were built, the tenants' restricted ability to choose their area of residence and the movement to and away from council estates. From the first, people explained to me why they moved to their present housing, what they liked or disliked about it and where they would like to move, if they wanted to move in terms of the reputation of their housing area.

However, residence on an estate with an undesirable reputation need not cause dissatisfaction for all or even the majority of tenants. Not only do problem estates vary in terms of their popularity with residents, but as I have suggested in Chapter Three, the term "problem estate" has been used to describe estates with very different characteristics. The defining characteristic of a problem estate for the Sheffield study is one with high official offender residence rates. Such estates, as Baldwin

(1974) shows, need not share the characteristic, so often attributed to problem estates, of the majority of residents being distressed or dissatisfied with their housing situation.

1.2 The reputations of the five estates

On CHH, (as I have shown) the 'indigenous' population are often 'content' with the estate - although not with the actual houses - and unworried by its reputation. On CFH I found more evidence of the distress and dissatisfaction often attributed to 'problem' estates, among all residents. There was dissatisfaction with life on the estate, and distress at having to live on such a stigmatised development.

Not all reputations are negative: council house estates may also have reputations for being 'select'. CHL is an estate with such a reputation. Residents of CHL told me it had 'always been select', that it was 'known as a nice area', that they had to 'wait a long time' for their tenancy on the estate, and that neighbours were 'respectable' and until recently there had been "no 'problem families' on the estate". At the time of my research residents of both CHL and CHM had begun to worry about the reputation of their estates when it became common knowledge that slum clearance tenants were being housed there. This, coupled with the state of repair of the housing, and the better council housing being built nearby, made a number of residents think they were living in a declining area. These people seemed to worry about the personal effects of the stigma of living in an undesirable area, and also the practical effect that it might be increasingly difficult to move away. The fear that CHL and CHM might deteriorate, both in terms of the reputations and the reality of living on the estates prompted a number of people I met to 'put in for a transfer'. These transfer requests were often to a nearby newly built estate, and the very fact that one or two people took this action encouraged others to do the same.

Mrs. K said to me,

> "One neighbour moved to - and the others got an exchange to - . We don't really want to move, this has always been a select estate. You were one up if you lived here. It worries you though wondering who you'll get in as neighbours. I think in the end we'll put in for - too."

Those residents I spoke to on CHL who reacted like Mrs. K to recent tenancy changes on the estate and to the frustration of living in deteriorating housing were still in a minority. Most still felt it was a good estate to live on. It is too early yet to look for changes in the social character of CHL and CHM through the influx of slum clearance tenants. It may be that slum clearance families will not change the character of the estate in any direct way, but the reaction to them by older residents might, through increasing the vacancy rate and through the loss of the 'select' reputation, put these estates in lower demand. Certainly CHM had not only lost its 'select' reputation, it was beginning to acquire an undesirable one, and a number of prospective tenants of the council told me they would not ask for this estate. Any loss in reputation and social status that CHL and CHM have suffered must be directly attributable to the influx of slum clearance tenants in recent years, that is, to the reputation of this type of corporation tenant rather than to their actual behaviour. In a similar way the belief that the council is using an estate for 'dumping' undesirable tenants may also lead to a change in the social character of an estate through the reaction of residents, irrespective of whether the council is really operating such a policy, or whether the newcomers are in fact 'undesirable'.

In contrast, CFL has had a high proportion of slum clearance tenants from first lettings, the estate being built in a clearance area. The reputation of this estate, however, if not 'select' is at least 'comfortably average' among insiders, despite the cloud of CFH which hangs over it. The majority of residents I spoke to did not want to leave the

estate even when they said that really they would prefer a house to a flat. Again, most people seemed to have lived on the estate for some years, quite a few had been the first tenants when the flats were newly built, and among these older tenants particularly, a number said they had chosen this estate. Another characteristic of the longer length tenants was that they were local people. The clearance families on this estate do not appear to be stigmatised by other residents, but rather are seen as the backbone of the community, and just as individual families are not stigmatised as 'clearance people', as many are on CHL, so the estate itself CFL is not stigmatised as a clearance estate. The difference in the treatment of clearance families on these two estates is not so curious on closer examination. The slum clearance tenants of CFL, far from being outsiders, were the original tenants and in the early days of the estate I was told,

> "Most of us came from this district on clearance - it was really the same people in different buildings, that is in flats rather than the old houses."

What is more curious perhaps is that the estate does not appear to have suffered from the stigma of being a slum clearance estate to outsiders in the way Hodges and Smith (1954), for example, describe the stigma of Blackacre. To some extent the answer must be in the 'slum' areas from which people came. Local people know that slum areas are not homogeneous as many 'outsiders' would seem to imply. 'Slum' areas are merely different residential areas of a city that have been designated for clearance by the local authority. These areas vary in reputation and 'social character' almost as much as council estates do. The slum clearance tenants of CFL came from two 'good' 'reputable' working class areas of the city. In contrast, the slum clearance tenants to Blackacre in the 1930's came from the city's roughest district. The slum clearance families arriving on CHM and CHL in the 1960's and 1970's are from a highly stigmatised area of housing which is in a very industrial part of the city. This area

itself in more recent years has changed in social composition, and is one of the areas of the city where immigrants have settled in relatively large numbers, the reputation of this 'slum' has been bad for many years, and recent population movements have brought it into further disrepute. The intruders to CHL and CHM are, in some cases, double strangers - from a different part of the city and a different race. A long established settled area such as CHL or CHM is least amenable to the reception of such 'outsiders'.

Residents of CFL are quick to distinguish between their estate and CFH. A few of them had first been made an offer on CFH which they had turned down before accepting their present tenancy on CFL. Mrs. Best said to me that although her family was virtually homeless she had refused CFH:

"I told them not CFH, not at any price."

She went on to say,

> "I can't say we wanted CFL - we didn't but it was quicker than - where we really wanted. But we wouldn't have taken - or CFH and we were told they were the quickest of all."

None of the residents of CFL high rise that I spoke to sought to deny the legitimacy of its 'dreadful' reputation, although most felt they personally were out of place on the estate. In contrast, the residents of CFL and the CFH maisonettes stressed that their estates were 'good' and 'respectable' and were extremely annoyed that their estates could be besmirched by the reputation gained by CFH high rise. As they pointed out to me, anyone who knew the estateswould have to admit the differences between them, both in terms of the appearances of the estates and behaviour of the residents. As one resident of CFL put it to me,

> "We have our rough families here but they're all rough up there."

A resident of the maisonettes said,

"We're a little community here - it's nothing like CFH."

All manner of rough and deviant behaviour was attributed to the residents of CFH high rise, and the amount of conspicuous vandalism and bottle throwing on CFH high rise reinforced the belief that people on this estate were rougher. Again, most people on these estates believed that the Housing Department had deliberately created a ghetto out of CFH high rise through their allocation policies. A number also mentioned that CFH high rise housed people from 'all over'. It was generally felt by residents of CFL and the CFH maisonettes that CFH high rise suffered from a lack of community, and that if it had housed mainly local people the residents would have identified with the estate and taken more interest in 'keeping it nice'. The irony of the situation was acknowledged by several residents of CFL, who pointed out that no local people would want to live there now anyway.

1.3 The origins of a negative reputation

At the time of my field research the origins of the reputation of CFH remained obscure, and those of CHH confused. In the case of CFH I could see the estate had the ingredients of a 'dreadful enclosure'. Although not built as a slum clearance estate it is of the least popular 'concrete jungle' type that mushroomed in British cities in the sixties. Many of these are now among local authorities' worst estates throughout the country. CFH also has a high child density for young children, and is at present showing signs of excessive wear and tear. Its architectural type and its demographic characteristics are enough to give it a 'bad' reputation, and the continual high rates of residential mobility are sufficient to maintain this reputation. At the same time, however, the architecturally similar estate CFL has a better balanced age structure and a more stable population. CFL has remained relatively unstigmatised and

has evolved as a fairly ordinary council estate.

CHH has none of the 'classic' problem estate origins, which in the literature are linked to the evolution of a 'bad' reputation, such as being a slum clearance estate, having original tenants of a low social status, or being of substandard planning, siting or construction. Nor does CHH have an excessively high child population or high rates of residential mobility. There seems no doubt about the 'select' origins of CHH and among older residents there is some consensus that the estate began to decline in post-war years. The demise of CHH at this time is attributed to the amount of better council housing being built[1] and its waning popularity with new applications for council housing. Also frequently mentioned is the presence of a number of very rough families on the estate. Both the uncompetitive housing on CHH and the 'rough' families gave the more respectable aspirational residents the motivation to move. Demand fell off for CHH as it gained an undesirable reputation. Tenants also emphasise the role of the Housing Department in further precipitating the decline of CHH by using it in recent years for housing 'problem families'. CHH, I was told by residents, has suffered a decline and has over the years slipped from 'select' to 'problem' status.

1.4 Local Authority housing policy and negative reputations - the tenants' perspective

No discussion of the origins of an estate's reputation can be complete without a consideration of the role of the local authority housing allocation policies in the formation of 'good' and 'bad' estates. Moreover, once a reputation is established allocation policies can re-inforce or combat a reputation. The most obvious way in which a local authority can be directly responsible for the reputation of its estates is by a deliberate policy of grading applicants, tenants and estates and matching them

accordingly. In the case of the 'problem' estate with the 'dreadful' reputation the local authority might have set this estate aside for the housing of those people perceived as unsatisfactory applicants and 'difficult' tenants, including those evicted from a previous council tenancy for either rent arrears or contravening tenancy regulations. In Chapters Two and Three I have discussed a number of researchers who argue that local authorities do precisely this. Despite these allegations local authority housing departments invariably deny operating such a policy.

The tenants I spoke to on all the council estates were fairly unanimous in apportioning the blame for a 'problem' estate with a 'bad' reputation on the council. Their accusations fell into two broad categories. Firstly, that certain estates were set aside by the council for the purposes of dumping undesirable tenants and applicants - in many cases these were seen as 'slum clearance' people, in others just 'problem' families. Secondly, that these estates were left to decline further by the council's lack of interest in repairs or maintenance. This latter view was, of course, most prevalent on the pre-war estates, although residents of CFH also said to me that the council neglected to maintain the estate environment because it was seen and used as the city's housing ghetto.

A great variety of people told me that the corporation used certain estates as 'dumps': a resident of CHH, for example, said to me,

> "We were graded low on account of us not being married and having a baby and I've got children by my husband in care. We weren't given any choice, one look at us and it was CHH or Blackacre and that was after 4 years on the list."

A resident of CHL told me,

> "They're deliberately using this estate to rehouse slum clearance tenants that's why they won't do anything about the houses, the council are going to turn it into a slum."

A resident of CFH said,

> "They come from all over - anyone they don't like the look of they stick them here. Me? We were living in one room and this was the first offer - we had to take it."

Residents appear to be well aware of the popularity and reputation of their estate. In the case of CHH, residents also seemed to know the 'worst' part of the estate, and in the immediate area of CHH it was the south-east corner which was held in the greatest disrepute. On CFH a similar situation pertained, whereby it was the 'high rise' block which was the most stigmatised and residents from the maisonettes tried to dissociate themselves from this part of the estate.

On CHH I met a number of people who wanted to leave the estate. Many of these gave their reasons, not only in terms of the roughness of the neighbours or the poor condition of the houses, but also because of the stigma attached to living there. On CFH the residents who didn't want to move were the exception. Again, those who wanted to move invariably mentioned the reputation of the estate and the stigma accruing from it as a motivation for leaving. There was a 'shared feeling' on both these estates that the 'lowest order' of council tenants were housed there, and that no one could possibly want to live on such an estate through choice. It was to examine the substance of these widely held beliefs amongst council tenants that I sought access to the Housing Department records. In this chapter, however, I am confining myself to the findings of the field research. In Chapter Eight I describe the Sheffield housing allocation policies, and in Chapter Nine relate these to the fives estates using quantitative data collected from the city's housing department.

1.5 Negative reputations - the effect on the housing market

Tbe importance of a 'dreadful' reputation for CHH in understanding its high offender rate is two-fold. Firstly, I would argue that its

negative reputation has encouraged the growth of an inward-turned community which has fostered the growth of a non-conforming subculture. Secondly, the reputation has influenced mobility patterns in as much as there are always a fair proportion of tenants wanting to move away, and a correspondingly low demand from others to move in. This has the effect of vacancies, which occur when dissatisfied tenants manage to move away, as well as due to 'natural' causes such as death and changes in family circumstances, being filled by those who already have connections with the estate and those who are desperate for a home 'at any cost'. Both these types of letting must further affect the social character of the estate, firstly by re-inforcing the kinship and friendship networks on the estate which I argue are the basis of the non-conforming subculture, and secondly by houses being taken by those who have no interest in the area and resent having to live there - these people characteristically isolate themselves and do not contribute in any way to the social life of the area. Some of these reluctant tenants have accepted a tenancy as a place of the last resort and their own personal and domestic arrangements have already suffered from severe housing problems. Such families often contribute to the 'difficulties' of the estate. A negative reputation can therefore be both cause and effect of a high offender rate.

It may be seen that a 'problem' estate such as CHH may be both 'problem' attracting as well as 'problem' producing. It produces 'problems' by the immersion of the newcomers - the children at least and sometimes the adults - in a deviant way of life (this is discussed in a later section). Widespread discontent with the estate also increases the difficulties associated with such an estate. CHH also attracts 'problems' in that it attracts people with domestic and financial problems, offering cheap housing and a comparatively short waiting list.[2]

In contrast, CFH, I was told by residents, has always been rough and suffered a 'problem' status from its early years. Demand for CFH has always been low[3] and requests to move away high. CFH has always had a highly mobile population and few residents I spoke to had accepted their tenancy with any expectation of permanence. The unpopularity of CFH and its undesirable reputation has meant that the estate is 'problem' attracting in the same way as CHH. Although the rents of flats on CFH were high at the time they were built they are now fairly average for council housing in the city, and they do include hot water and central heating. CFH is the obvious 'choice' for those desperate for housing. The waiting list is even shorter than for CHH, and as residents told me they were actually offered this estate when they were not eligible by their waiting time for anywhere else. There is little 'community' on CFH, in fact residents commonly complain of 'social isolation' with the exception of the collection of ex-Blackacre residents.

As might be expected, then, from the widely different nature of CHH and CFH in terms of location, age, estate and dwelling type there are no common factors in the genesis of their undesirable reputations and problem status. It is my contention, however, that negative repuations once established have the same consequences for an estate, through low demand patterns, whatever the original causes of the reputation. The processes that set in once an estate has acquired a negative reputation re-inforce that reputation, so that the original cause may well be lost but new factors have been introduced which ensure that the reputation is maintained. A stigmatised estate becomes a 'place of the last resort' and despair and dissatisfaction is increased by newcomers who accept tenancies on such estates as short term expedients, only to find their tenancy is of necessity a more permanent arrangement. 'Problem' estates, then, with undesirable reputations 'attract' the same type of tenant - those

with attachments to the area and those who are in desperate housing need. This is true of both CHH and CFH. On both estates it seemed only the 'indigenous' population were relatively happy with their housing lot and that 'misplaced outsiders' reacted to their situation with bitterness, and,characteristically,withdrawal from neighbours. On CFH 'high rise' most of the tenants I met were of this type and they characterised life on the estate to me as 'lonely' and 'isolated', but believed firmly in the necessity of "keeping oneself to oneself", so as to avoid the rest of the "riff-raff". Despite the communal areas of the block - the landings, the stairs, the lifts and the estate surrounds, there was little evidence of a social life between neighbours, although as I found during informal observation people were willing enough to talk to an outsider.

The existence of such a 'non-community' does little to enhance the reputation of an estate. Many of these misplaced outsiders, as I have mentioned in connection with CHH, appear to have 'problems' caused or aggravated by their previous housing situation and these did not always disappear with their new tenancy. The reputation of a 'problem' estate is, then, re-inforced by patterns of demand for the estate, both through emphasising its unpopularity and in the more concrete way of changing or re-inforcing the social composition of the estate.

Even among 'problem' estates there is a hierarchy of desirability. Thus on CHH I met a few families who had transferred from unpopular post-war developments such as CFH, having been advised by the Housing Department that CHH was one of the quickest estates for houses (as opposed to flats). Most of these although not thrilled with CHH found it preferable to the estate they had left.

Mrs. G had previously lived on CFH,

> "We knew it was a bad area (CHH) but we had to have something - anything was better than where we were on those flats. They told us at Housing to ask for CHH if you really want a house quickly."

To these people, as to those new to the council sector who accepted a tenancy on CHH through necessity rather than choice, its reputation was less important than their need for housing, their preference for a house as opposed to a flat, or their desire to leave their present accommodation.

A reputation, then, is re-inforced by supply and demand patterns so that just the reputation itself will ensure that there is a steady supply of vacant dwellings on the estate and demand for these will remain low. This in turn re-inforces the reputation in a vicious circle of mutual causation.[4]

1.6 Some characteristic problems of those in great housing need

I have already suggested that many people in great housing need have domestic and financial problems, caused or aggravated by their housing situation. Sometimes the existence of such problems can themselves cause a housing crisis. Whatever the causal link between housingneed and financial and domestic problems rehousing on a 'problem' estate can exacerbate such problems.[5] On both CHH and CFH I met very young couples with young children, many of whom had lived previously in stressful conditions with relatives, friends or in inadequate privately rented accommodation. The strain of such arrangements, both emotional and physical had taken its toll on their family unit. Some informants I met from these estates had actually been homeless, or had been 'split up', with either children in care or husband and wife separations through lack of housing. A few of these told me that they had been awarded 'priority' by the corporation and offered this tenancy without choice; others told me that they had accepted the first offer from the corporation without question, having a home with basic amenities for a family took precedence

over considerations of the social status of an estate. Being rehoused on a 'problem' estate can exacerbate personal and domestic troubles. Rehousing in itself can increase financial problems. Debt and deviance arising out of debt are not uncommon on either CHH or CFH. People in desperate need of rehousing do not usually have much money and they often have young families. The demands of the move and furnishing new accommodation often push them further into debt.

Many of the couples were too young to cope with such a situation and the number of marital breakdowns and one-parent families that I heard of and met on these estates appeared inordinately high. This was particularly true of CFH which has the shortest waiting list of any estate in the city. Of course a number of incoming tenants were already one-parent families, as such people are very often in the greatest housing need. On CFH I also met a number of divorced or separated people living in the single person accommodation on the estate. They also had often accepted tenancies there because council tenancies for single people are in short supply, and acceptance of such a tenancy on CFH greatly speeded up the process of being rehoused.

1.7 The causal process of a reputation

From my field research I formed the idea that a housing estate establishes its social character, good or bad, by a process of circular cumulative causation. This process has been described by Gunnar Myrdal (1975) in another context. The idea of such a process is contained within the Shelter Report (1975), the CDP Publications (1974)(1975), and is apparent in the explanation of Gill (1977), though in none of these is it made explicit. It is this idea that is entailed in Damer's (1974) use of Merton's self-fulfilling prophecy and Baldwin's (1974) description of the vicious circle that was responsible for the reputation of Blackacre.

Such a process is started off by a primary state - in the case of a council estate it may be, like Damer's Wine Alley, an estate designated for slum clearance tenants, or it may be a number of unrelated, unfavourable factors such as those found on CHH, isolation from more pleasant parts of an area, poor housing conditions and a number of 'rough' families living in close proximity. The process of circular cumulative causation sets in from the primary state as Myrdal explain,

> "In the normal case a change does not call forth countervailing changes but, instead, supporting changes, which move the system in the same direction as the first change but much further. Because of such circular causation a social process tends to become cumulative and often to gather speed at an accelerating rate."
> (p.13).

Using CHH as an example, it may be seen that the effect of the unfavourable primary state was the growth of a bad reputation, the decrease in demand for this estate and movement away by the more 'respectable', aspirational tenants. This in turn led to a letting pattern, whereby only settled CHH families and others in desperate need of housing accepted tenancies on this estate. This re-inforced the reputation and the emerging social character of the estate as already described.

Myrdal believes that this principle of interlocking, circular inter-dependence within a process of cumulative causation has validity over the entire field of social relations. Instead of seeking one predominant factor, a basic factor as the cause of a social situation, we should more accurately see a process of mutual causation between all the factors we identify in a social situation. On a 'problem' estate one negative factor is at the same time both cause and effect of other negative factors. The same is true for a select estate in that one favourable factor is both cause and effect of other favourable factors.

Myrdal believes that such a process can be arrested,

> "One possibility is that new exogenous changes may occur which have the direction and the strength necessary to bring the system to rest ... Alternatively the position of rest may have been achieved by policy interferences planned and applied with the intention of stopping the movement."
> (p.13).

To return to the example of CHH, such changes occurred in the past to transform the estate from 'select' to 'problem' status, on CHL and CHM such changes are occurring which might arrest and reverse the process which has kept these estates 'select'. Myrdal makes a distinction between fortuitous exogenous changes and deliberate planned changes brought about by the intervention of an outside agency. If this idea is applied to council housing it might be said that the clearance of a particularly stigmatised housing area near CHL and CHM and the popularity of the latter amongst the displaced residents was a fortuitous exogenous change which reversed the cumulative process by which these estates maintained their high status. To extend this example further, an outside policy interference could arrest the predicted cumulative process of decline from high status for these estates by, for example, the refusal to let houses on these estates to slum clearance applicants.

In theory, then, it is possible that council estates may remain stable in terms of social characteristics and reputation, they may suffer a decline or they may improve. The reason why there are so few examples of the latter is probably due to the lack of planned intervention by housing departments to this end. Also it is perhaps in the nature of reputations that it is far more difficult to erase the bad reputation than to besmirch the good. As one of my respondents remarked, the reputation of CHH should have improved in recent years because the houses had been improved, but "mud sticks".

The reputation of a council estate can, therefore, precede the social reality of an estate or merely reflect it. For example, in the case

of a slum clearance estate, housing people from a notorious slum area, the reputation precedes the reality. In contrast, the reputation of CHH seems to have followed changes in demand for the estate and its changing social character. The order of the reputation factor in the causal chain is, however, unimportant for as both cause and effect it is an essential factor in the circular cumulative process which produces 'good' and 'bad' council estates. That is, in short, a reputation through the operations of the housing market within the council sector is self-fulfilling. Similarly, the reputation of a council estate can have both a cause and effect relationship with the proportion of criminal offenders resident on an estate. That a high rate of criminal convictions amongst residents of an estate will be at least a contributory cause of an estate's 'bad' reputation is obvious, it can in fact be sufficient cause in itself for an estate to acquire a problem status. At the same time, however, through the circular cumulative process of causation that takes place on council estates an offender rate may also be the effect of a reputation, through the effect that reputation has on demand and supply within the council housing market. This is a more complex relation than that of the offender rate as cause of the reputation, but it is no less important.

2. Reputations - two hypotheses from the literature

2.1 Reputation and the natural cultural process of selection

It is necessary to note here the importance of the theme of reputation in two other possible explanations of 'problem' estates, and relate these to my own research findings.

Wilson (1963) suggests on the basis of the research by the Bristol Social Project Team (1964) that the social character of council estates is formed primarily by a natural cultural process of selection,

whereby 'good' tenants are attracted to 'select' estates and 'bad' tenants are either indifferent to or have a preference for living among their own kind on 'problem' estates. This hypothesis necessarily assumes that council estates will develop reputations and that these reputations will influence people's decisions on where they want to live. As I have shown in Chapter Two, Wilson was not alone in offering this explanation of the polarisation of council estates, but rather clarifies and expands on this idea which is contained in many of the earlier studies of council housing. My research suggests that estates do establish reputations, and that these reputations do affect people's choice of where they want to live. In conflict with Wilson, however, I found 'everyone' wanted a 'select' estate and no one actually wanted a 'problem' estate. Individual 'problem' estates were in demand from a few people but never, I found, because the applicant for such a tenancy perceived the social status of the estate or the social character of the neighbourhood as compatible with their own life-style. Rather, the natural cultural process of selection could more accurately be named the natural cultural process of rejection - the rejection of a problem estate tenancy by all who are able to do so. I did, however, find evidence to support Wilson's hypothesis in that although most people I spoke to on CHH expressed a desire for a modern house on a 'good' estate, it was only the withdrawn 'respectables' who were distressed enough at having to live on CHH to take positive steps to move. These families were typically more aspirational than many others who did not take such action, and also altogether more 'capable'. Some families made no attempt to move from CHH, despite articulating the desire for better housing, because of areal loyalties or familial ties. Others simply did not seem to have the enterprise or energy to initiate such action, they appeared defeated by their situation.

Contrary to the Wilson hypothesis, the few 'rough' families I met on the better estates, CHL, CHM and CFL, although sometimes feeling

ostracised or persecuted by the neighbours had no intention of giving up their tenancy on a 'good' estate because of this. They might have wished for more compatible neighbours, but they had no intention of relinquishing a 'good' tenancy and going to live on a 'problem' estate to achieve this.

In conclusion, then, my findings support Wilson in the demand of 'respectable' applicants for 'select' estates and the movement away from 'problem' estates by 'respectable' tenants. I also found the 'rougher' families more ready to stay put on the 'problem' estates. They conflict with Wilson in that I found no evidence of 'rough' applicants asking for 'problem' estates, nor of 'rough' tenants wanting to move from 'good' estates because they could not fit in with the area. Tenancies on problem estates were accepted by respectable and rough families alike, acceptance being ~~restricted~~ motivated by need rather than attraction to such estates.

2.2 Reputation and secondary deviance

I have already shown that my research lends no support to the idea of differential policing as the explanation of differential offender rates between council estates. Similarly, I found no evidence of secondary deviance - another idea thrown up by the transactionalists - that might have been important as an explanation of 'problem' estates with bad reputations. Damer (1974) also found no evidence to support the idea of secondary deviance being accountable for the high level of deviancy on 'Wine Alley'. Armstrong and Wilson (1973) in the rather exceptional circumstances of Easterhouse did find some support for this thesis, and Gill (1977), although not explicit about the relevance of this concept to his findings on Luke Street, does in his descriptions of the deviancy of his subjects at least suggests that the ideas contained in the concept of secondary deviance are relevant.

Lemert (1967) defines secondary deviance as,

> ".. deviant behaviour, or social rules based upon it which become means of defense, attack an adaptation to the overt and covert problems created by the societal reaction to

> primary deviation. In effect the original 'causes' of the deviation recede and give way to the central importance of the disapproving, degradational and isolating reactions of society."
> (p 17)

I found little evidence that deviant behaviour on either CHH or CFH could be accurately described as 'a means of defense, attack or adaptation' to the stigma accruing from being a resident of a 'problem' estate. On CHH, however, where there was among young people a definite identification and sense of belonging to a local community on the estate, some of these younger residents had a certain assertive pride in coming from a 'rough' area or from a 'problem' family. Despite this, their delinquency, I would argue, is more accurately understood in terms of subcultural theory, discussed in the next section, rather than as secondary deviance prompted by the estate's reputation. Their delinquency is still primary deviation, the type of activity which attracts them such as stealing cars, breaking into houses or general vandalism would interest them whether or not they believed that their area of residence was stigmatised or they had been labelled delinquent by outsiders. It is also the case that the people I met on CHH, whose activities from time to time violated the law, were less worried by the 'dreadful' reputation of CHH and the possibility of the stigma attaching to them as individuals than were those residents who ~~had~~ tried to hold themselves aloof from the area and their neighbours, and who considered themselves too respectable for the area, generally believing the stigma referred to other than themselves. Such people did not lapse into criminal activity as a result of the label, on the contrary they struggled to make their respectability evident to all.

In general terms, and with some exceptions, notably on CHH, I found as Baldwin (1974), Damer (1974) and Hole (1959) did, that while residents of problem estates such as CHH and CFH colluded with the label accepting that their estate is rough and there is much deviant behaviour among residents, they saw this as applying to other people on the estate

and not themselves. Because the reputation of an estate is a label applying to a collectivity rather than an individual, people can evade that label as being applicable to the individual self or family and merely take it as applying to others. It should be noted here that despite these evasion tactics I did not find as Baldwin (1974) and Damer (1974) that an ecological equilibrium existed on either CHH or CFH, that is people thinking the deviants lived elsewhere on the estate from where they lived. On the contrary, on both CHH and CFH residents had very clear and accurate perceptions of the high deviancy areas of their estates, and even if residents of south-east CHH and CFH high rise blamed their neighbours for the estates' reputation, they acknowledged that they were living on the 'worst' part of the estate.

The Shelter Report (1975) recognises the link between a housing area with an undesirable reputation and the growth of a deviant subculture.

> "... the creation of areas of housing that no one with any choice will live in, a stigmatised community that is all too aware of its undesirable reputation, and which is likely to develop a non-conforming subculture." (p.26-27)

The exact nature of the relationship between subculture and reputation is not, however, examined.

Hodges and Smith (1954) in an earlier study of a Sheffield council estate suggest that a stigma attached to an estate can have the effect of increasing neighbour contact and heightening neighbourhood identification to make a close knit community.

> "Past and present has strengthened an awareness on the part of the inhabitants that they are 'poor people', it does not in any sense arise out of an assertive pride in their own culture but is rather to be regarded as evidence of a sense of inferiority which is a function of the status accorded to the estate in the city .... Unfavourable opinions about the estate are widely held and expressed strongly enough for the residents to have no illusions about their reputations whether they regard it as justified or not ... To some extent, therefore, the community suffers from deprivation: like other deprived communities it possesses a certain measure of internal cohesion which is imposed on it by the negative attitude of those in more favoured circumstances." (p.89).

This statement by Hodges and Smith is relevant for an understanding of the situation on CHH. The negative reputation of the estate has to some extent socially isolated its residents, and made it a community 'turned in on itself'. Many of my informants from CHH gave the impression through general conversation that they felt that the fact of being a resident of such a stigmatised estate set them apart socially from people in better housing areas. Some coped with this by various means already discussed, such as believing the stigma attached not to themselves but to their neighbours, but they still found their addresses at times could be a social embarrassment. South-east CHH was even more a community turned in on itself, for it was stigmatised even by people living elsewhere on the same estate. In such circumstances people look for others similarly placed to interact with on equal terms, and neighbours who share the stigma are the obvious choice.

The reputation of CHH did not cause the deviant subculture directly - this is discussed more fully in succeeding sections. Nor did the reputation propel the residents into secondary deviance, rather it provided circumstances conducive to the growth of a deviant subculture. A stigmatised community is fertile ground for a deviant subculture through the deprivation and social isolation of its members, as Hodges and Smith describe, and also through the housing market processes, which I have already discussed, determining who leaves the estate and who accepts tenancies there.

3. Subculture

In a preceding section I described CHH as an estate characterized by a close knit community, bound by familial and neighbourhood ties. I gave brief descriptions of several individuals and families to illustrate this characterization, and also gave examples of 'respectables' who did not

fit in with or participate in the local way of life. In this section I want to relate this local way of life to the sociological concept of subculture, and more particularly, to the idea of a culture of poverty and intergenerational continuities in deprivation. It is also necessary to explain more fully the link between the deviant subculture and the high rate of criminal offenders living on this estate.

The literature on subcultures in sociology, both as theoretical concept and empirical phenomenon is voluminous. For the purposes of describing the local way of life on south-east CHH as a subculture, I understand subculture to be a distinct pattern of life developed within a social group which gives expression to their social and material life experiences. Normative attitudes, values and patterns of behaviour develop within a subculture and, in time, it offers group members a 'map of meaning' which makes experiences intelligible. The local way of life on south-east CHH is by this definition a territorially specific subculture contained within physical and social boundaries. Its relation to working class culture generally and to other working class subcultures is, I believe, beyond the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, in empirical terms I observed the local way of life as not unrelated to working class culture as I knew it, but as an accentuation of certain facets of working class life. The people I met who I included in this subcultural group were particularly deprived in material terms, and this deprivation was compounded by the fact of living in a depressed neighbourhood. They were in a sense a hard core of families who would be described by those outside the group as 'rough' and 'problem' families, but their life style in fact varied in degree rather than substance from those of ordinary working class families. There can be, as I have indicated elsewhere in this thesis, no sharp dividing line drawn between ordinary working class and rough working class families. All I can say to convey the difference between families within this subcultural group is that they are generally 'rougher' than the more ordinary

families living elsewhere on the estate, and amongst their number are several who undoubtedly meet the criteria of problem families as described in the literature and defined in Chapter Five of this thesis. The lack of clear distinctions between family types in reality also justifies the term subculture being used to describe the local way of life: it is different but not unrelated to the parent working class culture. Other studies of disadvantaged areas, such as Jephcott and Carter (1955), Mays (1963), Kerr (1958), Downes (1966) and Willmott (1969) describe very similar ways of life which suggests that the similarities between working class subcultures transcend territorial areas. If culture is seen as the human response to material conditions this will obviously be the case, as the deprivations and difficulties faced by low income, low status people living in socially disadvantaged urban areas are rooted in the wider socio-economic structures and processes of society. Thus local conditions will introduce differences which will be reflected in the subculture, but these do not mask their common origins.

3.1 Family and neighbourhood networks on CHH and the deviant subculture

I have already suggested that the desire to be housed close to families of origin is quite usual among council tenants in the city - it is, after all, a characteristic of working class life styles generally - and that it is on low demand estates such as CHH that this desire is most likely to be met. I have also suggested that tenancies on such estates are accepted by others in desperate need of housing, and that such families often have severe domestic and financial problems dating from their previous housing experiences. Inadequate housing in itself can be an immediate cause of marital breakdowns and family separations, and inadequate housing is related to low income families who cannot buy an adequate home for themselves. A number of informants on CHH had come from intolerable

emotional circumstances living with in-laws or other relatives. Many also in these circumstances had to cope with severe physical overcrowding which had often put further stress on their own marriages. Others had been actually homeless and had experienced separation from other family members. On estates such as CHH one encounters the misery that has been caused by people suffering severe housing deprivation prior to obtaining a council tenancy. On obtaining a council tenancy domestic problems rarely melt away and familial relationships may never recover from the experiences of the homeless years. Both these types of tenant, the local family and the reluctant newcomer are likely to contribute to the problematic character of the estate - the former through their socialisation into a deviant subculture, the latter as an immediate response to problems arising out of past circumstances, and later possibly through immersion into the local culture.

A social worker is quoted in the Shelter Report (1975) as characterising this typical situation on a 'dump' estate, which I believe well describes the situation on CHH.

> "The cases are very much concentrated on certain roads, and on many roads they have no cases. Family relationships on the estate are very unstable, referrals are mainly over child care and mental health. Juvenile delinquency and vandalism are common on Fairfields as on other similar estates. Petty crime is another feature, in the form of housebreaking, quarrels between neighbours are also common. Both the discontent at the state of the estate and the poverty of many tenants lead to high levels of debt." (p29-30)

Although some of the features mentioned here are not unique to problem council house estates, nor are they all present in every problem estate, such characteristics are founded on the empirical experiences of such estates by those who come to know such housing areas. A non-conformist subculture does seem to evolve from the situation that exists on such estates. In the case of CHH many informants suggested to me that I should

understand the continuing way of life on the estate in terms of the younger generation who are brought up in such an environment. On a council estate which is some fifty years old a number of generations of children will have grown up, many of whom spent all their childhood and adolescence living in the same house, and who left home for a house on the same estate. Newcomers - including those with their own problems - may not want to join in the local way of life, and in fact many of my informants who fell into this category had really socially isolated themselves from their neighbours. Such families, however, inevitably have children who will mix socially with other children of the estate, both in and out of school, and who are likely to be drawn into the 'norms of the neighbourhood' and join neighbourhood peer groups whose activities frequently get them into trouble with the police. Such parents may not want their children to grow up on the estate, but their inability to buy a house and the lack of suitable alternatives in the private sector, coupled with the long wait for a transfer to another council estate makes this unavoidable. Children of the newcomers whose family is also rather unstable are likely to be more at risk in being drawn into the behaviour patterns of their peers on the estate. Consistent with this I found that discontent with the estate was concentrated mainly with the older and middle aged, who felt the character of the estate had changed and they had been 'left behind', and with younger couples who came to the estate from outside the area through necessity rather than choice. Teenagers I have spoken to who live with their families on CHH and have grown up there seem generally satisfied with their housing, their answers to my questions on what they think of their housing area is typically in terms of liking it because this is where their friends live.

3.2 Estate design and subculture parameters

In my research the relevance of social network formation to the built environment liesin its correspondence with areas of high and low offender rate. As I have already indicated it certainly appeared that on the inner roads - the cluster of cul-de-sacs and side roads - in the south-east corner of CHH the effect of neighbours was most keenly felt. It was here that social isolates who had chosen not to participate in the life of neighbourhood were most distressed by the intrusion of neighbours' behaviours into their own lives. Complaints about excessive noise and unruly children, for example, would be met with abuse. In these roads the 'rough' and 'problem' families seemed to dominate the neighbourhood, their life styles, by definition, being more intrusive than those of the withdrawn respectables, and their children make more use of space outside the home for entertainment. These families were more numerous in the south-east of the estate and at the same time the design of the streets is both more conducive to neighbouring and makes isolation from neighbours more difficult to achieve. All the social isolates I met in this corner of the estate, who had the will, the ability, the energy and the organising 'know-how' to move were trying to do so. In the situation of a 'problem' estate the will to move is not enough, a tenant needs the means to do so. Oneinformant told me they had tried for a transfer but when their name came up on the list they were in arrears and so their application was cancelled. Another told me she would desperately like to move, but felt it was impossible - the house was such 'a tip', no one would want to exchange with her. The 'defeated' tenant and the poor tenant, then, can find such a move impossible.

Once a vacancy does occur in the south-east corner the house is typically relet to someone already living in the area or originating from it,

who have asked for the tenancy. Such a person is likely to already be a member of the subcultural group, although as I have already suggested, it may be let to an applicant from outside the estate in great housing need. There were, of course, inner road areas on CHL, but my enquiries showed that on these most tenants were well-satisfied. Typical responses were in terms of the neighbours being 'no trouble', and life in a cul-de-sac being 'friendly'. I met only one instance of a 'problem' family being housed on an inner road of CHL and the neighbours, while complaining about them obviously did not feel threatened by their presence. These roads were numerically dominated by 'respectable' and 'ordinary' working class families and the 'problem' family in this case was the social isolate. They themselves were not too happy about the situation, and felt themselves harrassed by neighbours and subjected to a constant stream of complaints. Nevertheless, they liked the estate itself and had no intention of trying to move away.

It would seem, therefore, that disharmony in life style and conflict between neighbours is felt most in cul-de-sacs and inner estate roads. In the case of south east CHH, away from the main thoroughfares, it was on these roads that social networks based on neighbour and familial ties had emerged, and in a circular cumulative process this had become a community of people espousing a 'rough' life style. On these roads this community had made life for non-participating neighbours intolerable. On CHL, the life style of the residents of comparable roadswas predominantly respectable or ordinary working class, and although the occasional family may be housed here who doesn't fit in with the social character of the neighbourhood, if their numbers remain low they will not disrupt the neighbourhood unduly. If life becomes intolerable for a 'rough' family in such a neighbourhood they may decide to move away, but they do not, in

my experience, leave a 'select' or 'good' estate for a 'problem' estate, hoping to find better neighbours with whom they may fit in, rather they will try for another 'good' estate and hope they might be lucky and suffer less neighbour troubles there.

Social networks appear to form more easily in housing areas that facilitate social contact, and in areas where the prevalent value is on sociability. Jenning's (1962) description of a Bristol estate also fits well the situation on south east CHH :-

> "Even a comparatively small number of difficult families could disrupt the life of the street and induce an attitude of withdrawal in their neighbours. In the shortest streets and in the closes their influence on the patterns of relationships was increased by greater physical proximity, in certain streets one matrimonial or police court case followed another and the streets attained a bad reputation on the estate. It was obvious that some respectable families were reluctant to move onto them. Movement away also followed as a result of neighbour troubles."
> (p.127).

3.3 The origins of the subculture

Most of my informants were agreed that the local way of life on CHH stemmed from certain rough families being housed there, in particular, in the south east corner of the estate, and that it had continued through the generations of those families who had remained on the estate. It is interesting that diverse people gave this opinion on the origins of the subculture - policemen, social workers, respectable family residents and the rough families themselves. The same family names, past and present, were repeated to me by many different people as being responsible for the 'roughness' of the estate and its subsequent reputation. None, however, could shed any light on how these 'families' were housed there in the first place. There were complaints that the corporation had in recent years exacerbated the situation by using the estate to house problem families

from 'all over', but it was not thought that the Corporation did this in the years when CHH was select and so brought about directly its demise.

The Housing Department had little information to offer on the early days of CHH, as this was before any of the present staff's time. They did, however, deny any knowledge that this estate had at any time been used to house unsatisfactory tenants or undesirable applicants. I think that this denial has to be accepted, given that the Department admits to a more-selective allocation policy in the past. Various staff named certain estates that had before the war been used for selective allocation - CHH was not one of these. As the origins of CHH are select it seems unlikely that the Department should have, in these pre-war years, reversed the normal policy and used a select estate for low graded families, and thus brought about its decline. Rather, departmental policy on CHH would be likely to follow conventional lines and endorse natural market trends by allowing the better applicants and tenants housing on the better estates, and vice versa.

Most informants, including residents and housing officials, adhered to some version of a 'bad apple' theory. That is, they believed the rough way of life had continued and flourished on CHH because mixing the 'bad' with the 'good' made all go 'bad'. This process was thought to be particularly relevant to children growing up in a socially mixed environment. From the apparently accidental housing of a few rough families on a hitherto select estate informants felt that the situation had snow-balled. In addition to the influence of the rough families on others in the neighbourhood, the relative decline in the standard of housing on CHH in post-war years, its accompanying loss in popularity and the growth of a negative reputation cemented the decline of CHH. Within the process of circular cumulative causation the local way of life may be seen as both cause and indirect effect of the estate's undesirable reputation.

3.4 The deviant subculture and its links with delinquency and crime

Many of the shared ways of living which I have described as a subculture on south east CHH are well documented by other researchers on 'rough' working class life styles. I have already noted the similarity between the subculture on south east CHH and the descriptions of other working class subcultures in various parts of the country.[6] Not every facet of life of a deviant subculture will involve infraction of the law for its adherents, indeed no-one is constantly criminal in their everyday life. Many of the daily pre-occupations of the members of this group are perfectly law-abiding, but they may be deviant in terms of middle class and respectable working class culture. I want only to pin-point certain facets of this life style which could have an immediate and direct link with crime and delinquency.

Typical adult leisure activities on south east CHH include going to workingmen's clubs, pubs and bingo halls. These are not the places where children can participate in adult activities. In fact, one of the most noticeable characteristics of CHH, particularly in the south east corner is the number of children at play on the streets. On getting to know individual families better I found that the norm was leaving children to their own devices, whether this is watching TV inside the house or playing out. One of the problems for senior youth clubs was the number of teenagers who brought very young children in tow. "Mum says can I bring our young one with me?" was a very common request, and the number of infants being brought to the senior nights at one time became such a problem that the programmed activities for the older children were almost brought to a halt. Adults and children, then, seemed typically to live very separate and self-contained lives until such time as the children were old enough to participate in adult activities. Children left on their own to create

their own amusement are commonsensically more at risk of delinquent involvement than children who have their leisure time organised and supervised by adults. Even in the home where delinquency is severely punished children left on their own are more likely to become involved in the delinquent activities of their peers, whose parents perhaps are less censorious of such behaviour. Gold (1963) found that delinquents and their parents shared few leisure activities, and West and Farrington (1973) found delinquency significantly more common among boys who spent little of their leisure time at home and whose fathers participated little in family activities.

Many characteristics of the subculture of south east CHH appear in the criminological literature as correlates with delinquency. Thus, for example, Ferguson (1952) found a significant statistical relationship between delinquent boys and the number of family members with criminal convictions. On south east CHH there appeared to be a number of families who had several members with criminal records. West and Farrington (1973) found an association between delinquency and mental illness within a family. Impressionistically, mental health problems on south east CHH seemed inordinately high. A number of researchers have found an association between delinquency and domestic discord (McCord and McCord (1959), Glueck and Glueck (1959), West and Farrington (1973), Power et al (1974)). On south east CHH the police familiar with this area and many residents in the vicinity emphasised the frequency and severity of domestic disputes. Despite this reporting of domestic troubles, which often erupted into violence, the wider kinship groups on south east CHH appeared very close knit and mutually supportive - the commonly expressed desire to live near relatives must support this. Although I met a number of single parent families through ~~mental~~ marital breakdowns and desertions living on this part of the estate the reliance on families of origin to some extent compensated for this. It is in fact a characteristic of the accepted way of life on

south east CHH that marital disputes and domestic troubles do not have to be conducted in private. Similarly, neighbour disputes are usually dealt with face-to-face, thus these sorts of interactions are more visible to outsiders. In fact, it is unusual for a subcultural member to call in a third party during such disputes - complaints to the police or possibly to the Housing Department are usually made by 'outsiders' and the latter are consequently often subjected to much abuse. The police generally are disliked by typical members of this group of residents, and the emphasis is put on sorting out one's own troubles, even when one is the victim rather than the agent of a crime. From this observation in the field it seems likely that there may, in fact, be an under-reporting of crime on south east CHH. In my experience it is general attitudes which are transmitted within 'criminal' families and through the neighbourhood subculture, rather than children learning specific criminal acts from their parents or other adults. Children may learn at a young age that "dad fixes the electric meter", or that "mum bought a carpet from someone in the pub", and so such behaviour will not appear particularly wrong to them but a necessary way of obtaining certain desirable goods. What is wrong if they steal, or break someones window as an act of hostility is not the fact that such action is against the law, but rather the bother it can cause if they get found out. I met few parents who actually encouraged their children in delinquency, although there were instances of parents telling their children "to see what they could find in the empty houses" and to "smack him one" in disputes with other kids. It is rather a situation of kids knowing that their parents sometimes steal to get what they need or want and not believing this is wrong, or witnessing their parents fighting with neighbours and accepting this as normal, often joining the general abuse and local vendettas themselves. There are no hard and fast rules on parental reactions to delinquency in their young. I have met some parents with criminal

convictions themselves who have reacted with great anger at their children's misdemeanours. More often, however, parents who are not always opposed to breaking the law in certain circumstances, such as knowingly buying stolen goods when the opportunity arises, or 'lifting' the odd item or two whilst out shopping, will react to similar behaviour in their young with mild scolding (usually coupled with the belief that it is their child's friends who are culpable), indifference or just disbelief. In a number of families delinquency appeared to go unchecked because the parents were unhappily married and so were engrossed in their own domestic miseries. In one case the mother tried very hard to stop her sons in their delinquent activities, but as her husband derided her and often beat her up in front of the children she could gain no respect from her sons.

Any description of the content of a deviant culture tends to read to the outsiderlike a situation of social disorder or social pathology. This is emphatically not the case on south east CHH. The area as a whole may be socially disadvantaged, and the ways of the 'roughs' may predominate, but the life styles of most of these people have their own harmony and rationality.[7] The content of the deviant subculture should not be assumed to be entirely negative. This is not an attempt to gloss over the misery that poverty causes people, but to argue that ways of life that arise out of shared experience of material deprivation should not be indiscriminately dismissed as disorganised, deviant or given some other negative label. A reading of Lasells (1962,3) Wellington Road should surely show some of the positive aspects of human behaviour in the most degrading material circumstances. In a very different context, Willis (1978) makes this point about deviant subcultures having positive aspects.

> "It is meanspirited, uncharitable and pedantic to list all the things these cultures were not, when they so clearly were something - something ... which teaches us about a whole unexpected range of cultural struggle and transformation."
> (p.180).

It is for the distressed 'respectables' living in an area such as CHH that neighbour behaviour can be threatening and appear chaotic. For such people the 'nightmare' of living on such an estate is increased by the difficulty they experience in trying to move away.[8]

I have tried to give some indication of the type of behaviour norms adhered to by many families on south east CHH, and how such behaviour norms relate to criminal and delinquent behaviour. My explanation of the high rate of criminal offenders living on CHH, and in particular on the south east corner of this estate, may be seen to owe some debt to the theory of differential association, but more to the subcultural explanations of crime and delinquency offered by Mays (1954, 1972) and Downes (1966). Throughout this discussion I have referred to CHH as a disadvantaged area and have shown how residence on such an estate from childhood often results in familial and emotional links with the estate which encourages children to stay and bring up their own families in such a disadvantaged locality. This is not, however, to argue that people born into such a neighbourhood or from 'problem' families themselves do not or cannot resist immersion in neighbourhood subculture. Individuals do move away from their family of origin and leave behind the friends of their youth through marriage, work or perhaps simply personal ambition. Such individuals, however, I would argue are the exception. In the next section I want to consider the idea of inter-generational continuities in disadvantage which are transmitted both through the family and through areas of residence.

In the preceding sections dealing with the concept of a deviant subculture and its links with criminal activity I have confined my discussion to CHH. This is because it was only on this estate that I found evidence of such a local way of life. The concept of a deviant subculture does have some relevance for CFH in a discussion of the previous histories and places of origin of the population of this estate. This is discussed in

section five of this chapter. I found, however, no evidence of a shared subcultural way of life on CFH itself; rather the contrary, life on this estate was characterised by residents as lonely and socially isolated. On CHL and CFL I found residents spoke quite frequently about the "community" and the sociability and friendliness of neighbours. On neither of these estates was there a hint that this community shared anything but good solid respectable working class values and it was on these the local life was based.

While the concept of a deviant subculture is only relevant to CFH in terms of the previous histories of the residents the concept of cycles of disadvantage which is discussed in the succeeding section, although based on observations on CHH, may be understood as very relevant to the situation of many of the residents of CFH. Again, the relevance of poverty and deprivation generally to the understanding of criminal activity on CFH is discussed more fully in section five. CFH is still too young to trace inter-generational poverty within the estate. But it is my contention that many of the families housed on CFH have 'inherited' the material deprivation of their families of origin. On CHH the inter-generational links may be traced within the same estate and the deviant subculture related to the concept of a culture of poverty.

4. Cycles of Disadvantage and the Culture of Poverty

It was my impression of some families on CHH that poverty and associated 'problems' continued through the generations. Thus several informants had come from families with problems and were experiencing these problems in their family of marriage. Similarly, at the other extreme, few respondents reported grown up sons and daughters living in more advantaged housing areas, or having attained high levels of education or non-manual jobs. These impressions necessitate a consideration of the relevance of the notion of cycles of disadvantage (Rutter and Madge (1976)).

There are two levels of inter-generational continuities of social disadvantage that need to be considered. Firstly, the existing social structure of our society perpetuates advantage and disadvantage through successive generations. Thus social historians and social researchers have documented the 'bad start' experienced by children of many low income, low social status families in Britain. The disadvantages in this category include such characteristics of childhood as dietary deficiency, general material deprivation, low levels of schooling, narrow occupational choice, and so on. But there is also the idea of a 'culture of poverty' which perpetuates disadvantage inter-generationally. This is particularly pertinent to the local way of life on south east CHH, where I would argue the local subculture acts to re-inforce the social disadvantage of successive generations, so that the disadvantages experienced by people of low income and low social status, such as those who live on CHH, are compounded by disadvantages arising out of the peculiar local situation. A culture of poverty makes such social characteristics as low educational achievement, early marriage, low occupational aspirations, the norm. Jennings (1962) considers the life of the rough families in terms of a culture of poverty; although her study of Bristol housing estates contains no explicit discussion of this, she is aware of the cycle of disadvantage that can be passed down through generations, so that a way of life can become self-perpetuating.

> "How far the early histories of these and other families with long term difficulties were the result of prevailing standards in the area where husbands and wives had been brought up or had spent the first years of married life it is impossible to judge."
> (p.126).

Unfortunately such descriptions carry an implicit acceptance of the idea of a deviant subculture as social pathology. In my research experience the life styles of the 'roughs' are essentially rational responses

to material conditions. This is not to underestimate the misery that poverty and deprivation cause the individual and the family, but to argue that in such a context an act of deviancy - such as breaking into a meter to obtain the money to pay a pressing bill - is not the result of an unthinking adherence to a pathological subculture, nor an imitation of past parental behaviour, but is a chosen solution, made easier for the individual in that the choice does not conflict with the norms of the neighbourhood or family, and will not bring upon the offender strong familial or social disapproval or ostracism by neighbours.

John Gower Davis (1972) poses the question for Rye Hill - the twilight zone which is the subject of his study - do the residents suffer a 'felt deprivation' or, is their condition part of a 'culture of poverty' - a way of life adhered to by people who explicitly reject official and respectable norms? In the case of CHH, and, in particular, south east CHH I would describe the local way of life as a response to a 'felt deprivation' which has in fact over the years become a 'culture of poverty'. The two, then, are in reality inseparable. Not all materially deprived people react in this way to their material situation. My research supports the idea that one important determinant of response to deprivation is neighbourhood. Many materially poor people live in 'respectable' areas and lead 'conformist' lives. But there are also poor people on 'problem' estates such as CHH who do not get drawn into a deviant subculture. Nevertheless, it is easier to get drawn into deviancy if one lives in a deviant neighbourhood, and similarly it is easier to adopt the deviant solution when one has at least tacit support from neighbours, family and friends.

The 'culture of poverty' thesis as expounded by such writers as Oscar Lewis (1959, 1961, 1966) has been criticised on both theoretical and empirical grounds. Its main problem is that exponents such as Lewis see culture as the perpetuator of poverty, rather than the external material

conditions, set by the socio-economic and political structure of the wider society, as the cause both of the poverty and the cultural solution.

The idea of a culture of poverty as a distinctive way of life adopted by certain groups of people 'to cope' with poverty problems and deprivation should not, however, be abandoned simply because various exponents have used it in such a way as to bring it into disrepute. Rather, in an area such as south east CHH I would argue that material and cultural conditions have combined and interacted so that a local way of life is perpetuated through generations. Rutter and Madge (1976) found

> "little documentation of any communities in this country which might correspond with the descriptions of a culture of poverty given by Lewis."
> (p.30).

From this they argue that

> "The culture of poverty concept is inadequate for an analysis of British society."
> (p.30).

Lewis' concept of a culture of poverty is, in fact, based on his research in other countries; while accepting some of the criticisms of Lewis I would argue from my findings on south east CHH that there are ideas contained in the concept of a culture of poverty which may well be very pertinent to an understanding of certain disadvantaged housing areas to be found in British cities.

The housing situation of families can itself have inter-generational effects. Firstly, my research has shown that the tenure type of parents influences the tenure type of children. It may be seen from the data presented in Chapter Nine that the children of council tenants are more likely to apply for council housing than children of owner-occupiers, or even the children of private renters. Position in the housing market can be inter-generationally transmitted and the underlying causes of this are probably both material and cultural.[9] Secondly, the housing situation of

parents may have long term effects on children, for example, in terms of health, education and socialisation processes at school and in the neighbourhood. It is with the effects of growing up in a delinquent neighbourhood with which I am most concerned in explaining the continuing high offender rate of CHH. But many children do not just grow up on CHH. The inter-generational continuities in residence, through inter-marriage and children wishing to remain near their families of origin, mean, in effect, that many never leave their childhood peers but marry and raise children themselves in the immediate neighbourhood.

Turning now specifically to 'problem' families, there is some evidence in the literature of inter-generational continuities of 'problem' families. Wright and Lunn (1971), for example, undertook research into some Sheffield 'problem' families and carried out a follow up study of their sons and daughters. Although they found a general trend towards improved circumstances in the second generation, the rate of 'problems' in offspring was still very high and inter-generational continuity marked. They estimated that a third were already 'problem' families or had started on a course of involvement with welfare agencies which was unlikely to be reversed, a third were coping quite adequately, and the final third were managing precariously. My own impression is that south east CHH has an inordinately high proportion of 'problem' families compared with 'better' estates such as CHL. Not only are a few of these related, but the children of these families are by virtue of the conditions of their upbringing likely to face similar problems in their adult lives.

Children brought up in a disadvantaged area such as CHH, whether from 'problem', 'rough' or 'respectable' family backgrounds are all open to the effects of socialisation into the neighbourhood subculture. It is, however, the children of the 'respectable' families whose home background counteracts the neighbourhood influences who are most likely to break out

of the cycle of disadvantage and may leave the area on adulthood. Where family background and housing area combine to multiply disadvantage children are least likely to be able to combat the continuance of this disadvantage in their adult lives.

5. CHH and CFH: points of similarity and difference in the explanation of high offender rates

CFH, we have seen, suffers from having a reputation which is probably worse than that of CHH, and is certainly more widely known. CFH is Sheffield's 'dreadful enclosure', all types of deviancy are attributed to residents of this estate and it is popularly thought to house the city's problem families. But quite apart from the stigma attaching to its residents CFH also offers the most unpopular type of housing - multi-storey flats built in an enormous block type construction with deck access via corridors and outside staircases and lifts. Even the somewhat deteriorated dwellings of CHH are generally perceived as more desirable by the unfortunate tenants of such an estate as CFH. The modernity of the flats do not compensate for the lack of a garden and a traditional type of home. True, CFL offers similar dwellings but there are compensations in the form of a better reputation, a sense of community and an altogether less threatening neighbourhood. CFH, then, as an unpopular development both in terms of the type of dwelling and the stigmatised population, is in low demand from applicants and existing tenants of the council. Additionally, a high proportion of its residents are trying to move away. The particular market situation for CFH and the mobility patterns are discussed fully in Chapters Eight and Nine. Here it may just be noted that demand for CFH is overwhelmingly in terms of people being desperate for housing. The few exceptions I have noted are the ex-Blackacre residents who accept a tenancy on CFH because it is close to their area of origin and Blackacre itself has a waiting list considerably longer than CFH.[10]

The lack of community, the social isolation, the sense of threat from neighbours on a highly victimised and vandalised estate, have all been at the forefront of residents' perceptions of CFH. People are said to have 'come from all over' to this estate and in Sheffield where there is an almost rural emphasis on locality and place of origin this is a greater indictment than it might perhaps be in a larger or more cosmopolitan city. The spiral of decline has been considerably accelerated by the adverse publicity this estate has received in the local media in recent years. The estate has received such publicity following two murder inquiries, a number of bottle and other missile throwing incidents, and through residents themselves writing letters of complaint to the press. All such publicity re-inforces the general belief that no one would want to live on such an estate, and diminishes the possibility of people asking for a dwelling on this estate through any real preference. This, in turn, re-inforces a pattern of letting to people in great housing need.

Unlike CHH, no one has suggested that the origins of CFH were anything other than problematic. Not only is the estate of the most unpopular type of design and dwelling type, but informants told me there was never any demand for CFH. This is supported by the fact that I myself met people who had only been on the waiting list a matter of months before they received a letter from the Housing Department offering them immediate housing either on CFH or another unpopular estate of similar age and construction in another part of the city. CFH, then, is not an estate that has suffered an appreciable decline in its popularity or reputation - it was stigmatised and unpopular from the first. The stigma is not one associated with notorious slum clearance estates such as Blackacre, or with the influx of slum clearance families as is beginning to happen on CHL, and to a greater extent on CHM. In fact, there appear to be very few slum clearance families on CFH at all.[11] The stigma attaching to this estate

is in terms of problem families. CFH is seen as housing the city's miscreants, the outcasts of council housing.

On CHH it was shown that it was on the inner estate roads, the cul-de-sacs and side roads away from the main thoroughfares where the influence of the 'problem' and 'rough' families was most keenly felt. It was here that 'ordinary' and 'respectable' families felt most distressed by the close proximity of unacceptable neighbours. On CFH there is a heightening of this effect, with shared access by means of lifts, stairways and corridors, distressed residents felt 'hemmed' in by unacceptable neighbours. The problematic behaviour of some families intruded upon the lives of all the residents of a block. On most corridors on CFL neighbours generally perceived each other as 'respectable', 'friendly' or 'ordinary'. Here the built environment does not serve to heighten tensions between residents, just as on CHL where inner roads did not appear problematic to residents.

Both CFH and CFL share a design which, as I have shown in Chapter Six, may be conducive to children engaging in delinquent activities such as bottle throwing. But such delinquencies are only likely to become a problem to residents where there are sufficient numbers of unsupervised children for offenders not to be identified and dealt with by the residents themselves, and when parental co-operation is unlikely to be forthcoming. On CFH, this is just the situation which the 'victimised' population finds itself in. In a similar way but on a lesser scale the same situation pertains on CHH. CHH and CHL have comparable built environments, but on CHH residents complain about continual harassment from children, including the frequent breaking of windows. On CHH there are apparently more unsupervised children 'on the streets' than on CHL. Moreover, these children are more prone to delinquent activities through their early socialisation and immersion into the delinquent subculture than their counterparts on CHL. Coupled with this is a feeling among the distressed 'respectables'

on CHH that the children are all nameless hooligans and even if a name can be fitted to a face the parents would be more likely to be abusive to the complainant than to reprimand the child. Thus similarities may be seen in the residents' reaction to victimisation by juveniles on both CFH and CHH. There are certain shared feelings of being in a minority surrounded by hordes of delinquent children with uncaring and possibly aggressive parents. In the same way, on both CHL and CFL, the sense of 'community' and sociability between people who broadly see their neighbours as not so different from themselves enables residents to identify children and speak to their parents about offending behaviour. At the same time, the numbers of unsupervised delinquent children are far less on CHL and CFL than on CHH and CFH respectively.[12]

6. Some conclusions from the field work

My field research suggested that it was the inter-relation of three key factors; reputation, the housing market and subculture, which explained the high offender residence rates on CHH.

CHH undoubtedly suffers from an undesirable reputation. It is known locally as a 'rough' area, where 'rough' people live in old sub-standard council housing. The effect of this reputation on the council housing market is that there is a relatively low demand for houses on this estate. Houses are either let to people who are in considerable housing need and are in no position to wait for a better offer, or to people who want CHH because they originate from or have other links with the estate. The effect of this letting pattern over the years has been the growth of an increasingly isolated community of materially disadvantaged people. Extensive kinship networks amongst residents on this estate have encouraged the growth of community as have the overall low mobility rates on this estate with the characteristically long length tenancies. Neighbours are usually friends of long standing, they are also often relatives. Out of this community has developed a local way of life which has been shaped by the more dominant 'rough' families living on the estate. This way of life encourages some forms of criminal activity, and it allows others to go on unchecked by the sanction of social disapproval. There are 'outsiders' housed on this estate who resist immersion in the local way of life. The children of these families, however, are still likely to be drawn into the deviant subculture through contact with their peers, even if their parents have tried to withdraw from the social life of the neighbourhood. This local way of life is self-perpetuating, in that through socialisation of the young it is kept alive through successive generations. The existence

of this deviant subculture - the way of life of 'rough' people living in a 'rough' area - reinforces the reputation of CHH and the letting pattern continues unchanged. Thus a continual process of circular cumulative causation takes place.

There are similarities in the explanation for the high offender residence rates on CFH, as I have already suggested. The stigma attaching to CFH is again primarily in terms of its population. It is seen as a 'ghetto' for all types of 'problem' families. Additionally, housing development of this kind - 'concrete jungles' - are always among the least popular types of council housing stock. The reputation of CFH and the unpopularity of this type of housing development ensure that demand remains low. Tenancies are accepted by people in urgent need of housing. CFH is Sheffield's estate of the last resort, filled with people who are beset with problems associated with deprivation. Such problems often prompt criminal solutions. I found no evidence of a deviant subculture on CFH, indeed life on CFH would not seem to encourage subcultural growth, there being little neighbour sociability, no discernible family networks and few neighbourhood bonds. Mobility rates for this estate were very high and while taking the relative youth of CFH into account short term tenancies appeared to be the norm.[13] CFH, then, cannot be seen as the territorial 'base' of any type of subcultural community; nevertheless, like Jennings (1962), I would suggest that much of the deviant life styles apparent on CFH are, in part at least, attributable to socialisation into deviant subcultures in these people's areas of origin. For example, the mass of unsupervised children who terrorise the estate may be linked to child rearing patterns associated with a deviant subculture such as that in evidence on CHH. Taking this example further, however, this explanation for delinquency on this estate must be balanced both by consideration of

the design of the estate and its conduciveness to delinquency, and by consideration of the overall high child density on CFH, which is linked to the population characteristics of people in great housing need. Th e final 'subcultural note' to be made on CFH is that while not enjoying a local demand, such as CHH does, the estate does act as an 'overspill' area for the younger generation of Blackacre who are seeking their own tenancies. On Blackacre I was told of a deviant subculture which sounded much like that I had witnessed on CHH. The ex-Blackacre families were, in fact, the only tenants of CFH that I met who could be fairly described as having a social life based in the neighbourhood.

The explanations for the high offender rate council estates, CHH and CFH, differ in detail but the ingredients are the same; stigmatised housing areas where the poor and disadvantaged congregate mostly through necessity, though sometimes in the case of CHH, through choice. These estates are locked in a downward spiral of decline. Their reputations determine demand and subsequent letting patterns. The resulting population characteristics increase the stigma which, in turn, reinforces the letting pattern. In the next chapter I consider to what extent the city's council housing allocation system is responsible for the existence of such disadvantaged housing areas.

FOOTNOTES

1. See V. Hughes (1959) for a list of corporation estates built in this post-war period.

2. About three years, which is the shortest for a house in Sheffield. Waiting times for flats on unpopular estates are less than this. All waiting lists fluctuate, however, in accord with council building prggrammes, slum clearance, and so on.

3. To say demand is low is to mean as low as the continual shortage of low income group housing allows. For this type of housing, of course, overall demand always exceeds supply.

4. Residents of CFH actually told me that during their time on the waiting list the Housing Department wrote to them informing them of two estates on which they might get an offer soon, and warning them that the waiting time for other estates was considerably longer. CFH was one of the named estates, the other was a very similar type of development.

5. Mrs. Jacobs who lives on CFH well illustrates this:-
She was housed with her husband and two children from her husband's parents' home on a peripheral pre-war estate. Their marriage was already in difficulties due to the strain imposed by living with in-laws, who did not really like Mrs. Jacobs. On gaining the CFH tenancy Mrs. Jacobs thought her troubles were over - they were, in fact, only just beginning. Her husband hated CFH. "The ~~house~~ noise, the dirt and being away from friends." Mrs Jacobs was under stress coping with her children in this new environment, in addition to which, her husband blamed her for the move. Eventually he left and returned to his parents. Mrs. Jacobs has subsequently committed offences to alleviate her financial difficulties and is heavily in rent arrears.

6. I am thinking now of such characterisations of 'rough' working class life as low educational and occupational aspirations, early marriages, unplanned pregnancies, etc., etc. Also there is the work of the more psycho-analytically orientated researchers such as Kerr (1958) who are concerned with typical child rearing patterns amongst this social class, and contrast them with middle class values and behaviour. Thus, for example, working class socialisation patterns are characterised as giving immediate gratification to the child compared with the middle class emphasis on deferred gratification.

7. A number of times I have read social worker reports on individual 'problem' families which read like a catalogue of chaos and disorder, but the worker considers that despite the horrendous conditions of the home the family appear to be very close and the children quite happy and very attached to their parents. Often such reports give the impression that their author is in fact astonished by the family solidarity and mutual affection under what appear to be appalling conditions.

8. I deal with this more fully in Chapter Eight of this thesis.

9. Some additional evidence for probable intergenerational continuities in housing market position is contained in the interview survey carried out as part of stage two of the Sheffield Study in Urban Social Structure and Crime. A higher proportion of private renters and the children of owner-occupiers said they had expectations of buying a house than did those housed within the council sector. There was very little difference in the proportions in the four different estates in the council sector, with respondents in 85-90% of households on each estate saying that they did not ever expect to own their own property.

10. At the time of my research the waiting period for Blackacre was around six years, compared with less than two years for CFH.

11. The reason for the small number of slum clearance tenants on CFH is discussed in Chapter Eight. Quantitative data on this is presented in Chapter Nine.

12 In fact, CFH has a higher child density than CFL. The reasons for this are discussed in Chapter Eight. The child densities of CHH and CHL are comparable.

13. Mobility rates and average lengths of tenancies for both CHH and CFH are considered in more detail in Chapter Nine.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Council Housing in Sheffield

1. The nature of the housing stock - demand and supply

Sheffield, like other large English cities, has a wide variety of council housing, ranging from pre-war cottage housing estates such as CHH, CHL, and CHM to massive post-war settlements often on the periphery of the city, the houses on these estates having every modern amenity. The city also has its tower blocks as well as its 'concrete jungles' such as CFH and CFL. It has estates composed predominantly of maisonettes, and others which comprise of a mixture of many different types of dwelling. There are pre-war walk-up flats close to the city centre and a variety of types of housing from farms and cottages to short-life terraced dwellings which come under the miscellaneous category of sundry housing. At present the Corporation owns approximately 40% of the city's housing stock, and with the final slum clearance programme now in progress (1978-81) it is planned that selective clearance will still take place after this date. The building of new council dwellings continues and so the percentage of council owned stock is likely to continue to rise. In a city in which 40% of the dwellings are council owned their percentage as a proportion of working class housing owned by the council is of course much higher.

In such a situation, as suggested by Baldock (1971), there is likely to have developed a status hierarchy among estates, whereby working class people aspire realistically to a better council estate, rather than to owner-occupation. My research experience, which was endorsed by staff of the Housing Department, is that working class people in the city are very aware of status distinctions between estates and there is a broad consensus on the most and least desirable. Reputations,

of estates, then, seemed to be widely known and firmly established among council tenants generally, and I was told by housing staff that patterns of demand followed reputations fairly closely. Council housing in the city is heavily concentrated in the north and east, and there are few estates in the desirable south-west. Social distance is expressed in spatial terms in Sheffield as much if not more than in most comparable cities. Most of the inner city estates have lost their popularity, but the very peripheral post-war ones were often slow starters although gaining in popularity now. Estates in the west and south-west are among the most popular, but in areas of solid council housing such as north-east Sheffield certain estates still stand out as more favoured than others. Even in the least popular areas of the city generally, for instance, those areas containing heavy industry, estates can have their own following; that is, they will be popular and therefore in demand by those people who already live in the area.

A peculiarity of Sheffield noted in The Urban Criminal is its stable populationand its isolation from other large cities, and other researchers have commented on its 'village like' characteristics. Each small area of the city has its own name and is viewed by residents as a separate enclave. Among working class people in the city generally I found little enthusiasm for moving from the area of origin, and when this area was a very small enclave, say, embracing a few streets or a small part of the estate, residents would look aghast at the idea of moving outside this immediate area. Rough estates such as CHH with a bad reputation are not in demand by people from other areas, nor by people from the general area who have alternatives, but still CHH has its small following among those born and bred on the estate, who prefer to stay in the place they know and are known, rather than aspire to 'better housing in a nicer district.

The council has acknowledged that differences in dwelling type and estate design can influence demand, and from this social character and reputation are established. Consequently it has been decided to build no more 'concrete jungles' - by far the most unpopular type of council housing, except, perhaps, for the pre-war walk-up flats in central city areas. Tower blocks are also 'out', as are old persons highrise flats; 'low-cost' bungalows and houses being the present day substitute. There has been a recognition that traditional-type houses with gardens are the most popular dwelling with the vast majority of applicants and tenants and these, therefore, are the easiest to let. The unpopular estates, however, cannot be abandoned in a situation where demand exceeds supply, and present day mistakes continue. There is an estate now under construction in Sheffield which has five-bedroom maisonettes, above ground level. The Housing staff themselves doubt the wisdom of such planning, realising the connection between such dwellings and high child density with all the attendant problems on flatted estates.

The nature of the housing stock is, then, a significant factor in the character formation and reputation of an estate. The differential nature of a city's housing stock is the point from which differences in demand and supply stem. Individual characteristics of an estate, such as its geographical location, its age, the condition of the housing and the facilities it offers, and the architectural design of the dwellings are as important in setting patterns of demand and supply for an estate as are other factors that may be correlated to its type, such as the age structure of its population or its particular origins. Thus, for example, an estate built on the 'wrong' side of the city or near a network of railway lines and major roads, or close to heavy industry, will have a headstart in acquiring a bad reputation. Demand for the houses on such an estate will be lower than for estates in more residential

areas, some vacancies will be filled by applicants who are more interested in quick rehousing than the attractiveness of the offer. Others will move away from the estate if the opportunity presents itself and so the downward spiral of circular cumulative causation, that I have described in Chapter Seven, is begun. The new suburban estate on the 'right' side of town is much more likely to become 'select'. Those who can wait for a house on such an estate and are willing and able to pay the higher rent and travel expenses will do so, and as Maule and Martin (1956) suggest, such an estate is most likely to appeal to those with middle class suburban aspirations and the corresponding life style.

An estate close to a slum clearance area will have a high proportion of people from this area wishing to stay, and thus asking for a tenancy on their local estate. In Sheffield the Sharrow Community Development Project found that 70% of their respondents wanted to stay in the area as opposed to 23% who wanted to move away when their houses were demolished. As the literature on housing testifies, slum clearance tenants can carry with them a notorious stigma which is a blight on the reputation of any council estate, even if all else is in its favour.[1] That is, even if it is situated in a popular area of the city, is attractive in design, is composed of houses as opposed to flats, and is built to the best modern standards. Many of the pre-war slum clearance estates suffer from the additional stigma of being built to specifications deemed adequate for a stigmatised group of people. Similarly, many of the council complexes of flats have an inbuilt stigma associated with their external appearance, and the fact that despite the arguments of planners, architects and housing administrators to the contrary, the majority of people still have a preference for a house with a garden. This is particularly true of the young married age group with children.

Some estates start their life stigmatised, others experience a

decline. Such a decline is often related to the state of repair of the houses and their lack of modernisation; with the building of modern council house estates those with dwellings in a state of physical decay and of outmoded design will decline in popularity, demand will be low and many residents will try to obtain a more modern council house. In the article by Kirkby (1971), on inter-war council housing he recognises this problem resulting from the physical deterioration of many pre-war estates,

> "many tenants are seeking a transfer to newer property. Moreover some authorities are already having difficulty letting their pre-war accommodation, prospective tenants preferring to wait and pay extra for a more modern, better equipped dwelling".(p.264)
> (Kirkby)

Other estates experience a decline in fortune due to the peculiar age structure of their population. An older estate, for example, may have a predominately aged population so there comes a time when an inordinately high number of vacancies occur from death and movement to relatives and to old persons' accommodation. When this occurs vacancies may be let to young families which brings a dramatic increase in the number of children on the once 'quiet' estate. If these estates offer less desirable accommodation than the post-war ones they may become a letting difficulty. Alternatively, if they are close to a slum clearance area the houses may be relet mainly to slum clearance tenants, either letting pattern can be disastrous for the reputation of an estate.[2] Any estate which has an abnormal number of vacancies occurring even through 'natural causes' such as the age structure of the population, has its good reputation put in jeopardy.

The Shelter Report (1975) suggests,

> "Feelings that an estate is deteriorating are often bound up with the arrival of a number of new families with children; an estate reaches a quieter phase when the children of its first generation of tenants have grown up, and the arrival of a younger generation of families is seen as a problem".
> (p.29).

Whether the estate comes through this critical period with its reputation untarnished is dependent on a number of factors. Most important of which, I would suggest, is the state of repairs of its houses and its subsequent popularity with a new generation of council tenants.

2. Eligibility rules and the date order allocation system

Under the Council's present lettings policy people living or working in the city may register on the general waiting list if they are married, or have dependent children, or are single persons aged 18 years or more. The latter group actually become eligible for council accommodation on marriage, or at twenty-five years of age, if they remain single. In addition to this the council has recently announced that common law couples can be considered for council housing. The one proviso to eligibility is that an applicant does not live in accommodation which is for his or his family's exclusive use, or that it is not self-contained. A tenant of a house or flat that is self-contained may still be eligible if he or his family has to share bathroom or kitchen facilities with other occupants of the premises, or if they are living in overcrowded conditions according to the Council's criteria, or if they have one or more children and their dwelling lacks a basic amenity, and an improvement scheme to provide such an amenity is not feasible. Finally, a family with one or more children living in a caravan is eligible, subject to a twelve-months residence qualification. The general waiting list is subdivided into three for administrative purposes: an ordinary waiting list, a single persons' list and an aged persons list for people over 60 years. Applicants for the latter list must be resident in Sheffield - having adequate housing at the time of application is no bar. Within the general waiting list category of

applicants there are special cases, such as key workers, policemen, social workers and so on, who may be found council accommodation without taking their turn on the list. There are also people under threat of eviction through 'no fault of their own', because, for example, the landlord has obtained possession for his own occupation, or for modernisation of a property, or on the termination of a service tenancy. This latter group usually apply for 'priority' on the grounds of 'special hardship', or 'homelessness', and may be housed out of turn if their application is successful. Many of these applicants for priority rehousing will already be on the waiting list but their circumstances have become so difficult that waiting their turn is impossible if homelessness is to be avoided. Others actually become homeless and families are separated as a consequence. Some are not registered on the waiting list when these conditions occur but ask for 'priority' rehousing immediately on registration. Medical priority may be awarded to applicants from the private sector who have not waited their turn on the list.

Eligibility for council housing also occurs for people living in clearance areas. An offer of a council dwelling is made to every household living in the affected area at the date of the housing visitor's pre-tenancy visits. Some of the people living in areas designated for clearance will already be on the waiting list, but the majority never register on this list, either because they are aware that they will be rehoused in time under the clearance scheme, or because they are quite satisfied with their present accommodation. Special priority may be awarded to slum clearance applicants under certain conditions, for example, if the dwelling is in an unfit, verminous or dangerous state. As the Council buys property in clearance

areas ahead of demolition a number of families rehoused on clearance will already be tenants of the council, of these some will have been "inherited" on the purchase of the property, others will have been allocated the tenancy, subsequent to the council purchasing the dwelling, from the waiting list as a sundry letting.

Sheffield holds a liberal policy on allowing their tenants residential mobility. Exchanges are permitted between council tenants, between a council tenant and a private tenant, and between a council tenant and an owner-occupier, who may want a dwelling with modern amenities, or be seeking someone to take over his mortgage. Pre-tenancy exchanges are also allowed, whereby an applicant who is due to be rehoused by the council either through mature registration on the waiting list or, more usually, through slum clearance, may exchange the offer he has received from the council for the tenancy of an existing council tenant. These pre-tenancy exchanges may become quite complex, involving three parties. To negotiate an ordinary exchange a council tenant must have held his tenancy for a minimum of six months. The dwellings of both parties must be inspected and passed as fit and the rent accounts of both parties (or the rates in the case of the owner-occupier) must have been clear for a minimum of three months. Additional conditions are that neither party should have 'backed out' of an exchange in the previous six months without 'reasonable' grounds and that the end result of the exchange should not result in either overcrowding or under occupation. Sheffield also allows tenants to register on a transfer list, the waiting time involved is dependent on the tenant's choice of estate. Tenants of all types of council property are allowed to register for a transfer, and although the tenant is expected to state the motive for wanting to move this does not appear, in practice, to

influence the waiting time for rehousing, unless 'priority' is requested and granted. Medical priority is the most commonly claimed type of priority transfer, and if the special sub-committee is satisfied that it should be awarded, the tenant may be rehoused without waiting his full time on the transfer list. Conditions for transfer are similar to those for an exchange: namely, a 'fit' dwelling, a clear rent account for three months, no 'unreasonable' refusal of an offer since registration on the list, and the move should not cause overcrowding or under-occupation. In addition to these conditions if the applicant holds a tenancy on an unpopular estate for which he only had to wait a short period he may not be rehoused through the transfer list on to an estate for which there is a long waiting list unless his period of tenancy and waiting amount to the average waiting time for the estate he has selected.

The Council also assumes responsibility for rehousing certain other categories of tenant within the council sector. A tenancy may be transferred to an applicant if he or she lives in a council property already as a relative of the tenant or as an authorised sub-tenant when the existing tenant dies or relinquishes the tenancy. Tenancies are ~~granted~~ guaranteed to certain applicants in special cases, for example, when an applicant relinquishes a tenancy to care for a sick relative. The Council also has the power to compulsorily transfer a tenant who has damaged property or caused extreme nuisance to neighbours, or in other ways contravened the tenancy agreement. The Council can also transfer tenants to other properties while modernisation schemes on council housing are carried out.

Discussions on whether to award priority in transfer, waiting list or clearance cases are made by a special sub-committee. This committee also considers disputes about eligibility or claims to

registration. It also acts as a 'court of appeal' for applicants who have refused offers and are threatened with cancellation of registration or priority. In Sheffield the 'desirability' of an applicant for council housing is not a criterion of eligibility. If an applicant meets the eligibility requirements as stated by the Council then the authority will not refuse that applicant housing, even if a pre-tenancy report by the housing visitor is highly unfavourable. There is, however, one exception, that of the tenant who has been previously evicted from a council house for arrears. The arrears have to be paid off before such a person can re-register for council housing. During the time a family is homeless following eviction from a council tenancy the Council may offer hostel accommodation to the wife with dependent children.

Sheffield imposes no length of residence qualification on applicants, apart from caravan dwellers. Eligibility is granted from the first day of living or working in the city. From this point the Authority operates a strict date order of registration allocation system, and with this there is no points scheme in operation.[3] Within this allocation system, I have already described the special "priority" that may be awarded, that is, on what grounds an applicant within a certain application category can ask for priority. Priority, however, is also awarded between groups.

The order of allocation in terms of priority is as follows :-

1) Hardship and urgent slum clearance cases.
2) Slum clearance and medical priority cases.
3) Council tenants who are required to move for modernisation schemes.
4) Transfers and waiting list cases.

The two groups given first priority do not infringe upon each other as 'hardship' priority cases are given no choice of estate, are made only one offer and this is usually of the type of dwelling and/or

on the type of estate which is in the least demand. In a similar way 'hardship' priority cases do not conflict with the priority accorded to the second group, slum clearance and medical priority cases, because hardship cases are allocated tenancies not in demand by other applicants. Tenants being moved for modernisation schemes are given priority transfers away from their estate but may only want temporary transfers and will accept accommodation in less demand - returning to their own tenancy when work is completed. The waiting and transfer lists are dealt with in date order of registration.

Not only do the slum clearance applicants get priority in their choice of housing, they are also entitled to more offers than other application types. The number of offers awarded to each type are as follows :-

1) Slum clearance (including slum clearance with priority) - three reasonable offers. On the third refusal the case to be referred to special sub-committee. (In practice, this usually results in a further offer being made with a warning of the consequences of refusal.)
2) Council tenants required to move for modernisation - three reasonable offers, on the third refusal the case to be referred to special sub-committee.
3) Hardship and priority rehousing cases, e.g. homelessness - one reasonable offer only.
4) Transfers - one reasonable offer only (previously this group have been allowed two.)
5) Priority transfers on medical grounds and medical priority from the waiting list - two reasonable offers. (In practice, if two offers are rejected a further one is usually made.)
6) Waiting list - two reasonable offers.

The word "reasonable" in this context is taken to mean in the area of the applicant's choice. However, special hardship and other priority

rehousing coming under (3) above are given no choice of area.

The Cullingworth Report (1968) and more recently Shelter (1975) have paid some attention to local authorities operating a date order allocation system. The Cullingworth Report makes the point that if such a system is going to be used it is essential that certain provisions be made for those who deserve priority consideration because of the urgency of their housing situation. Sheffield does have such a provision in its 'priority rehousing' scheme. The Report, however, also recommends that a 'date order' system is only suitable

> "in situations where there is little or no backlog of housing need". (p41)

A recent Shelter Report is in agreement with this recommendation, and cites South Yorkshire as one area in which there is still a backlog of housing need. In favour of a 'date order' allocation system, however, is its simplicity for the administration and, more important, its clarity and apparent equity. Applicants understand a date order system quite easily and it has the appearance of fairness, whereas a points system can lead to confusion, resentment and doubts as to the integrity and ability of its administrators.

A second general criticism of local authority allocation systems, of whatever type, is the alleged secrecy in which they are operated so that applicants and tenants remain ignorant and confused about their chances of rehousing and the rules and regulations that determine what offers should be made.

Damer (1976), for instance, argues :

> "They work hard at concealing the grounds for such allocation from their tenants".
> (p.73)

Sheffield does make eligibility rulings and some details of allocation policies available to applicants: such as the system of priorities,

the number of offers made to applicants and the choice of areas permitted. It does not, however, publicise its grading system, discussed in the next section, or the details of individual offers made to applicants. On an individual level, however, applicants who are given a low grading on their pre-tenancy visit may be informed by the Housing Visitor of the reason for their restricted choice of estate. On many of the pre-tenancy report forms of applicants with a 'pre-war' housing only recommendation I read a note by the Housing Visitor to this effect. The following are typical examples.

> "I explained to Mrs. -. that in view of the poor state of their present accommodation I did not think they would be suitable for new property."
>
> and
>
> "I told Mr. -. that I did not think they would be able to afford the rents of newer properties, he agreed and asked for - ."

Similarly applicants are advised on the length of waiting time for different estates in which they express an interest. Another typical note from the pre-tenancy report is,

> "I explained the difficulty of choosing this estate, she agreed to widen her choice to include - and -."

If an applicant shows a sense of urgency or impatience for housing they are also advised of the estates with the shortest waiting lists. Applicants may request this information at the time of their pre-tenancy visit, others are told when they contact the Housing Department to enquire how much longer they have to wait for an offer. The Housing Department in Sheffield is now so open about these demand differentials for estates that a spokesman for the Department was recently quoted in the local paper naming estates which were currently popular and therefore had a long waiting list, and those with the shorter lists for which applicants would not have so long a wait. The Department has ~~had~~ tried to take the pressure off the most popular estates by grouping estates together in geographical areas and asking the

applicant to select a preferred area. In practice, this has not helped unequal demand patterns, applicants are likely to state a preferred area but add, "not X estate", or to state a preference for area '7' and then add the name of the estate, if not the name of the street, they want. If they feel they can wait for an offer on this estate, or if they feel in a strong enough position to do so, they will refuse all other offers of estates within their stated area of preference.

3. Allocation policy and the creation of estate differentials

It is now necessary to take a more detailed look at the allocation policy in Sheffield to see how far, in this city at least, the Housing Department is itself responsible for the creation of 'select' and 'problem' estates.

A higher proportion of council housing is let each year to people displaced by local authority clearance schemes than to any other single application type. Between the years 1971 to 1975, 49% of all council houses falling vacant were let to slum clearance applicants. For three of those years figures are available :-

	Total available	Let to clearance applicants	%
1973	2,957	1,377	46.6%
1974	3,511	1,772	50.5%
1975	4,733	2,278	48.1%

It is also estimated that houses let to slum clearnace applicants in 1975-6 is 24.3% up on those let over the corresponding period in 1974-5.

But not only are more council dwellings in Sheffield being let to slum clearance applicants than any other type, these applicants are also awarded 'priority' and allowed the most offers, as explained above. In practice, this means that when a house falls vacant for re-letting

or new houses are completed, a slum clearance applicant asking for a house on the particular estate will be made the first offer. A vacancy will only be offered to another type of applicant if there are no slum clearance takers. It may be seen that the local authority housing allocation policy in Sheffield, at the time of my research, and indeed I am told since post-war years, has varied quite significantly in its treatment of slum clearance applicants from other local authorities described in the literature. The priority and choice given to slum clearance applicants is not compatible with the idea - based on the 1930's housing practices and present day accounts of various local authority clearance policies - that slum clearance families are the lowest grade of council tenant and are allocated the lowest grade of council housing accordingly. In Sheffield, the demand for an estate by slum clearance applicants is an index of its popularity. The letting to such applicants of dwellings of their choice is dependent only on vacant dwellings being available. There is no attempt on the part of the Authority to segregate slum clearance tenants from other allocation types, nor to congregate them on selected estates. By the same token no attempt is made to disperse them amongst other application types. In this way newly built estates can become slum clearance estates through the new dwellings all being asked for andtaken by families displaced in a clearance scheme. This is particularly likely to happen if a new estate is built in a clearance area where the vast majority of families will want to stay. On older estates, where vacant houses are relet to new applicants, the number of clearance families moving on to the estate will be dependent on the vacancies occurring and the demand from those applicants. The most popular of those estates with slum clearance tenants may later experience a fall in demand when clearance in the area is completed, and especially if the reputation of the estate has been affected by the arrival of the clearance families.

Thus, in Sheffield, at least, the local authority cannot be charged with a policy of segregation of slum clearance tenants, nor with the reservation of the worst of the housing stock for this category of applicants. In this respect in post-war years the local authority has not created stigmatised estates by designating them primarily or only for slum clearance tenants.

The priority awarded to applicants from clearance schemes reflects the fact that a slum clearance applicant does have more of a 'lever' with the local authority than other types of applicant. If he is not offered a house in his area of preference, he can stay in his condemned dwelling holding up an entire clearance programme. The local authority does have the ultimate power to serve 'notice of entry' on such a tenant and forcibly evict him, but in Sheffield the emphasis is on trying to offer the applicant an acceptable house, that is, if he is asking for a popular estate where only one or two vacancies occur each year, every attempt is made to make him the offer of a dwelling on his second choice of estate. Sheffield claims such a success with this approach to rehousing that in the past eight years the local authority has only had to use this ultimate power of eviction twice, and in one case this was on a resident of a condemned house who did not want to move anywhere. In effect the local authority is forced to respect the fact that the slum clearance applicant is in many cases not an applicant in the true sense of the word at all. That is, he has not sought to apply for council housing because he wants to move from his former dwelling, rather the local authority through its clearance schemes has made him homeless and therefore must accept the responsibility of this action.

Slum clearance applicants are also allowed the opportunity of arranging pre-tenancy exchanges, by which they can enter into agreements

with one or more corporation tenants so they can take over the tenancy of a house of their choice, and the corporation tenant can take on this applicant's priority. Such arrangements usually take place when a slum clearance applicant wants a house on a popular pre-war estate, where there are few vacancies occurring. If he can find a tenant on such an estate who would like to move to a new council house but who would normally have to wait for a considerable period on the transfer list, the latter can speed up his move by taking on the other's priority because new estates usually have enough houses to accommodate all the slum clearance applicants wishing to move there.

There are two possible constraints on the slum clearance applicant obtaining the estate of his choice. First, in the availability of houses on that estate - the number available for letting at the time of his being rehoused and the demand for them amongst other slum clearance applicants. This is a simple supply and demand constraint. Secondly, it is possible that the grading given to him by the Housing Visitor on his pre-tenancy visit may mean that he can only be offered pre-war property. The details of this grading system and its importance in the formation of 'select' and 'problem' estates in the city is discussed in the next section.

For those on the waiting list, waiting times for estates vary considerably and these will fluctuate over time according to changes in popularity, which are, in turn, influenced in part by council clearance schemes. In general terms, however, the post-war flat developments of the 'concrete jungle' type have the shortest waiting list and of these CFH has the shortest of all. Also unpopular and therefore involving a short wait are the inner city pre-war walk-up flats. Waiting time for a house is considerably longer and even on CHH, which is one of the quickest estates for a house it is some three years or more. A house on

an estate with an 'average' reputation will involve a still longer wait, and for the most popular estate, post-war and pre-war included, the wait can be anything in excess of ten years. On some of the 'elite estates' so few vacancies occur, and these are immediately taken by slum clearance applicants, that the waiting list applicant is never likely to get the offer of a house on such an estate. The minimum waiting period on the single persons list is 'a few months', and for a bedsitter on the aged persons list the waiting time is similar. The easy availability of such accommodation is due to the provision of such dwellings on the city's least popular estates, in particular CFH. On this estate old people have the priority for single person accommodation, but such dwellings on this estate are so unpopular that many are filled from the single persons list.

The date order allocation system means that applicants in great housing need can apply for 'priority' rehousing to speed up the process of rehousing. This category in Sheffield is given no choice of area or estate and is made only one offer.[4] The Department offers accommodation least in demand to these applicants. Similarly, those waiting their turn on the list, who feel the greatest need for rehousing but who have not applied for or who have been refused 'priority' rehousing will accept the most unpopular accommodation for which there is the shortest wait. If such an applicant states 'any' for his area of preference this is read by the Department as an opportunity to offer a less popular estate. In this way the market mechanisms ensure that the least popular accommodation is taken by the most desperate applicants and the Housing Department endorses this by offering such accommodation to those in great need, to those on the waiting list who have one chance of refusal, and to those on 'priority' for whom a refusal results in the

loss of that priority. Those on the ordinary waiting list can indicate which of the short waiting list estates they would be prepared to accept, those granted priority do not have this opportunity.

With the important exception of the slum clearance applicants, therefore, Sheffield may be seen through its applicant classificatory schemes, and the appropriate rulings on differential priority, choice of estate and offers made, to encourage a situation in which the most disadvantaged applicants take the tenancies on the most unpopular estates. In this way unpopular estates are likely to become increasingly stigmatised, being tenanted by the most materially deprived applicants to the council sector.

4. <u>The grading system</u>

Despite the disparate nature of the housing stock the Housing Department does not grade its estates, rather they are divided into two categories - 'post-war' and 'pre-war'.[5] Sundry housing is assessed on an individual basis. Similarly, although the pre-tenancy report has an applicant classification section consisting of the categories, 'very good/good/moderate/poor' which the Housing Visitor deletes and rings as appropriate, applicants are in fact graded either suitable for 'post-war or pre-war property', or for 'pre-war only'. The latter category may also be allocated a less desirable sundry property - typically, an unimproved, short life, terraced dwelling of the 'patched and mended' variety.

'Pre-war' only applicants are typically those graded 'poor' or sometimes 'moderate/poor'. Such a recommendation may rest on low income, in which case the applicant may have a higher grade but still ask for or be recommended for the lower rent old property. More usually, poor

rent payment records or low domestic standards are more influential in determining the pre-war recommendation. Although this assessment role of the Housing Visitor is much criticised by outside observers, academics[6] and tenants alike, all local authorities seem to accord much weight to this assessment. In this Sheffield is no exception. The Housing Department staff in Sheffield justify this by pointing out that the Housing Visitor is "a well-selected, well-trained, well-supervised worker" essential if the interests of the local authority as landlord are to be protected. The role of the Housing Visitor is seen as protecting the Department from high rates of arrears, resulting from tenants unable or unwilling to pay high rent being let modern council housing.[7] Similarly, the assessment is seen as a protection of the newer housing stock from the tenant who will physically abuse it.

In practice, only a very small minority of applicants are recommended for 'pre-war' only. Eligibility for unrestricted choice of estate is not confined to those applicants graded 'good' or 'very good', most graded 'moderate' are allowed this choice, with the exception of those who have a history of rent arrears, and even 'moderate-poor' applicants may be recommended for either post-war or pre-war property if they had a good record of rent payments. All applicants, then, recommended as suitable for 'pre-war or post-war' property are treatedd the same way and their applications dealt with in a strict date order fashion. From an analysis of pre-tenancy reports it seemed in Sheffield that by far the most important factor in determining the housing recommendation is the consideration of income and rent records. An applicant may receive a low grade of character assessment and disparaging remarks on his domestic standards but still be allowed unrestricted choice of estate if he has a good record of rent payment. When low domestic standards are combined with financial unreliability the

applicant is most likely to be restricted to the pre-war or short-life sundry housing stock. The pre-tenancy reports I studied showed that Housing Visitors were fairly consistent in their grading of applicants. Broadly speaking, assessments on domestic standards could be more arbitrary than on income levels and rent records. At times it appeared that a f amily had received a low grading not because of their domestic standards as such, the rooms, for example, might be noted as clean, but because of 'irregularities' in their personal circumstances such as cohabiting couples.[8] Also influential in gaining a low grade appears to be a poor presentation of self on the part of the applicant, such as being 'demanding' or 'aggressive', and in some cases misunderstandings, particularly likely to occur with foreign applicants, appear to lead to a low grading. All this is hard to substantiate, as I was not present during pre-tenancy housing visits. It is rather an impression gained from careful scrutiny of a few hundred pre-tenancy report forms on which the Visitors make many additional remarks and include descriptions of the interview which are not demanded by the actual format of the report. Applicants may ask for a second visit and re-assessment if they particularly want a post-war property and they have been graded as unsuitable for such, but few, however, are aware of their right to make such a demand.

The pre-war housing stock, as already described, varies immensely from the very unpopular 'slum-like' walk-up flats and the 'problem' estates to the quiet residential areas which are in great demand. Theoretically, then, the 'pre-war' only applicant, either by choice or by assessment, can be offered a tenancy on any of these pre-war estates. In practice, it is only the low grade slum clearance applicant who is likely to be made an offer on one of the most popular pre-war estates. Ordinary waiting list applicants assessed as 'poor' and recommended for

'pre-war' only can in theory be offered a tenancy on a prestigous 'pre-war' estate and I came across the occasional family who received such a grading on their pre-tenancy report but who held out for the 'right' offer. Most usually, however, low gradings are found on applicants who are in extreme housing need, their financial position and domestic standards being inextricably bound up with their housing situation and personal circumstances. These applicants are not the ones who can wait for many years to be rehoused on an estate for which there is a long waiting list.

Sheffield, then, denies the grading of estates into anything more than the two broad categories, pre-war and post-war, and all the evidence I saw supported this claim with one exception. In the case of CFH, in the years when it was becoming a letting difficulty, it was not unusual to see on a pre-tenancy report form "recommended for pre-war or CFH only". The Authority also denies any policy of segregating low grade applicants and tenants from others and congregating them on certain undesirable estates. In practice, it would seem that the following policy is pursued in housing the "unsatisfactory" applicant.[9]

1) An offer of a sundry short-life property is made usually following the suggestion that acceptance of such an offer would speed up the process of rehousing.

   Sundry houses of the unmodernised terraced type in areas programmed for clearance are seen as particularly suitable for the low grade applicant, being let at a low rent - lower than the rent for a pre-war estate house. These houses are often in a very poor condition and this is seen by the Department as making them even more suitable for the unsatisfactory tenant or applicant, constituting a property to which little damage may be done and which have in any case only a limited life. Additionally the neighbours of such a property will be a mixture of private renters, owner-occupiers and other council tenants, and those in the private sector appear

less likely to call upon the Department to sort out problems with 'difficult' neighbours. On council estates, in contrast, it is not unusual for neighbours to get together and draw up petitions demanding the removal of a family.

2)q If no suitable sundry property is available, or if the applicant states specifically that he does not want such a property an offer will be made of one of the least popular pre-war estates within the area of the applicant's choice. The exceptions to this are the special hardship and homeless application type, who are given no such choice, amd the slum clearance applicant who may hold out for a better offer.

3) Individual dwellings in a poor state of repair or next to dwellings which already house 'difficult' council tenants may, on occasion, be singled out to be offered to the low grade applicant. Usually, however, such dwellings occur on the least popular estates anyway.

The qualification for the tenancy of a 'select' estate in Sheffield is not so much 'suitability' or 'good character' of applicant as time on the waiting list or slum clearance priority. The 'problem' estate tenancy is awarded to those selecting the estate for personal reasons, those in great housing need and those awarded priority and no choice (the special hardship group to whom only one offer is made) if no suitable sundry property is available. This process of allocation and lettings is not so much a 'selective conspiracy' on the part of the Housing Department, but rather a situation which arises out of the selective mechanisms of the housing market. The prizes go to those who already 'have'. The slum clearance applicant is the exception to this. If he is on a low income, has a history of rent arrears, or his domestic standards are not of the'required minimum' he may be allocated pre-war only, but these include some of the city's most prestigous estates, and the pre-tenancy reports offer evidence that low grade slum clearance applicants do obtain tenancies on these better pre-war estates. In this

way the treatment of the slum clearance applicant to some extent balances the waiting list situation whereby the most deprived applicants will get the least desirable tenancies. The socially and economically deprived slum clearance applicant may get the best of the pre-war estates. This policy towards slum clearance tenants does interfere with a clear-cut division between the 'haves' and have nots' in the housing world which exists before applicants entry into the council sector and, in the case of waiting list applicants, is maintained within the council sector through the differentials in the housing stock and the unfettered market situation.

As the stock of short-life sundry council dwellings is depleting with the completion of large-scale clearance schemes, and the improvement of the remaining dwellings of this type in 'Housing Action Areas' and 'general improvement areas' has the effect of such dwellings being relet at higher rents, it would seem safe to predict a greater polarisation of estates in the city in the future, as those applicants who would formerly have been let a sundry property will be channelled towards the unpopular estates. This polarisation would be further encouraged by the introduction on a full scale of an estate grading system which is at present the intention of the Local Authority.

The grading and allocation system in existence in Sheffield at the time of my research, which had been in operation since immediate post-war years, does not support a straightforward Local Authority allocation policy explanation of differentials between the city's estates or parts of estates. This grading and allocation system enables low grade slum clearance applicants to obtain tenancies on good pre-war estates, such as CHL. Low grade waiting list applicants generally are allocated tenancies of sundry non-estate properties, the actual numbers getting to pre-war estates are very low (see Chapter Nine). The overall

numbers of 'poor' applicants obtaining tenancies on 'problem' estates are numerically too small to explain satisfactorily the 'problems' of such estates. Moreover a 'dumping' explanation could not explain the differences between two parts of an estate, such as was found on CHH. Differences between post-war estates cannot be explained by reference to the grading system, as at the moment the Housing Department makes no distinction between these estates. However, CFH was for a few years an exception, being made available for letting to low grade applicants who would not normally be offered a post-war tenancy.

4. Staff ideas on the genesis of the problem estate : experience from inter-war estates

The information presented in this section should not be taken as the official departmental 'line' on 'problem' estates. Rather it is a collection of views of individual staff members with whom I talked while collecting data within the Housing Department. Some of the information and opinion is derived from fairly formal interviews with senior staff, but most is an assortment from informal everyday conversations with staff of all levels and concerned with a variety of aspects of the local authority's housing administration. Although these conversations and interviews were carried out separately and at different times there was little conflict in staff accounts of the origins of 'problem' estates, although emphasis on the factors held responsible, of course, varied according to the views of the individual. This broad consensus might be attributed to 'staff ideology' seen as a necessary or inevitable concomitant of working for the Department. Alternatively, it might be the result of the common experience in the field of council housing policy and administration, and personal knowledge of estates and contact with tenants. My opinion is that staff accounts are usually 'a bit of both' and I shall show where staff accounts agree with and where

they differ from my research findings, which are based on tentants' own accounts. It should perhaps be said here that not all the staff I spoke with could be fairly described as disassociated bureaucrats, a number were involved with tenants not only through personal contact within the Department but also through 'working' on the estates, for example, in the capacity of housing visitor, welfare worker and rent collector. They were also mostly 'local' people themselves with a good knowledge of the differing reputations and social character of housing areas in the city and with the advantage, which I lacked, of having personal knowledge of estates over a long period of time. Some of the more junior staff held council tenancies themselves.

Staff of the Housing Department make the distinction between problem estates which started as 'problems' and those which have 'sunk' from a previously favourable position. The most obvious example of an estate in Sheffield which has been a problem since birth is Blackacre. The mention of Blackacre was spontaneous by staff citing the original problem estate and in this context CFH was also frequently mentioned. With my prompting, a number compared Blackacre with Whiteacre, which, at the time of my research, was still amongst the most popular of the city's estates, if not the most popular. Blackacre and Whiteacre are both 1930's estates, and I was told that at this time the Department operated a selective allocation policy being under no pressure to be self-conscious of doing so.

> "Today we have to do everything to avoid the charge of dumping .... it does still occur, that's inevitable but it's nothing like to the same extent as in the past."

Blackacre was built for slum clearance families from one of the 'roughest' parts of Sheffield. These families were moved into the new houses street by street, keeping many of the neighbourhood friendship

and familial ties intact. It was a time when many were suffering great financial hardship and this increased the bond between the new tenants. In subsequent years the reputation of Blackacre became such that demand for the estate was really limited to those from the estate and those with ties with the immediate area. The situation was exacerbated by the fact that the houses by post-war years had fallen into a state of disrepair, and lacked the basic amenities of modern housing. The Department reacted to the demand pattern for Blackacre by offering vacancies on this estate to those who had specifically requested a tenancy there. This eased the potential letting problem of the estate for the Department, but at the same time created new problems for them as landlord. For a letting pattern such as this fostered the 'inward-looking' nature of the estate and the deviant subculture associated with the estate flourished. The reputation of Blackacre as being a rough area, housing people who were in some way different was given firmer foundations. During my first week of field research I was told by a resident of CHH,

> "It's bad mind but not as bad as Blackacre, they don't speak to you up there if you pay your rent two weeks running".

By adopting a policy of letting to Blackacre people,[10] the Department created its own management problems in that certain community norms foster deviant behaviour such as the non-payment of rent, suggested by the CHH informant. The Shelter Report (1975) recommends modernisation programmes for problem estates.

> "Once a housing department has allowed an estate to become a problem the situation is impossible to reverse without dispersing the residents and carrying out major improvements to the estate." (p.31)

Sheffield has done just this on Blackacre, but today it still retains many of the characteristics of a 'problem' estate. On modernisatio

an attempt was made to 'socially balance' the estate, to break up the neighbourhood subcultural groups on rehousing. In fact the Department had the greatest difficulty in persuading tenants to move out of their houses while work was being carried out on them. All those already registered on the transfer list were moved out, of the remainder a division within the estate appeared. Only the 'bottom end' residents would accept even temporary transfers to alternative council housing, and then the alternatives had to be nearby estates. The 'top end' residents tended to be more resolute in their refusal to move and for these a system was worked out by which they could move within the estate. This reluctance to leave the estate even temporarily reinforces the finding of Baldwin, that a high percentage of the residents were satisfied with the estate despite its problems. It also substantiates the picture drawn by many of the staff, of Blackacre as an estate characterised by long length tenancies, and a close knit community where ties with the neighbourhood are very strong. On completion of the modernisation programme the houses of those who had left on permanent transfer were available for letting. The majority of those again went to applicants with close ties with the area. But modernisation is thought to have made the whole estate more popular with 'outside' applicants as well. In letting a number of houses to 'outsiders' the Department successfully resisted the demand of Blackacre's tenants association that all the improved houses should be let to Blackacre people. The Department reported great improvements in housekeeping standards - "Although not all tenants have changed". Consequently staff were accepting the idea that a good standard of housing might achieve the Department's objective of getting tenants to care for their houses better rather than leaving them depressed and demoralised in dilapidated housing hoping this will provide an incentive to better things. Less

success was reported with breaking up 'problem' streets and tenants have tended to form into a 'closed' community again, despite the increase in popularity of the estate with outsiders. The final judgement is left to a welfare worker who was involved at a grass roots level in all stages of the modernisation programme.

> "Modernisation has helped some of the residents to improve their standards, it has introduced new blood but it has not erased the reputation or the local way of life."

No one I spoke to in the Housing Department was asfamiliar with CHH as these informants were with Blackacre. Nevertheless, although records show that it did not start in the same way as Blackacre my field research suggests that today there are certain similarities between the two estates - some of these similarities were confirmed by Housing staff. It was agreed that there was a tight-knit community on CHH very comparable with that on Blackacre, and like the latter, typical behaviour patterns on CHH created similar deviancy problems for the Department. CHH is also characterised by long length tenancies and low demand. Again, the Department confirmed that the only true demand for CHH came from the 'local' people, and other tenancies were taken by applicants who could not wait for a more popular estate. CHH was certainly less well-known to the Department than Blackacre, in fact, apart from knowing it as an estate in low demand , with a high number of welfare cases and other tenancy problems such as arrears, informants were rather vague about this estate. I found, however, that it differed from the Blackacre depicted by Baldwin (1974) and by the staff in that I met only a minority of residents who were really satisfied with CHH, and many were really unhappy about living on CHH. Pre-modernisation Baldwin (1974) found a surprisingly small percentage of his Blackacre respondents wanting to move away.

"As far as this sample of residents was concerned only 20 (17.9%) could be said to be in any real sense unhappy about having to live on the estate."

This high degree of satisfaction is thought by Department staff to be explicable in terms of the common origins of the residents, the extremely stable population pattern and the "sense of community" enjoyed by the vast majority of the Blackacre tenants. CHH, in contrast, is an estate which has suffered a transition from being select to being disreputable. Despite the average long length of tenancies on CHH and the 'deviant' community there are on the estate many tenants who fall into one or other of the dissatisfied categories I have described, that is, the 'misplaced newcomers' and the 'respectables left behind'. Blackacre had some of the former, but subsequent to modernisation these families were transferred away, and the latter category is not really applicable as Blackacre never had a 'respectable' past, with applicants choosing Blackacre just because it was select, as happened on CHH many years ago. Older residents remember it as having always been rough, in contrast with CHH where many older residents can remember the estate as 'select' and are distressed at its decline.

The present-day parallels between Blackacre and CHH remain great, despite their different origins and histories. On both estates 'communities out of adversity' could be said to have developed and a local way of life emerged that fosters certain types of deviant behaviour. Again, the comparatively low demand for both estates means that those who request a tenancy on either estate because of familial or friendship ties are usually successful in being granted a tenancy. CHH, CHM and CHL, however, were thought by housing staff to have started like Whiteacre - all being estates built to house the respectable working class. All these estates were products of the days when the Department could operate a selective allocation policy with impunity. Again, the

early days of CHH, CHM and CHL stretched too far back for any present-day member of the housing staff to remember. One, though, could remember the early days of Whiteacre, an estate situated in the more desirable west Sheffield in a popular area of 'respectable' owner-occupied and privately rented working class and middle class housing. My informant told me that the local name for Whiteacre, 'the brass button estate', which is still used today, is a prestige label referring to the type of applicant the estate was first used to house, the respectable working class occupational groups - postmen, busmen and railwaymen. Whiteacre is an estate with a 'good' geographical location, the housing was of the highest standard of the time and its original tenants gave it a 'select' reputation. The low vacancy rate occurring on this estate right up to the present-day coupled with the high demand meant that applicants gaining a tenancy on this estate had waited a good length of time for this. As my informant pointed out to me, this meant that, firstly, such an applicant would 'cherish' this tenancy, secondly, that the applicant would not have been of the type to have got themselves into a 'predicament' which made urgent rehousing essential, and, thirdly, such an applicant would be older and more mature on gaining the tenancy than a comparable applicant for a short wait estate. A shadow may hang over Whiteacre in that the standard of housing it offers is no longer comparable with that of many modern estates (28% of Baldwin's sample raised some complaint about the Corporation's maintenance of property) and its age structure is such that an increase of vacancies must be expected due to the death and old age of many of its residents. Such vacancies are immediately taken by slum clearance applicants. My informant, however, believed that Whiteacre was 'safer' in its selectivity than CHL. Firstly, there is a lack of alternative select council housing in the area, whereas around CHL there has been some council building, particularly of dwellings suitable for old people. This means that Whiteacre has had a lower

vacancy rate than CHL in recent years. Secondly and following from this Whiteacre had received less slum clearance families than CHL and those that it has taken tended to be from a "different type of clearance area" than those taking up tenancies on CHL and CHM. There has been selective clearance of small rows of terraced housing in the generally 'respectable' Whiteacre area and demand from these tenants exceeds the supply of vacancies occurring on Whiteacre.

Blackacre and Whiteacre provide useful examples for the comparison of 'good' and 'bad' estates which are the result of a deliberate housing allocation policy, reinforced over time by the circular cumulative process of causation. CHH, CHL and CHM were also started off as 'good' estates by the Department; however, over time CHH has become transformed into one of the Council's worst estates, a process which staff insist has taken place independently of their allocation procedures, although since demand has dropped for this estate a few houses have been used for letting to priority rehousing hardship cases. These are, in fact, very few in number, as I show in the next chapter, some of the pre-war and post-war flat complexes being more often used for such cases because the dwellings on these estates are in even lower demand than those on CHH.

In explaining the phenomenon of the 'sunk' estate such as CHH, and there are others in the city, Housing Department staff generally adhere to what I would describe as a 'bad apple theory'. This explanation of the cause of a 'problem' estate is probably the most heavily subscribed to by council tenants themselves, after the related explanation of the deliberate 'dumping' of 'problem' families on selected estates by the council. The 'bad apple' theory is really the explanation of deviancy by association. The Housing Department version is that by chance one or two 'problem' families are housed on a particular road of an estate and through neighbour contact other families, particularly the younger

generation, are influenced by their patterns of behaviour by adopting similar life styles and conduct. Other residents who cannot tolerate such neighbours will move away or socially isolate themselves. Finally a family moves in who is unable or unwilling to move away.[11] Such an explanation is largely conjecture, but the 'bad apple' theory is not as implausible as it first appears. Certainly I have traced a non-conforming subculture on CHH which both staff in the Department and residents of the estate alike allege originated from the housing of a few 'rough' families in close proximity to one another. Where staff and tenants part company is on how these 'rough' families came to be housed on the same area of the estate. Tenants generally believed that this was a result of deliberate allocation policy - some estates and parts of estates being set aside for the worst applicants and tenants. The staff for their part insisted that in the case of CHH and other estates sharing similar characteristics the initial lettings to 'rough' families happened by chance. It is difficult to verify either version on an estate as old as CHH, as there were no staff who remembered the estate in its early years and recorded information dates only from post-war years. As for the residents themselves, many had lived on the estate for a great many years, but opinions were mixed about when the estate started to decline, and this aspect of the Department's allocation policy and procedures has never been revealed to tenants. It seems likely, however, in the particular case of CHH that chance factors were responsible, as this estate was certainly considered a Corporation showpiece for many years. It is interesting to note here that although all the staff I spoke to were firm adherents of this 'bad apple' theory, based, they said, on their own practical experience of the estates, none suggested or even agreed that the converse could be true, that the housing of a 'rough' family on a good estate among respectable tenants would encourage or

inspire that family to 'better things'. Rather they were of the opinion that such a course of action would incite resentment from the respectable tenants, followed by a number of transfer requests. In fact, it would be by just such a process that a hitherto 'select' estate could be precipitated into a decline. Both the 'bad apple' theory and the social mixing ideal rest on the assumption that people are influenced by their neighbours sometimes in the direction of physical or social withdrawal, but more often in a sharing of life styles, the growth of common values and shared conduct norms. It would seem, however, that housing staff believe that the unsatisfactory tenant is more influential than the respectable in both prompting discontent and withdrawal among his respectable neighbours and in 'contaminating' the susceptible. Certainly the evidence of an estate such as CHH supports this belief and on an estate such as CHL, where at present only a very few 'rough' families have obtained tenancies, there is no evidence of such families adapting to the local way of life. Rather, such families appear withdrawn and socially isolated from their hostile 'respectable' neighbours. In fact many of these outraged respectables insisted to me that the Housing Department had in fact deliberately chosen their estate to house these 'rough' families in the hope of improving their standards by association with CHL people.

> "They are putting the bad in here hoping it will change their ways. It won't - anyone with any sense can see that. They'll just turn it into a slum. They're slum people and always will be, we are putting in for a transfer to - ."

In conclusion, it may be said that Housing staff accepted that the Department should accept much of the responsibility for the creation of estate differentials in the past. In more recent years, however, they insisted that the Department had not pursued any selective allocation policy that could possibly account for the vast differences in reputation

and social character between the city's estates, nor for such differences that occur sometimes within an estate. Present-day estate differentials were, in part, a legacy of past housing policies and procedures, but this was only part of the picture. Reputation, tenant self-selection and deviant subcultures were all seen as the more significant factors in an explanation of present-day disparities between council estates. Above all, Housing staff believed it was the freedom of choice given to applicants and the freedom to move within the council sector allowed to tenants that was responsible for differences between estates.

For example, far from being dumped on estates earmarked for decline slum clearance applicants were given priority and the widest choice of housing. This meant that slum clearance people, above all other council tenants, reside on estates they have freely chosen. In the case of CHL and CHM Housing staff confirmed that these estates were very popular with slum clearance applicants, particularly those who wanted a 'cheap relet'. Slum clearance applicants it was thought rarely asked for CHH, with the exception of a few who came from a small area under clearance close to the CHH estate. Although well aware of the attitude of other council tenants to 'clearance people' and the stigma attaching to such families generally, no member of staff attempted to support this prejudice or to offer evidence which would suggest that there was any substance to it. On the contrary, staff were more inclined to quote the example of the 'good' clearance applicants and tenants they had come across in the course of their work.

Again, staff emphasised the freedom given to waiting list applicants to select the area in which they wished to live. They pointed out that the dumping of low grade applicants only occurred in so much as they were restricted to sundry or pre-war property and certain post-war complexes, but this category included some very good pre-war estates. Priority

rehousing cases on special hardship grounds would be denied any choice of housing and allocated the least popular property. This they admitted could lead to a concentration of families in hardship, domestic and financial situations on the least popular estates. But again, the more significant factor in the concentration of the disadvantaged on the least popular estates was seen to be the choice accorded ~~by~~ to all applicants so that those in greatest need asked for the estates with the shortest waiting list. This freedom of choice also meant that on estates such as Blackacre and CHH children of existing tenants could request and receive tenancies on their estate of origin.

Finally, it was pointed out that the mobility permitted within the council sector encouraged the process that occurred when an estate was perceived to be in decline - the rush of 'respectables' away from a "sinking estate", and the reluctance of applicants with any choice to fill the vacancies on such an estate.

5. CFH and CFL : Housing Department policies

Before considering the 'unofficial' views of Housing staff on the problems of CFH, I document below changes in 'official' perceptions of the problems of this estate, drawn from a number of sources.

In the early years of CFH the apparent dissatisfaction with the estate, expressed in various forms by the residents, was explained in conventional terms. In fact, the Housing officials steadfastly refused to acknowledge that the 'concrete jungle' type developments introduced any new 'problems' for residents that would not be encountered in conventional low housing.

The Housing Manager prefaced a survey into one such estate in the following way,

> "The concentration of families in multi-storey buildings raised social problems that do not differ in kind but degree from those that arise in the traditional two-

storey cottage property estates."

Dissatisfied residents are explained in the following way :

> "Although every effort is made to settle applicants in the house and area of their choice it is clearly impossible to secure maximum happiness of everybody and there is established evidence from psychiatrists that it is not so much the defects and de-merits of the building but it is the inherent tensions of the tenant that lead to dissatisfaction in the small number of intractable cases."
> (Park Hill Survey - Sheffield Housing Department publication, September 1962)

The growing unpopularity of CFH which was becoming increasingly apparent in the years between 1965 and 1976 created immense letting difficulties for the Department. The estate developed an inordinately high transfer request list from residents wanting to leave and high rates of refusal of dwellings on this estate were encountered from applicants. In fact, there developed a situation where few applicants indicated that they would even consider an offer of housing on this estate. The Department attempted to counter this situation by offering dwellings on CFH to those applicants known to be desperate for housing. The following letter was sent to such applicants:

> "You will probably know that your turn for attention on the housing waiting list has not yet arrvied, but in view of the large scale building programmes undertaken by the council there has been a falling off in demand for properties at -, CFH and pre-war flats in the - area of the city[12]. It is possible you could be accommodated there sometime before your turn for accommodation in any other area has arisen.
>
> I am, therefore, inviting you to let me know if you would like to be considered for accommodation on either of these two estates bearing in mind it could be some time before you are made an offer of different accommodation."

The typical recipients of this letter were young couples with young children who were sharing accommodation either with relatives or in inadequate privately rented housing. The files on CFH show that a

number of such families replied indicating willingness to accept an offer on CFH and were immediately allocated a dwelling on this estate.

In 1976, however, there was an acknowledgement of the problems of estates such as CFH, and a recognition that letting dwellings on such estates to families with young children who accepted such an offer as 'emergency' accommodation, was no solution to the difficulties of this troubled estate. In the 'Report of Working Parties on High Density Developments' (September 1976), there is an acceptance that estates of the architectural type of CFH do create problems for residents, and in particular are not suited to families with young children, the built environment being particularly vandal prone and not conducive to parental supervision of children outside the dwelling.

In this Report there is no mention of the individual pathology explanation for tenant dissatisfaction relied on in the Park Hill Survey (1962). It is recognised that a policy of letting flats to those in great housing need does not necessarily solve the overall letting problem of the estate - this is reflected in the number of transfer requests from CFH tenants.

The Report admits :

> "to the extent that tenancies of flats in high rise estates have come to be looked on as the first rung in the housing ladder it is only to be expected that the number of transfers reflects the wishes of tenants to obtain other accommodation more suited to their needs."

Subsequently, a new policy towards CFH has been adopted which includes the transferring out of families with young children, the temporary ban on letting flats to families with children under 15 years of age and the warning of the problems associated with those flats, to applicants.

Evidence of the operation of this new policy towards CFH is also contained in the house files. For example, in November 1976, a young couple with a child were let a flat on this estate. Previously they had lived with their in-laws in a flat also on CFH, and they specifically requested to remain on the same estate. The Housing Visitor recommends such a letting after noting,

> "Discussed choice of area, couple asked for CFH. Advised them of present difficulties, but they stated they were aware of the difficulties, wife had lived there most of her life and man's parents also lived on the estate."

The above extract from a pre-tenancy report is also evidence of another aspect of new lettings policy adopted for CFH following the 1976 Report. It was decided to encourage the letting of flats on CFH to those who specifically asked for this estate because of familial or friendship ties with other tenants of the estate. This is planned to foster the growth of a community on CFH, the lack of which to date is seen as a root of its problems, and an obstacle to its 'recovery'.[13] Additionally, a proportion of flats on CFH has been set aside for letting to students - this is being done in an attempt to solve the letting difficulties and also to balance the population.

The 1976 Report accepts the idea of a natural cultural process of selection in its explanation for the 'decline' of CFH, and contrasts it with CFL in the following way :

> "It is not considered that the situation on CFH is irretrievable; however, it will require a concerted effort. The situation on the other estates seems to be less serious, CFL at the other end of the spectrum, providing something approaching a model in terms of community interest and pride."

The Report recognises the necessity of creating the "right atmosphere for a community to integrate and flourish." In accord with this objective it made the following recommendations :

1) The regular maintenance and repair of high rise developments is more important than for other types of council property because of high density living, the existence of communal areas and the general "bleak, dreary, hostile environment".

2) An attempt should be made to select the right tenants to enable the neighbourhood to stabilise and harmonise.

3) Attempts need to be made to reduce vandalism.

4) A police call kiosk to be set up on CFH.

5) A community development officer to be appointed for the estate.

Despite these possible areas of improvement the authors of the Report admit that vandalism and general delinquent annoyance can probably never be altogether prevented.

> "Such behaviour can probably never be fully eradicated where a large number of adults and children live at a high density with communal areas and a fair degree of anonymity."

6. CFH and CFL : informal views of Housing Staff

Unofficially, housing staff accepted much of the responsibility for the problems of CFH. All acknowledged that multi-storey flat developments of this kind offer the least attractive type of housing in terms of estate design and layout. None would have wanted a flat on this type of estate, and particularly they would not have wanted to be housed on CFH. It was seen as the estate which more than any other housed the city's deviant poor, but the social character of the estate was attributed to its low demand, offering the quickest housing to the most needy applicants, rather than to any deliberate 'dumping' policy.

One member of staff, very involved with CFH, blamed the Department for creating its problems by "indecisive lettings policy" following a situation when CFH was first builtof there being no demand for its dwellings. All the local people cleared from the area had already been rehoused on CFL and some on the CFH maisonettes. Additionally, all the

transfer requests from the surrounding pre-war estates for new property had been settled on CFL. The waiting list had been reduced anyway by other council building and CFH could not compete with other more attractive estates. In the case of CFH the Housing Department was, for the first time,in its history, able to go right down the waiting list offering tenancies on CFH. The result of this was many very young couples who had just registered were able to get a tenancy on CFH - others who already had young children and were in great housing need accepted a tenancy on this estate - this led to a high child density for such a development and an overall young population, which later began to show all the problems associated with such a population structure - financial hardship, high levels of debt, high rates of marital breakdowns, high offender residence rates, excessive vandalism and juvenile delinquency, high levels of arrears, and so on. As the estate began to acquire a bad reputation, even less people wanted to be housed there and more wanted to move away. This increased the tendency of the dwellings being let to urgent rehousing cases. A few years after its completion a new estate was built nearby, and this encouraged a rush of transfers from CFH to this estate, which produced more CFH dwellings to be let to reluctant takers. As one housing official put it :

> "It became a ghetto for 'problem' families from all over the city."

For CFL, in contrast, there was great demand. It was completed at a time when the waiting list stood at twelve to fifteen years, and two large areas of the city were being cleared. Both these areas were inner city - one where CFL now stands, another two or three miles away. Many housed on CFL were from these clearance areas and demographically a clearance area offers a much more balanced population than does the waiting list. The flats on CFL were particularly popular with the older people from the local clearance area who did not want to move away from

the area of origin. Moreover, transfers from local pre-war estates and lettings from the waiting list were to families of an older age group than those who were subsequently allocated CFH. A twelve year wait for rehousing compared with the six month wait for CFH, combined with the clearance lettings gave CFL an older population than CFH was later to acquire. So many of the CFL tenants were also from the local area that as one member of staff put it,

> "a community feeling was evident from the first."

Staff immediately concerned with CFL and CFH confirmed that the local area which had been cleared had been a 'respectable' working class area, very different, for example, from the area from which the Blackacre residents had come some twenty years previously. Staff also confirmed that in their own experience slum clearance entrants could often make the better tenants than those from the waiting list, particularly those waiting list tenants housed on such short wait estates as CFH. One informant said of CFH,

> "it's a shambles - it's hard to find one straight family up there."

Again, staff confirmed that slum clearance families were not homogeneous in age structure as tenants on short wait estates tended to be.

In Chapter Seven I showed how the reputation of an estate can affect the housing market. CFH and CFL, as described to me by housing officials, are examples of how the housing market situation can affect the reputation of a housing estate. Insufficient attention was paid to demand when CFH was built, both in being of the type of accommodation the majority of people wanted and the areas of the city in which such accommodation was needed. Dissatisfaction with CFH has kept up a constant supply of dwellings available for letting, discouraging the growth of any community. The built environment, the social character and the reputation of the estate have ensured that demand remains low. Lettings

have been made to "all takers" including those who would normally have been restricted to pre-war property. In contrast, despite the built environment of CFL, the demand for housing was there from its completion and this demand emanated from many who specifically wanted this area of the city. Satisfaction with CFL related to the local community feeling has kept dwellings available on the estate in fairly short supply, that is, most of the original residents did not want to move away. Demand continues now with a second generation of CFL families seeking tenancies on the estate.

7. Creating 'problem' estates : overview of housing department views

The Housing Department explanations for 'problem' estates vary according to the individual estates. Selective allocation policies in pre-war years and the lack of decisive lettings policies for unpopular estates in post-war years were recurrent themes. Also continually mentioned were the influence of 'rough' families in a neighbourhood in terms of mobility patterns, the growth of deviant subcultures and the effects of reputation on supply and demand. Housing officials' explanations conflict with tenants in their denial of a selective allocation policy in post-war years, and their denial of certain estates being deliberately run down for the purposes of dumping unsatisfactory applicants and tenants. Housing officials continually emphasised the freedom of choice allowed to applicants. Furthermore, the charge of dumping clearance families on such estates is emphatically denied by staff, and is disproved by eligibility and allocation rules.

I found myself in conflict with staff over two factors influential in the cumulative circular process of causation, whereby a 'problem' estate retains its problematic character. Firstly, I felt staff minimised the effects on an estate of using it primarily for special

hardship cases who were offered no alternatives. (This is different from allowing the desperate to ask for and accept less popular housing in that priority hardship cases involve a direct allocation without choice or preference on the part of the applicant being allowed.) This however did not affect any of the estates with which I was concerned, the numbers being very small for CFH and CHH (as shown in the next chapter), but was, in fact, relevant to the blocks of pre-war walk-up flats. Secondly, no one was prepared to accept that the state of repair and condition of the houses was a very influential factor in the 'social' decline of an estate, although their denial of deliberate 'running down' 'problem' estates must be accepted. The modernisation of Blackacre; current programmes for the modernisation of other 'problem' pre-war estates and the neglect of several 'prize' pre-war estates support their claim that the delay in modernising all pre-war estates is solely due to the shortage of finance, and that when finance is available the estates are assessed for modernisation, not on 'good' and 'bad' criteria but purely on the condition of the housing. In this way 'problem' estates which, by definition, have more neglected, decaying properties may be first in line for a facelift. The complaints from tenants on the lack of maintenance and delays in repairs seems fairly general for all the older housing stock. Certainly I have not found any evidence as Ward (1974) did that the estates were graded for maintenance and repairs in order of 'type' of estate, rather than urgency of repair.

From the evidence I collected at the Housing Department I would support the staff in their contention that the allocation rules and prpcedures cannot account for the differences between the city's estates. At the same time, housing staff recognised that Housing Department action could have indirect effects in the creation of 'problem' estates, but these varied according to the circumstances of individual estates. Overall

I would agree with their often expressed belief that it was the freedom of choice allowed applicants, coupled with the disparate nature of the housing stock - the latter being less emphasised by staff - that was the most important single factor in the creation of 'problem' and 'select' estates.

8. Housing policy : reaction to the market forces of supply and demand

The Housing Department, recognising the disparity of its housing stock and the differential patterns of supply and demand for its estates, pursues its own objective of housing as many applicants as possible each year. This means that speed in the letting or reletting of vacant dwellings is of the essence. In pursuing this objective policy interference with market forces is minimised, with the exception of the slum clearance priority ruling which exists to facilitate the local authority in its slum clearance programmes. The practical results of this are that unpopular vacancies are offered to those who are only to be made one offer and others in great housing need. All applicants are encouraged to widen their choice of area and estate to minimise their waiting time, but those who show themselves to be 'desperate' are told of the estates with the shortest waiting list.

Within this framework the Department accepts certain housing management policies which are fairly standard throughout the country. Firstly, there is the acceptance of the idea that the unsatisfactory tenant or applicant - either in terms of rent record or domestic standard - should not be housed in the best or newest dwellings. In Sheffield, this means 'post-war' with the exception of CFH, and another post-war city flat complex. Secondly, Sheffield also accepts that low income applicants should not be offered higher rent property. Again, this really means not post-war dwellings. Thirdly, that existing tenants

should not be allowed to move within the council sector, either by transfer or exchange, if their rent is in arrears or if their house has not been kept in good order. All these rulings may be seen as designed to 'protect' the housing stock, to minimise rent arrears, and to act as an incentive to applicants and tenants to conform to standards laid down by the Department. In this the Department functions very much as an individual landlord does in the private sector.

The sixth report of the Housing Management Sub-Committee, Unsatisfactory Tenants (1955), advises local authorities to make use of their older and least desirable housing stock in this way.

> "A number of authorities have pointed out the desirability of placing a family likely to prove unsatisfactory in the most suitable kind of accommodation. A new post-war house may be not only too expensive, it may suggest a standard of living which the family feel to be, initially at any rate, beyond them ... Much of our evidence records the value for such families of older property, and we believe the use of such property to be a good way of meeting the problem initially." (p 12)

The Cullingworth Report (1969) is rather more progressive, in that it suggests that a grading and classification system for tenancy allocation is outmoded, but at the same time, states that there will be a small minority of applicants - 'problem' families who can only be housed in the older housing stock. Sheffield really accepts the reasoning of the Cullingworth Report - the proportion of applicants graded 'pre-war only' is only a small minority and most of these are allocated sundry housing of the 'patched and mended' variety in clearance areas, the remainder going to the pre-war estates. In pursuing this policy staff justified it in terms of minimising rent arrears and protecting the better housing from the ravages of unsatisfactory tenants. They did not, however, accept the reasoning of the earlier report, Unsatisfactory Tenants, which argued that poor housing could act as an incentive to better things.

"The prospect of a transfer to a better house later may prove a useful incentive to better housekeeping standards .... Instead of groups of houses specially built for the purpose what is needed, in our view, is a pool of houses intermediate in standard between new and up-to-date houses and those unfit for habitation. They have the advantage that not only can they be let at low rents, but they do not require of the new tenant a standard of living so much in advance of his existing one as to make him despair of attaining it. Moreover, in the poorer district, where the houses are likely to be found a deviation from good standards is less noticeable and so less objectionable. It is thus possible, without grouping too many bad tenants together, to place individual tenants in surroundings in which subsequent efforts at rehabilitation may have the best chance of success." (P 14)

The Housing staff with whom I spoke on this subject were realistic enough not to subscribe to such an ideology. In their experience 'unsatisfactory tenants' rarely improved their standards, although on Blackacre it was noted that overall domestic standards did improve after the houses had been modernised for their tenants. Living in substandard housing or in deviant areas was seen by staff as minimising the chance of "rehabilitation". It was recognised that a family which is in difficulty anyway will have its problems exacerbated by inadequate housing. Transfers from a problem estate, however 'good' or 'reformed' the tenant, take so long to achieve that all the incentive they are meant to hold out is wasted. A "problem" estate or a patched house in a slum clearance area, it was acknowledged, can never be the best surroundings for "subsequent efforts at rehabilitation". The staff, then, did not attempt to rationalise this aspect of the housing policy as "for the tenants' own good", but rather saw it as a necessary measure if they were to operate efficiently as landlord, "efficiently" here meaning modelling their role on that of the private operator in any market situation in a capitalist society. Housing was seen as a welfare service only up to a point, the job of providing lower cost housing to those who need it, but at the same time they had to accept that financial losses must be

minimised. As a welfare service rather than as a business, 'bad risks' had to be accepted as tenants, but as a business rather than a welfare service those 'bad risks' must be kept in a position where the losses they could cause the firm to incur are kept to a minimum. Whatever the private beliefs of staff on council housing as a welfare service or as a business enterprise these objectives and operating rules were not devised by them on their own initiative, but rather they had been made accountable in these terms to the local council, who in turn are usually bound by the social welfare attitudes and ideologies which are played out on a grand scale in the centres of power and policy-making in society. The role and purposes of council housing is ultimately a political question, and the staff of the Department in Sheffield were well aware of this. Housing policy and practices at grass roots level are at most times determined by the role council housing is attributed by those who have political power. (I return to this question of the political economics of council housing as a welfare service in Chapter Ten.) However, not all departmental rulings are primarily motivated by a management interest, some are motivated by notions of 'fairness' and 'equity'. Elaborate rulings to prevent 'queue jumping' are an example of this, such as the rulings which prevent applicants obtaining tenancies on the more popular estates without waiting the normal length of time on the list for these.

It is not only pressures from 'above' to which the Department has to respond, their clients, the tenants themselves also make demands upon their landlord, and indirectly on their landlord through the council. The 'haves' in the council sector true to type do not really want the 'have-nots' to live with them, the natural cultural process of rejection offers ample evidence of this. The Department is under constant pressure to 'remove' problem neighbours and the 'respectable' tenants are often

quite vitriolic in their abuse of those who are suspected of being rent defaulters, or who live 'irregular' life styles.[14] At the national level, political parties in their statements on council housing have also responded to the demands of the 'respectable majority' as the CDP publication Whatever Happened to Council Housing? argues so convincingly. The system scroungers, one of the current folk-devils of our time, who are personified by the idle unemployed council tenant who defaults in his rent payments and draws numerous types of benefit, must not be seen to be getting a good deal. The moral panics of the self-righteous council tenants will ensure that they do not.[15]

9. The continuing predominance of market forces and the social character of an estate

From my research into council housing - both from talking to tenants and housing staff, and from examining housing records, I have come to the conclusion that even if one could eradicate the unwitting connivance of local authority and tenants in creating distinctions between council estates, the individual characteristics of an estate and the natural mechanisms of the housing market would make some kind of popularity ranking inevitable, and from differences in demand, all else follows. Lambert (1976) recognises this situation.

> "With so many unpopular units to let and so many needing council housing, scope for local authority managers to allocate according to choice or to manage freedom in exchange and mobility is and will remain severely limited." (p.219).

For Lambert it is the nature of the housing stock available which constrains freedom of choice in the council sector more than any local authority policy. Add to this the differential housing situation of applicants, and the inequalities between council tenants on different estates becomes more comprehensible. I remain unconvinced that even if the finance were made available to standardise council housing - and this would mean the abandonment of many estates for the purposes of council

housing altogether - that complete parity of estates could be achieved. Factors influencing demand for individual estates are, as I have sought to show, too subtle and complex for all this to be realisable in practice: some estates would remain 'more equal than others'. Furthermore, just as the finance for standardisation in our society is uhlikely ever to be forthcoming so the eradication of inequality - of which the inequalities between applicants for housing is just one small factor - could not be achieved within our existing political and social system. The alternatives left to a housing bureaucracy within this system if an attempt to achieve parity of estates is to be made is the adoption of an autocratic housing allocation policy, whereby the 'ideal' of social mixing could be wholeheartedly pursued at the expense of the 'freedom of choice' which is at present allowed to the vast majority of tenants.

There are certain practices of the local Department which do foster the inequalities between estates. These have already been mentioned, but I shall enumerate them here for the purpose of clarity.

1) In allowing the majority of applicants freedom of choice the Sheffield Housing Department permits the natural cultural process of rejection to go unchecked, and the 'needy' to go to the most unpopular estates.

2) By restricting low income applicants to cheap relet property there becomes a concentration of 'poorer' tenants on the pre-war estates. Many of the poor will also be in housing need and therefore go to the unpopular pre-war estates. Low income slum clearance entrants are more likely to go to popular pre-war estates.

3) By restricting low grade applicants to pre-war property there becomes a concentration of 'deviant' tenants on the pre-war estates. Many of the 'deviants' will be in great housing need and therefore go to the unpopular pre-war estates.

4) By disallowing deviant tenants mobility there can become concentrations of these families on certain estates who would not be allowed to move even when they want to.

5) By restricting special hardship and homeless cases to one offer and making them an offer of an unpopular estate this may further increase the number of tenants of the 'problem' estates who have domestic or financial problems.

6) By allowing the letting of tenancies on 'problem' estates to second generations of that estate, the persistence of inequality is fostered.

At this point it must be stressed that 2,3,4 and 5, the "restrictive practices" of the Department, affect only a small minority of those applying for or holding a council tenancy, and that these restrictions, in themselves, cannot account for differentials between pre-war estates, between parts of the same estate or the existence of 'problem' post-war estates. It is the market situation in which these restrictions are practised which is important (1) and (6) cannot be described as restrictive but rather the opposite: these practices are designed to offer the maximum of freedom to applicants and tenants. The Department sees this lack of policy interference with natural demand patterns as not only helpful in meeting their housing objective, but also true to the ideal of allowing the individual the maximum freedom of choice in his housing. It would seem that freedom and equality conflict in council housing as they do in other aspects of human affairs. The Department's policies champion freedom, albeit a limited and limiting freedom, at the expense of equality and it has not been able to resolve the age-old conflict between the two.

The 'problem' estate, then, cannot be viewed in isolation if an understanding of its genesis is to emerge. The problem estate must be seen in the context of the housing market generally, and the council sector in particular. Within the council sector inequality in terms of previous housing and personal circumstances, economic and social, coupled with a disparate housing stock and the overall scarcity of low-income housing, has created a situation of wide variations between council estates, so

that the council sector in any one city may embrace the best and worst of working class housing. This variation in estates in turn reinforces the situation of inequality within a housing class and indeed within what many regard as one social class. Nevertheless, I would argue that my research modifies the view of Damer (1976) that:

> "these estates are not reflections of "real differences" within the class they are producers of them." (p.73).

Certainly estates such as CHH can produce or reinforce characteristics in their population which makes them different in various ways to th e population of select estates such as CHL, as I have described in Chapter Five. At the same time, the inequality that exists in terms of housing situation and access to council housing from outside the council sector is, I would argue, just another aspect of the socio-economic inequality that persists within the working class. Furthermore, to argue against real differences in working class life styles would be both to deny the disparity in material conditions within this class and also to deny the validity of many people's chosen adaptation to these material conditions.

Social segregation within the council sector may thus be seen to result from a varied housing stock; differential rents; the degree of freedom of choice accorded to most applicants and tenants; and the differential placement of people in socio-economic terms and in respect of the urgency of housing need. Certain practices of the Housing Department in Sheffield do help to foster disparities between estates and in other ways policy allows the natural cultural process of rejection to have the same effect. It is this process of natural cultural rejection - alluded to by tenants, confirmed by housing staff, and of which there is much evidence on housing files - which reveals that there are basic

inequalities by which people are differentially placed in their housing opportunities within a housing class, as well as between housing classes. In Sheffield the existence of problem post-war estates (two of the seven highest offender rate estates in Sheffield are post-war), and the differentials between pre-war estates seen in the context of the Housing Department's grading and allocation of tenants suggests that in fact the role it plays in creating 'problem' and 'select' estates is quite insignificant unless it is to be held responsible in being in default of a social mixing policy to counter the selective mechanisms of the housing market.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Notes:

1. My research findings somewhat modify this picture of the stigmatised slum clearance tenant. Two factors seem important - firstly, the reputation of an estate which houses predominantly slum clearance entrants may be less damaged than one in which the slum clearance families are seen as an intrusive minority. Secondly, a distinction needs to be made between the differing social status of clearance areas - areas of old terraced housing, suffering different reputations in just the same way as council estates do.

2. Neither CHL nor CHM could be described as a letting difficulty, in fact, CHL still ranks as one of the most popular pre-war estates.

3. A date order allocation system is operated just as the name implies - applicants are offered housing in strict chronological order, according to their date of registration and their stated preferred housing area. A points system is a somewhat more complicated allocation system. Applicants are awarded points on a variety of criteria, most devised to assess need such as conditions of present accommodation, size of family, and so on, but length of time on the waiting list may also be a source of points. Applicants are then offered housing according to the number of points they have accumulated, i.e., the more points the quicker the offer.

4. Those granted priority on medical grounds are treated somewhat differently. They are given a complete choice of area and are allowed two 'reasonable' offers.

5. Very recently, since the end of my field research, the Housing Department in Sheffield has made some attempts to bring their grading system more into line with other local authorities which operate a finer grading system. This is not so much a conscious attempt at conforming, but rather is justified as a necessary measure to protect the best of the city's housing stock, and to free some of the less desirable post-war housing for letting to all types of applicant. At this point in time a pilot scheme is still at an informal stage. Lettings officers are attempting to grade estates according to popularity and reputation, as well as age, and to make allocations accordingly. This, however, has happened so recently that it could not account for the differences in estates which posed the research problem, nor could it have affected my findings in the field.

6. See Sean Damer and Ruth Madigan "The Housing Investigator", New Society, vol.29, no.616, July 1974.

7. A rent rebate scheme is in operation in Sheffield which is designed to help the 'needy' tenant with his rent payments. This is, however, viewed as a short term expedient for those temporarily in distress,

for instance, through illness, unemployment, mental breakdown or bereavement. The rent rebate scheme is not used by the local authority to enable low income families to take tenancies of post-war properties.

8. This was particularly so in the past, of course. On the more recent pre-tenancy reports it is interesting to note the changing attitudes and expectations of Housing Visitors - common law unions are no longer seen as so extraordinary or sinful, and are therefore not so often taken as evidence of 'poor' character.

9. Those evicted from a previous council tenancy are always included in this category.

10. I mean by this the letting of houses on Blackacre to the sons and daughters of Blackacre tenants and others who have familial or other links with the estate.

11. It may be seen that this version of the 'bad apple' theory has strong parallels with the Wilson Hypothesis. The staff I spoke to, however, recognised that many people get to such an estate through their need for housing rather than through genuine self-selection. Furthermore, staff also acknowledged that movement away is subject to the constraint of long transfer lists which are given a low allocation priority. It is believed that some families arriving with every intention of moving on become 'contaminated' (their word) so that rent records or domestic standards can ultimately prevent their being able to achieve this objective.

12. The two alternatives to CFH offered here were (i) a multi-storey flat development of a very similar type to CFH but in a different part of the city, and (ii) some extremely dilapidated pre-war walk-up flats almost adjacent to CFH.

13. There is some irony in this part of the stabilisation programme for CFH. It has been argued that it was the growth of a community amongst the disadvantaged people on CHH and on Blackacre which has given these estates their problematic character. The type of community that evolves in a housing area is dependent on the social character of the population. Communities can be 'deviant' or 'respectable' depending on the type of people who predominate in an area.

14. I base these comments on the wealth of evidence in the housing files, in the form of correspondence from tenants that the vast majority of council tenants do not want "social mixing" and are outraged by the idea of "scroungers" in their midst. A number of Sheffield estates have sent in residents' petitions to remove certain families who are thought to 'lower the tone of the neighbourhood': CFH is one example of this. Indeed, most of the tenants I met in the course of my research favoured the idea of a nissen-hut type camp for the 'problem' families. There is in my experience no more reactionary an animal than the 'respectable' council house tenant, except in perhaps the 'respectable' private estate dweller.

15. It might be argued that the shiftless scroungers or the undeserving poor have been 'folk devils' for a long time in British history. However, in recent years they seem to be receiving a revised interest from the media which is possibly linked to the present economic condition of the country and rising levels of unemployment.

CHAPTER NINE

The Housing Department Data

In Chapter Four I described how, at the end of my field research on the pre-war estates, I gained access to recorded information within the Sheffield City Housing Department, to test certain hypotheses formulated from the data collected as a participant observer, and to seek out any new information not available to me in this type of research role. While my main purpose of research within the Department was a search for relevant quantifiable data I also gained information from conversations with housing staff and by simply using the technique of informal observation within the Department itself. This information is included in the previous chapter. In this chapter I discuss briefly the various sources from which quantifiable data was collected, and I present this data and relate it to the explanations for the estate differentials which have evolved from interaction with and observation of both housing staff and council tenants.

The material in this chapter is ordered according to the source from which it has been collected. The four sources are listed and briefly described below:

1. The Quitting Book

This recorded all council houses and flats vacated by tenants in the period January 1973 to December 1974 inclusive. It also contained the date the dwelling became vacant, the date it was relet, the new address - where available - of the quitting tenant and the old address of the incoming tenant and the type of entry of the latter. All details of houses and flats falling vacant on the four estates, CHH, CHL, CFL and CFH, plus a small area of CHM - The Avenue - were noted.[1] The numbers

involved, therefore, on each estate varied greatly and this will be examined more closely in the section devoted to the 'Quitting Book' analysis. All quitting book data omits entries and quittings to council dwellings by exchanges which are recorded in a separate book.

2. The House Cards

The Housing Department keeps a record of all its dwellings by keeping a 'house card' on every one. A one in four sample was taken of the dwellings of each of the four estates plus The Avenue, and there was a card for every dwelling in the sample. These cards recorded the total number of tenants and the dates of their tenancy for each dwelling, since 1930 for the pre-war estates, and since the first letting of the post-war flats. They indicated whether each tenant was 'new' to the dwelling or whether a transfer of tenancy had occurred among family members already resident in the dwelling. Where the tenant had entered by an exchange this was also shown. Finally, these cards also showed if the current tenant was requesting a transfer, or had in the past although subsequently cancelled, and the preferred estate for transfer.

3. The Exchange Book

Three books, recording all exchanges successfully completed by Sheffield council tenants during the period January 1970 to January 1976 inclusive were traced. Details of exchanges during January 1975 were, however, apparently lost as it seems unlikely that there were no exchanges during this month and the state of this particular exchange book was dilapidated to say the least! All exchanges involving tenants of the estates in question were noted and the total number from each estate again varied greatly, as did the total numbers obtained from the quitting book. Although the exchange details were collected by road names I have grouped these into estates to present the data.

There was also a book containing records of exchanges which were started but not completed during the period of the 24th October 1968 to the 9th September 1975 inclusive. I have noted these for the estates which concerned me, and I have recorded the party by which the exchange was cancelled and the reason given for the cancellation.

4. The House Folders

House Folders existed for every council dwelling, but the information these contained varied greatly. Some contained no information at all; the papers were either lost; 'gone to Welfare' (which can also mean lost) or the dwelling is let, in the case of the pre-war estates, to a tenant whose tenancy commenced prior to 1940 from when the records date. House folders contained details of the current tenant - as opposed to details of the house which is recorded on the House Cards. Some folders contained a wealth of information, others were empty as I have already indicated. Between these two extremes most folders held at least some of the following data:

a) Letting Slips

These record the name and date of entry of the current tenant, his previous address and type of entry. Tenants who had rented a council dwelling in the city previously had their old letting slips included in the folder of their current accommodation.

b) Pre-tenancy reports

These record various personal details of the current tenants, including the type and date of his application for a council house. If this was not his first council tenancy the pre-tenancy report of the first tenancy was usually included in the folder. Sections of this report are devoted to the housing visitor's assessment of the applicant's character type, the condition of his accommodation, his domestic standards and his need for rehousing. Personal details of his family such as dates

of birth of both spouses, and children, date of marriage, or in the case of cohabitees, length of relationship, parentage of children where this is in question, place of employment, income, rent record, type of housing to be recommended and so on are recorded. The pre-tenancy report also contains information on the applicant's choice of area and estate and any refusals of offers of housing on the part of the applicant together with reasons for refusal. Conversations with the applicant where the housing visitor considers these significant are also recorded in the report.

c) Previous offers of the dwelling

These were also to be found in the house folder, recording the address of the refuser and the reason for refusal. These, however, were only included in a small percentage of the folders and therefore have not been used for statistical analysis.

d) Arrears notices and notices to quit

These have been included in the following statistical analysis, although I feel that probably not all notices of arrears - particularly for small amounts - are included in the house folders. The tables, therefore, pertaining to arrears in the current tenancy may well err in underestimating the frequency with which some tenants fall into small arrears and also the total number of tenants who fall into arrears at some time in their tenancy.

e) Miscellaneous Report Forms

These include applications for the authorization of sub-tenants, complaints about repairs that have not been attended to by the local Public Works Department Depot, applications for transfer following medical or welfare reports, disputes between neighbours, reported breaches of tenancy regulations and various welfare reports that have been initiated by some event - such as a neighbour dispute or a breach of tenancy regulations - as opposed to reports by welfare visitors on those families

on the regular visiting list, which are not included in the house folder. As with arrears notices I gained the impression that only the more serious complaints about neighbours reached the Housing Department itself, tenants being able to take more immediate action by informing a housing visitor (if they are in receipt of such visits), or the rent collector. Complaints about the houses or some feature of an estate's environment also usually go first to the Public Works Department Depot and only reach the files of the Housing Department if the complainant is not satisfied with the action taken by his local depot. The variety of content of these reports and their unequal distribution among the house folders, made it inadvisable to include them in the quantitative analysis. Some reports of tenants' complaints about their houses and the neighbours, and the housing visitor's assessment of these has been included with the qualitative material.

f) Tenants correspondence

The house folders contained many letters from tenants on matters of an ~~adverse~~ diverse nature, from various anonymous letters directed against neighbours, whose emotional content made them at times incomprehensible, to well written requests for permission to carry out home improvements. Again, these letters, many of which are the subject of various report forms are unsuitable for statistical treatment, but contain extremely informative evidence of tenants' complaints, aspirations, preoccupations, satisfactions, and so forth.

Despite the uneven distribution of data throughout the house folder sample, and the unsuitability of some material to statistical analysis, as much of the data as could be reliably used for quantitative analysis has been used in this way. It is hoped that the tables in the house folder section in this chapter justify the collection of this data and its analysis by statistical methods.

The sampling fraction for the pre-war housing is one in four, but for the post-war flats this was reduced to one in eight.

The sample sizes for the five areas were as follows :

The Avenue	=	38
CHL	=	203
CHH	=	235
CFH	=	163
CFL	=	122

I list below the number of house folders in the sample for each estate which contained absolutely no information on the current tenant.

The Avenue	=	0
CHL	=	12
CHH	=	15
CFH	=	5
CFL	=	3

For the house folder analysis it was decided to split two of the estates into two. These were the two high offender rate estates, CHH and CFH. This was done because it was thought that the 'better', i.e. the lowest offender rate parts of each of these estates might disguise to some extent the differences of these estates with their 'matching pair'. The last phrase refers to the basic purpose of this research, explained in Chapter One, namely the comparison of two sets of estates, CHL and CHH, and CFL and CFH, to establish any differences between the two which could relate causally or otherwise to their different offender residence rates. Thus the estates for the house folder analysis are presented as follows:

The Avenue	=	38
CHL	=	191
SE CHH	=	60
NW CHH	=	160
CFH high rise	=	140
CFH maisonettes	=	18
CFL	=	119

Although the number for which no information is available is quite small, I have included a 'not known' category (X) throughout the analysis, to cope with the uneven distribution of the data. Thus, for example, folders could be included which contained only a letting slip, the information on which could be used only in Tables 23 and 24. In calculating percentages and significant differences the 'X' category has been deducted from the overall total to give a percentage of the total known categories.

Finally, I include a short note on council house sales on the three pre-war estates during the short period when this was council policy.

1. The Quitting Book Analysis
January 1973 - December 1974 inclusive (this excludes exchanges)

In this section I examine recorded data which relates to patterns of demand for the four estates and for The Avenue (CHM). The Quitting Book showed the period of time each vacated dwelling remained vacant. Table 1 shows the vacancy periods for dwellings in the five areas.

TABLE 1 : Relet times of dwellings in the five areas

Relet time	Avenue	CHL		CHH		CFH		CFL	
0	3	16	19 (25.3%)	20	28 (27.1%)	22	65 (19.9%	9	27 (17.1%)
1	1	2		2		7		5	
2				4		11		5	
3		1		2		25		8	
4	1	2		4		41		8	
5		7		10		32		8	
6		9		8		38		17	
7	3	7		14		20		9	
8	3	17	31 (41.3%)	11	39 (37.9%)	29	131 (40.1%)	9	60 (46.5%)
9	4	4		8		22		14	
X	2	2		5		17		6	
Y	2	8		15		63		31	
TOTAL :	19	75		103		327		134	

Code to relet times

0 - 6 days	= 0	28 - 34 days	= 4	56 - 62 days	= 8
7 - 13 days	= 1	35 - 41 days	= 5	63 - 69 days	= 9
14 - 20 days	= 2	42 - 48 days	= 6	70 - 76 days	= X
21 - 27 days	= 3	49 - 55 days	= 7	76 +	= Y

The overall number of flats vacated in this period on CFH and CFL as a percentage of the total number of flats on each estate is shown below :

CFH = 25%

CFL = 13%

In this two-year period CFH, as expected, has the highest mobility rate. This expectation was based on the qualitative information collected on CFH and presented in Chapter Eight.

The overall number of houses vacant in the period on CHL and CHH as a percentage of the total number of houses on each estate is shown below :

CHH = 10.9%

CHL = 9.2%

No significant difference was expected in the number of houses falling vacant on these two estates (both estates being characterised by long length tenancies and low mobility rates), and as the figures above show, this is upheld by the analysis of the quitting book.

It was expected that CFH would show more flats with longer vacancy periods than CFL, being an estate with a "difficult to let" reputation. Table 1 in fact shows a slight trend in the opposite direction. The data was re-analysed, omitting those temporarily moved to CFH on the modernisation of Blackacre, and the 'Transfer of tenancies' (tenancies transferred to another member of the same household), to see if this was affecting vacancy periods. In fact, the trend remained in the same direction only slightly increased! Given that the overall mobility rates for the post-war flats were as predicted - almost twice the proportion of flats falling vacant on CFH than on CFL - it may be that the shorter relet periods on CFH are explicable in terms of lettings policy. That is, the Department's policy only to offer CFH to those in great housing need and, therefore, most likely to accept, and to those who specifically request the estate. By the time of the period of this analysis lettings policy may have altered the long vacancy periods previously associated with CFH, that has given it the reputation among staff of the Housing Department of being 'a letting difficulty'. There is some evidence that such a policy was in operation in this period, in the form of letters to applicants suggesting two estates as the quickest choice of rehousing - of which CFH was one (see the preceding chapter). Applicants were asked to reply and indicate which of the two - if either - they would be prepared to accept, refusal of both, it warned, could result in a long wait. The lettings policy for CFH has since again altered course, to discourage those from accepting a flat on the estate purely out of desperation, and to offer the flats to

applicants who want or at least have no objection to the estate.

CHH and CHL were not (from my data) expected to show significant differences in relet times, and in fact Table 1 shows no significant difference on this between the two estates. In Chapter Eight I showed that although demand is greater for CHL than for CHH there is, in fact, no shortage of takers for CHH. It should be noted, however, that the authors of The Urban Criminal found a correlation (0.60) between the offender rates of the twenty four Sheffield estates and the proportion of long-term vacancies which is significant at the one per cent level.

Table 2 shows the application type of the incoming tenant, and in Tables 3 and 4 I have grouped the application types into categories for the purpose of analysis.

TABLE 2 : application type of the incoming tenant

Application Type	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
0	-	2	23	84	12
1	-	-	-	96	41
2	4	7	18	52	48
3	-	4	2	5	2
4	10	44	26	6	11
5	3	5	5	2	-
6	-	4	15	11	2
7	-	-	1	55	3
8	1	9	12	10	8
9	1	-	-	-	1
X	-	-	-	3	1
Y	-	-	1	3	-
TOTAL:	19	75	103	327	129

Code to application types

Waiting List	= 0	Priority rehousing	= 6
Old person/single person waiting list	= 1	Blackacre Improvement	= 7
Transfer	= 2	TT (transfer of tenancy	= 8
Priority transfer	= 3	N/K	= 9
CPO (compulsory purchase order, i.e. slum clearance)	= 4	Guaranteed and temporary rehousing	= X
Pre-tenancy exchange (slum clearance)	= 5	Pre-tenancy exchange transfer	= Y

The transfer tenancies (8) and the Blackacre decants to CFH (7) are special cases and may be taken out of the following analysis. The one not known occurring on CFL is also omitted.

TABLE 3 : Grouped application type of incoming tenant

	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
Waiting List (0,1)	-	2	23	180	52
Priority etc. (6,X)	-	3 (7.7%)	15 (41.7%)	14 (74.0%)	3 (46.2%)
CPO (4,5)	13 (76.5%)	49 (75.3%)	31 (34.1%)	8 (3.1%)	11 (9.2%)
Transfers (2,3,Y & 7 for estates)	4 (23.5%)	11 (17.0%)	22 (24.2%)	60 (22.9%)	53 (44.5%)
	17	65	91	262	119

Including the 'priority' groups with the waiting list category as they are a 'waiting list type' of application, the difference between the general waiting list category entries to CHH and CHL is significant at the 5 per cent level and is in the predicted direction.

Again, the predicted difference between slum clearance entries to CHH and CHL is also significant (P .001). 7.7% of the houses relet on CHL in this period went to the waiting list type of applicant, compared with 41.7% on CHH. 75.3% of the houses relet on CHL went to slum

clearance applicants compared with 34.1% on CHH. It may be noted here that The Avenue also shows the predicted high level of slum clearance lettings (76.5%).

CFH and CFL also showed the predicted differences in lettings to the various application types. Including the priority entries with the general waiting list category, 74% of CFH lettings went to this group, compared with 46% on CFL. This is significant at the 0.1 per cent level.

The difference between the two estates on slum clearance lettings is in the expected direction and is significant ($P < .01$). An analysis of lettings in the early years of CFL would show a much higher percentage of slum clearance lettings from the local areas, but by the time of this quitting book (1973-1974) these areas had been cleared and the inhabitants rehoused, and thus the popularity of CFL with slum clearance applicants had reduced. CHH is more popular with CPO's than CFL, and this is consistent with the fact that areas local to CHH were being cleared in these years, whereas all clearance in the CFL area had been completed.

The transfer category also shows a significant difference ($P < .001$) between CFH and CFL - 22.9% of lettings on CFH went to this application type compared with 44.5% on CFL. This also fits in with the general picture of CFH - its acceptance only by those in the greatest housing need. Slum clearance applicants have a certain leverage in their choice of housing area, a fact recognised by the Department, and priority is given to these applicants. Transfer applicants have already secured a council tenancy. The type of applicant with the greatest housing need and least bargaining power is usually to be found in the waiting list category - a group who are over-represented on CFH.

The transfer category shows a higher percentage (24.2%) going to CHH than to CHL (17%) which, although not significant, may at first glance

appear surprising but becomes more comprehensible if it is remembered that there are more houses available to the transfer list on CHH than on CHL because of the latter's popularity with the CPO's, who have first priority. Table 4 shows transfers as a percentage of non-slum clearance entrants to the four estates.

TABLE 4 : Analysis of types of non-slum clearance tenants entering estates

Estates	Transfers[1]	Waiting List[2]	Total	% of transfers among non-CPO cases
CHL	11	5	16	68.8
CHH	22	38	60	36.7
CFH	60	194	254	23.6
CFL	53	56	109	48.6

Footnotes to Table 4

1. Transfers include 2,3,7 and _ from Table 2
2. Waiting List includes 0,1,6,X " " "

The transfer category as a percentage of the nonCPO cases shows clearly the relative popularity of the four estates among those who are already tenants of the Local Authority.

This is in the expected direction, particularly as there is usually less urgency in housing need for this category of applicants than for those on the waiting list. Transfer tenants may be expected to accept only a desired tenancy, rather than anything that is offered.

The transfer pattern for CHH and CHL is further explicated by the following tables. Table 5 shows the previous housing types of the incoming transfer tenants to CHH and CHL.

TABLE 5 : Source of tenants transferring to CHH and CHL

CHH	
Disreputable prewar estates (including 8 cases from CHH itself)	= 11
Select prewar estates	= 0
Disreputable postwar flats	= 6
Sundry	= 1

(continued on next page)

Peripheral but select housing estates	= 3
Select postwar housing estate	= 1
TOTAL:	22

CHL

Disreputable prewar estates	= 5
Select prewar estates (including 3 from CHL itself)	= 4
Disreputable postwar flats	= 2
Sundry	= 0
Peripheral select postwar housing estates	= 0
Select postwar housing estates	= 0
TOTAL:	11

Any such classification as the one made above is of necessity rather arbitrary and involves value-judgements. I have made such a classification to give a general impression of the status of estates and based it on my experience of council tenants' and applicants' ranking of the desirability of various estates (there appears to be a high degree of consensus on this), as well as information from staff at the Housing Department on high and low demand estates, which coincides to a great extent with tenants' assessments of the same.

CHH has twice as many transfer entries in this period as CHL, but none of these are from select prewar estates. Four are from select postwar estates, but three of these are on the periphery of the city. From conversations with CHH tenants who have obtained such transfers there appear to be two main motivations for such transfer requests; 1) a desire to return to the area of origin or where relatives live; 2) a desire to leave an expensive house as quickly as possible, i.e. expensive both in terms of rents and additional travelling expenses. The motivation to transfer to any housing estate from the disreputable postwar flats needs no explanation, and CHH, being one of the least popular housing estates, does offer one of the first opportunities of leaving a flat for a house.

In this period no CHL tenant transferred to CHH, but two CHH tenants transferred to CHL.

As already suggested, the lower overall number of transfer entries to CHL may be attributed to its popularity with slum clearance applicants and therefore transfer applicants, like waiting list applicants, are advised against this estate.

In Table 6 I show the type of housing that the quitting tenant moved to from these estates.

TABLE 6: New address of quitting tenant

New address	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
Death, old age, infirmity, hospital, OAP Home etc., (01, 02, 03)	4 (21%)	24 (32%)	25 (24.3%)	32 (9.8%)	26 (20.2%)
No meaningful address (04, 05, 06, 07)	4 (21%)	16 (21.3%)	16 (15.5%)	63 (19.3%)	30 (23.3%)
Prewar housing estates (98, 99, 9X and all the '1's)	3 (15.8%)	19 (25.3%)	18 (17.5%)	89 (27.2%)	16 (12.4%)
Postwar flats (25,26,31,33, 34,38,39,30, 41,44,49,54, 57)	2 (10.5%)	3 (4%)	31* (30.1%)	69** (21.1%)	31** (24%)
Postwar housing estates (all other numbers from 20-50 except:-)	6 (31.6%)	12 (16%)	9 (8.7%)	67 (20.5%)	19 (14.7%)
Sundry (59)	-	1 (1.3%)	2 (1.9%)	1 (.3%)	2 (1.6%)
Private (60)	-	-	2 (1.9%)	6 (1.8%)	5 (3.9%)
TOTAL:	19	75	103	327	129

Footnotes to Table 6

in column 1

1. The code for all the estates is not included here, but the above categories are both exhaustive and mutually exclusive.

2. (*) The figure for CHH tenants moving to postwar flats is misleading in that 28 out of these 31 went to O.A.P. flats adjacent to CHH: the majority if not all of these would be old people. When this number is excluded from the CHH and CHL quittings these estates show little difference in numbers moving to postwar flats; i.e. CHL 1, CHH 2.

3. (**) 30 tenants moving to postwar flats from CFH stayed on the same estate as did 22 tenants on CFL; i.e. these were intra estate moves. This leaves 39 CFH tenants moving to other postwar flats and 9 CFL tenants moving to other postwar flats. Of these, 9 CFH tenants moved to CFL but no CFL tenants moved to CFH: this would lend support to the belief that residents of the two estates are aware of their differences even if 'outsiders' tend to see them as one.

The percentage difference between houses falling vacant on CHL (32%) and CHH (24.3%) due to death or old age is not significant, but it is in the hypothesised direction.

The percentage difference between flats falling vacant on CFH (9.8%) and CFL (20.2%) due to death and old age is significant at the one per cent level. This is consistent with other data suggesting the majority of incoming CFH tenants are young families, or single people from the waiting list, and they do not stay long enough to complete a normal life cycle on the estate, whereas CFL single person flats are more popular with OAP's, and the estate has more of its original tenants who were of an older age group when they took up the tenancy (due to the length of the waiting list at that time) and thus now fall into the elderly persons age group.

The percentage difference between CFH and CFL tenants moving to prewar estates is significant at the one per cent level: 27.2% from CFH compared with 12.4% on CFL. This is no doubt partly explicable in terms of the return of a number of "Blackacre decants",[2] but these cannot be separated from those obtaining straightforward transfers to Blackacre for this analysis. The total number of moves to Blackacre from CFH in this

period is 57. In Table 7 I show that almost all of the CFH tenants going to prewar estates go to those in the disreputable category: this in itself is indicative of the dissatisfaction generated by CFH.

The number going into private housing from all the estates in this period illustrates how little movement there is between the council and private sectors, particularly in the direction of council to private. CHL had no such moves, CHH 1.9%, CFH 1.8% and CFL 3.9%.

Finally, I did try to analyse the data contained in Table 6 under a different classification - using the 'select'-'disreputable' estate dichotomy. As I have indicated earlier, there is a broad consensus over which estates are 'select' and which 'disreputable'; or put another way, 'high demand' and 'low demand'. However, one of the major problems of such an analysis is that, for example, although an estate may be undisputedly prewar housing it may be neither unreservedly 'select' or 'disreputable', and the demand for it might fluctuate over time or according to area. Thus some estates have 'select' and 'disreputable' parts, others are unreservedly one or the other, and a few are in the 'grey area' of being 'neither-nor'.

Table 7 shows the result of this analysis. Only prewar estates were included as in broad terms postwar council housing is in higher demand and these estates enjoy a select reputation with the exception of some lower-demand, mainly disreputable, flat complexes.

TABLE 7: The new address of quitting tenants going to prewar estates assessed as 'select' or 'disreputable'

New address	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
Select prewar 98, 13 17 18 1X	1	8	4	3	-
Disreputable prewar 99, 9X, 11 12 14 15	2	11 (15%)	14 (13.6%)	86 (26.3%)	16 (12%)
TOTAL:	3	19	18	89	16

Footnote to Table 7

1. Percentages are calculated on the overall total (see Table 6).

The only remarkable figure to arise out of this table is the 26.3% (86) going from CFH to disreputable prewar estates. This suggests, perhaps, that a move from CFH to anywhere is preferable to staying on this estate. However, it should be remembered that an unknown number of Blackacre decants will be included in this figure.

In Table 8 the old address of the incoming tenant is given. Again, these are grouped into categories so that it is the type of previous housing which is shown.

TABLE 8: Old address of new tenant

Old address	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
Private (01)	12 (63.2%)	52 (69.3%)	41 (39.8%)	88 (27%)	38 (29.5%)
Temporary and N/K (02, 03, 05, 06, 07)	-	1 (1.3%)	2 (1.9%)	15 (4.6%)	7 (5.4%)
Not applicable i.e. TT's (04)	1 (5.3%)	9 (12%)	12 (11.7%)	11 (3.4%)	8 (6.2%)
Prewar housing estates (98,99 9X and all the 1's)	4 (21%)	11 (14.7%)	29 (28.2%)	114 (34.9%)	14 (10.9%)
Postwar flats (25,26,31,33, 34,38,39,30, 41,44,49,54, 57)	2 (10.5%)	2 (2.7%)	10 (9.7%)	72 (22%)	51 (39.5%)
		(17.4%)			
Postwar housing estates (all other numbers from 20-50 except:-)	-	-	8 (7.8%)	16 (4.9%)	7 (5.4%)
Sundry (59)	-	-	1 (.9%)	11 (3.4%)	4 (3.1%)
			(46.6%)		
TOTAL:	19	75	103	327	129

From this table it can be seen that there is a significant difference between CHL and CHH in the percentage of tenants coming from the private sector, (69.3%. and 39.8% respectively). This is significant at the 0.1% level. We can assume at this point that the majority of this higher percentage from the private sector to CHL are CPO's, and that the CHH figure contains more entrants from the waiting list. The Avenue shows the same trend as CHL in this respect, (63.2%), from the private sector.

As Table 8 does not give much information it has been cross-analysed with application type for Table 9.

TABLE 9: Private sector entries to the four estates analysed according to application type

Application Type	CHL		CHH		CFH		CFL	
Waiting List	1)		6)		75)		27)	
Priority	2)	(5.8%)	4)	(24.4%)	6)	(92.0%)	-)	(71.1%)
CPO	49	(94.2%)	31	(75.6%)	7	(8.0%)	11	(28.9%)
TOTAL:	52		41		88		38	

This table shows that of the 52 entries to CHL from the private sector, 5.8% were from the waiting list group compared with 24.4% on CHH and 94.2% were slum clearance compared with 75.6% on CHH. These differences are significant at the 5% level, and they lend support to the contention above that the majority of CHL's private entry would be slum clearance, and that CHH would have a higher percentage entry from the waiting list than CHL.

This table also demonstrates that, although there was no significant difference between CFH and CFL in their entries from the private sector, when this is further broken down by application type there is a significant differencebetween the two estates, both in the percentage from the waiting

list and from slum clearance areas at the 1% level.

The figures for the council sector in Table 8 show a much higher percentage (46.6%) coming from the council sector to CHH than to CHL (17.4%). This difference is to be expected in view of the high percentage of slum clearance entries to CHL. It is a significant difference at the 1% level.

Table 10 information from Table 8 on council sector estates has been cross-analysed with application type.

TABLE 10: Council sector entries to the four estates analysed according to application type

Type	CHL		CHH		CFH		CFL	
Waiting List	1)	(15.4%)	16)	(54.2%)	90)	(46.0%	21)	(28.9%)
Priority Transfers	1) 11	(84.6%)	10) 22	(45.8%)	8) 115	(54.0%)	1) 54	(71.0%)
TOTAL:	13		48		213		76	

Both pairs of estates show significant differences on application types from the council sector. CHL has a lower percentage of waiting list entries (15.4%) than CHH (54.2%) ($P<.05$). CHL has, therefore, a higher percentage of transfer entries (84.6%) than CHH (45.8%). Similarly, CFH has a higher percentage of waiting list applicants than CFL (46% and 28.9%) respectively, and a lower percentage of transfer entries (54% to 71%) (percentage difference significant at 1 per cent level). These patterns of types of entry from the council sector to the four estates support hypotheses formulated at an earlier stage of the research.

The CFH transfer figure can be further broken down, out of the 115 transfers to the estate 55 were Blackacre decants and 43 from CFH itself, leaving only 18 transfers to CFH from other estates, (none of these were

from CFL). Similarly, 22 of the transfers to CFL were intra-estate, leaving 32 transfers to CFL from elsewhere (12 were from CFH).

Table 8 shows a very high percentage of CFH tenants coming from prewar housing estates (34.9% compared with CFL's 10.9%) The CFH figure, however, includes the 55 Blackacre decants; if these are taken out the CFH percentage is reduced to 18%. Although the differences were not significant, the table shows CFH has more entrants from prewar estates than CFL, but the latter has more from postwar flats, as proportions of the total lettings for each estate in this period.

Overall, this table again illustrates the relatively self-contained nature of the council sector. CHL has the highest percentage of private entries (69.3%), but of these 52 entries, 49 are slum clearance - a group of tenants who cannot be said in any real sense to come voluntarily into the council sector. CHH has 39.8% from the private sector, 31 of the 41 are slum clearance entrants. CFH has a 27% entry from this sector, 7 of the 88 are from slum clearance housing, and CFL has a 29.5% entry from the private sector, 11 of the 38 being slum clearance. An analysis of the house folders suggested - although I have no statistical data on this - that only a very small minority of slum clearance applicants had actually applied for council housing through the waiting list prior to becoming eligible through a clearance scheme, although the majority must have been eligible for waiting list registration on the inadequate amenities qualification.

2. The House Card Analysis

The data in this section shows various measures of resident "satisfaction" with their estate. Constraints on mobility discussed in Chapter Eight should be taken into account when reading these tables.

Table 11 shows the total number of tenants per sampled dwelling since 1930 for the prewar estates and since first letting for the post-war flats.

TABLE 11: Total number of tenants since 1930 for the prewar estates and since first letting for the postwar flats (sample size 1 in 4)

Total no. of tenants	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
1	2)	5)	12)	73)	70)
2	5)(39.5%)	33)(39.4%)	26)(32.3%)	87)(48.9%)	75)(58.9%)
3	8)	42)	38)	78)	41)
4	10	45	43	44	29
5	3	30	38	28)	18)
6	4	17	27	9)(13.8%)	9)(12.6%)
7	4	15	18	8)	3)
8	-	8)	16)	-	1)
9	-	5) (7.9%)	3)(14.1%)	-	-
10 +	2	3)	14)	-	-
TOTAL:	38	203	235	327	246
Mean no. of tenants	4.3	4.3	4.8	2.8	2.6

It was expected that CHH would have a higher percentage of houses having more tenants than CHL; the difference shown for 8 or more tenants by this table is in the predicted direction and is just significant ($P < .05$) However, CHH unlike CFH is not associated with an excessively high mobility rate.

It was expected that CFH would have a higher percentage of flats having more tenants than CFL. The difference shown in this table is again in the predicted direction, but is only significant for the two or less tenants category. This difference is greater if it is taken into consideration that CFL was, in the main, completed five years before CFH, and therefore on this fact alone, without any prior knowledge of the two estates, one would expect a greater number of tenancies per flat on

average on CFL than on the 'younger' CFH. In addition to this, CFH in this analysis was treated as one estate and therefore included the CFH maisonettes which were the earliest completed blocks on the estate, and which are thought to have a letting pattern bearing greater similarity to CFL than to their own estate (see earlier chapters).

The average number of tenants is shown at the bottom of Table 11. The prewar estates show a much lower overall mobility rate than the postwar flats when the age of the estates is taken into account.

In Table 12 the data from Table 11 is rather more refined, excluding transfers of tenancy to members of the same household.

TABLE 12: Total number of different family tenants per dwelling i.e. exdludes TT's.

No. of different family tenants	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
1	5) (44.7%)	22) (36.5%)	24) (28.0%)	81) (52.3%)	94) (62.6%)
2	12)	52)	42)	90)	60)
3	4	41	43	75	36
4	9	35	36	43	29
5	1	20	37	22)	16)
6	3	13)	20)	11) (11.6%)	8) (11.0%)
7	3	12)	12)	5)	3)
8	-	5) (16.2%)	11) (22.5%)	-	-
9	1	1)	3)	-	-
10 +	-	2)	7)	-	-
TOTAL:	38	203	235	327	246

This table shows much the same pattern as Table 11, although more than one tenancy of the same family has been excluded.

Residents of CHH dated its decline from the immediate postwar years, when, according to residents' accounts, there was considerable movement away from the estate to more modern council housing. Table 13 shows the mean number of real changes in tenancy (excluding transfer of tenancy to members of the same household) in each decade from the 1930's to the 1970's inclusive for both estates and The Avenue.

TABLE 13: Mean number of real changes in tenancies for the prewar estates.

	The Avenue	CHL	CHH
1930's	1.1	1.0	1.1
1940's	0.3	0.4	0.8
1950's	0.3	0.4	0.4
1960's	0.4	0.4	0.4
1970's (to 1976)	0.3	0.3	0.3

For the 1940's decade the difference in the mean for CHL and CHH is highly significant ($P < .001$).

Residents of CFH said the estate had been unpopular since first lettings, this unpopularity was said to have increased with time, with increasing numbers of residents leaving the estate. Table 14 shows the mean number of real changes in tenancy (excluding transfers of tenancy to members of the same household) in the 1960's and 1970's to 1976, for CFH and CFL.

TABLE 14: Mean number of realchanges in tenancies for the postwar flats.

	CFH	CFL
1960's	1.7	1.8
1970's	0.9	0.6
1965 - 1976	1.6	0.9

For the period 1965 to 1976 the difference in the means for CFH and CFL is highly significant ($P < .001$).

Some data showing annual vacancy rates on the prewar estates for more recent years was available. This is presented in Table 15. A steady increase in the numbers of houses falling vacant on these three estates is apparent. This is probably attributable to the several factors aleady discussed, the proportion of old age residents, and the condition of the housing, and in the case of CHM and CHL the unrest caused by the changing social character of the estates.

TABLE 15: Houses available for letting

	CHL and CHM	CHH
1973	52	30
1974	63	41
1975	85	60
TOTAL:	200	131

A further measure of population stability was taken by comparing the length of the longest tenancy per dwelling: This is shown in Table 16.

TABLE 16: The length of the longest tenancy per dwelling. (This includes continuous family tenancies.)

Length of longest tenancy	The Avene	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
0	-	-	5)	26) (55.4%)	3) (30.1%)
1	-	2)	8)	155)	71)
2	2	18) (16.7%)	12) (27.2%)	137) (44.6%)	63) (69.9%)
3	7	14)	39)	9)	109)
4	2	33	35		
5	5	41	41		
6	3	26	25		
7	5	25)	28)		
8	8	22) (34.0%)	22) (30.0%		
9	6	22	20)		
TOTAL: (see next sheet for code)	38	203	235	327	246

Code to length of longest tenancy

0	=	less than 5 years	5	=	25 < 30 years
1	=	5 < 10 years	6	=	30 < 35 years
2	=	10 < 15 years	7	=	35 < 40 years
3	=	15 < 20 years	8	=	40 < 45 years
4	=	20 < 25 years	9	=	45 years +

Footnote to Table 16

1. On the prewar estates where no details of tenants prior to 1930 exist the code can mean at least the minimum number of years for that code, e.g. 5 = 25 < 30 years or at least 25 years.

The results of this table are as predicted. One would expect more short length tenancies on an unpopular estate, in this case CHH and CFH, than on the more popular ones. Conversely, one would expect a higher proportion of long length tenancies on the more popular estates - although CHH is expected to have a substantial proportion of long length tenancies for reasons discussed elsewhere. (When considering such data it must be remembered that it is harder to leave an unpopular estate and, therefore, if there were equal opportunities to move for all council tenants the proportion of short length tenancies on unpopular estates would doubtless be higher.)

On CHH 27.2% of the houses had longest tenancies of less than 20 years, compared with 16.7% on CHL. This difference is significant at the 1% level. At the other end of the scale there is no significant difference between the percentage of the longest tenancies on the two estates, 34% of the houses on CHL had longest tenancies of more than 35 years, compared with 30% on CHH.

CFH and CFL show significant differences at both ends of the scale; 55.4% of flats on CFH had longest tenancies of less than 10 years, compared with 30.1% on CFL. Thus 44.6% of flats on CFH had longest tenancies of more than 10 years, compared with 69.9% on CFL. Satisfaction with an estate may be measured by comparing the transfer requests of residents from each estate.

TABLE 17: Transfer requests of the current tenant

Transfer request	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
0	27	165	166	205	199
1	8)	22)	41)	95)	30)
2	-) (29.0%)	4) (18.7%)	3) (29.4%)	-) (37.3%)	2) (19.1%)
3	3)	12)	25)	27)	15)
TOTAL:	38	203	235	327	246

Code for transfer requests

0 = No
1 = Yes
2 = Yes with specific statement re size of house
3 = Transfer request cancelled

Footnote to Table 17

1. Data source shows all transfers requested by current tenant - this table includes all requests, even if subsequently cancelled.

The differences in the proportions of tenants requesting a transfer or having requested a transfer in the past are shown in this table to be as predicted for the five areas. CHH (29.4%) has a significantly ($P < .01$) higher proportion of tenants requesting transfers at some point in their tenancy than CHL (18.7%). It is interesting to note here that although the figures involved for The Avenue are small this area has a transfer request pattern more similar to CHH than to CHL. There is also a significant difference between CFH and CFL, 37.3% and 19.1% respectively ($P < .01$).

In addition to this an unknown proportion of tenants on unpopular estates (in this case CHH and CFH and The Avenue on CHM) are desirous of a transfer but are deterred from applying for one because of the felt futility of taking such action. Many tenants of unpopular estates have given this as the reason for not applying for a transfer, that is, it is believed that the chances of an exchange are slim and transfers take too long to make registration on the transfer list worthwhile.

This evidence of a high percentage of transfer requests on CFH compared with CFL is supported by section 14 of the 'Report of Working Parties on High Density Developments' presented by the Sheffield Housing Department in September 1976. This section states: "The average ratio of transfers to total tenancies in Sheffield is approximately 11%." The figures for the four estates (excluding families without children) are:

CFH	22.2%
CFL	10.3%
Townend	18.0%
Cityside	16.1%

These figures underline the view that of the four estates the problems are most serious at CFH.

Tenants requesting a transfer state their first choice of estate. In Table 18 I have grouped the city's estates into categories for the analysis of data on choice of estate.

TABLE 18: Preferred estate for transfer

Preferred estate	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
Any and not stated	-	1	8	8	3
Prewar housing estates	10(91.0%)	27(71.1%)	41(59.4%)	45(36.9%)	9(19.2%)
Postwar flats	-	1(2.6%)	7(10.1%)	35(28.7%)	19(40.4%)
Postwar housing estates	1	9(23.7%)	13(18.8%)	34(27.9%)	16(34.0%)
TOTAL:	11	38	69	122	47

The overall impression gained from this table is the popularity of prewar estates, the only estate not to have its highest percentage of transfer requests for prewar estates is CFL, where 40.4% of the requests are for postwar flat estates. This might be taken as a level of satisfaction with this type of estate generally from the CFL experience.

14 CFH tenants asked for CFL, but no CFL tenants request CFH. 7 of the CFH transfer requests were for flats elsewhere on the same estate; 12 requests on CFL were for the same estate. A similar pattern shows on the prewar estates; no CHL tenants asked for CHH, but 13 CHH tenants asked for CHL or CHM; 15 CHL tenants requested another house on the same estate, 8 CHH tenants asked to remain on the estate or go to the local OAP flats.

There are no significant differences in the transfer request pattern between CHH and CHL. Between CFH and CFL, however, there is a significant difference in the number requesting prewar housing estates. The Blackacre decants who were given temporary housing at CFH would not show in this figure, but 28 of the 45 were requests for Blackacre, illustrating the interchange of population between the two estates which was discovered at an earlier stage of the research. 9 more of the 45 were for local prewar estates. Many of these requests are made by tenants who always wanted a prewar house but were forced by their housing situation to accept a postwar flat on CFH. Only 2 of the 9 CFL requests for prewar estates were for Blackacre, and a further 4 were for the local prewar estates. None of the other transfer request categories show a significant difference between CFH and CFL.

3. <u>The Exchange Books</u>

Tenancy changes by exchanges on the four estates and The Avenue, from January 1970 to January 1976 inclusive, but excluding January 1975.

The data in this section shows residents who have achieved an exchange. There is no data available on tenants who are currently wanting to exchange. Again, the discussion of constraints in exchanges in Chapter Eight should be remembered.

The total number of dwellings changing tenancy by exchange as a percentage of the total dwellings on the estate in the five year period

was as follows :-

CHL = 5.8%
CHH = 6.6%
CFH = 9.6%
CFL = 5.6%

The difference in the percentage of exchanges obtained by CFH and CFL tenants is significant at the 0.1% level. It may be seen, therefore, that despite the difficulty associated with procuring an exchange for the resident of a low status estate, CFH still has a significantly higher mobility rate by exchanges than CFL. If the intra-estate exchanges are omitted for these two estates this difference in exchanges on these two estates is still significant, being 8.3% for CFH and 4.3% for CFL.

These figures show that 6% of the tenants on CHH and 8.3% of CFH tenants managed to enter an exchange with tenants from other estates. Conversations with tenants of these estates and correspondence between tenants of these estates and the Housing Department suggest that many tenants on unpopular estates who seek an exchange are, in fact, unsuccessful, and others do not even try because they believe it impossible One might expect, therefore, that the number of tenants entering exchanges from these unpopular estates would be higher still if such constraints did not exist.

TABLE 19: Exchanges by type

	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
Intra-estate	-	10(21.3%)	6(9.7%)	17(13.5%)	13(23.6%)
Other estates	5	33(70.2%)	45(72.6%)	101(80.2%)	39(71.0%)
Private	1	1(2.1%)	5(8.1%)	2(1.6%)	3(5.5%)
Sundry	-	3(6.4%)	4(6.5%)	1(0.8%	-
Out of Town	-	-	2	2	-
Unknown	-	-	-	3	-
TOTAL:	6	47	62	126	55

Table 19 shows no significant differences between either 'pair' of estates in types of exchanges. I have, therefore, in Table 20 made the prewar-postwar, houses-flats distinctions that I have already used elsewhere, despite the problems such a classification presents.

TABLE 20: Exchanges within the Council sector (excluding intra-estate and out of town exchanges)

Type of exchanges within the Council Sector	The Avenue	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
Prewar Estates	4	25(69.4%)	26(53.1%)	59(57.8%)	21(53.8%)
Postwar Flats	-	3(8.3%)	7(14.3%)	24(23.5%)	13(33.3%)
Postwar Houses	1	5(13.8%)	12(24.5%)	18(17.6%)	5(12.8%)
Sundry	-	3(8.3%)	4(8.1%)	1(1.0%)	-
TOTAL:	5	36	49	102	39

This table also does not show any significant differences between either pair of estates.

Excluding intra-estate exchanges, 23 of the 102 CFH exchanges (22.5%) were with Blackacre. (For the link between these two estates see Chapter Six.) No other estate has a number of exchanges approaching that of Blackacre with CFH.

The most popular estate for exchanges with CFL in this period was a local prewar estate - 6 exchanges in all, or 15.4% of all CFL exchanges within the council sector, excluding those made within CFL itself. There was only one exchange between CFL and Blackacre in this period.

A prewar estate local to both CHH and CHL was the estate having the highest number of exchanges with both CHH and CHL; 9 on CHH, or 18.4% of the 49 exchanges within the council sector, and 11 on CHL, or 30.5% of the 36 exchanges taking place between CHL tenants and other council tenants in this period.

Four points of interest emerge from this data on exchanges:

1. The interchange of population between Blackacre and CFH is present through exchanges, as it is through the other forms of quittings and lettings already considered.

2. Even on low demand estates such as CFH and CHH, it is still at least possible to enter exchanges with tenants living elsewhere. Tenants of such unpopular estates generally tend to underestimate this possibility. The most common motivation for tenants from select postwar housing estates exchanging to CFH appears to be, from other data, the dislike, inconvenience or expense of living on a more peripheral estate.

3. All the estates had highest exchange rates with other estates in the same geographical area. This supports the idea of a high degree of identification with a small geographical area of the city that most council tenants feel for their area of origin. Even if the tenant finds his present estate unsatisfactory he usually wants to stay in the immediate area. The request to move within the area in which the applicant already resides, or to move back to the area of origin continually presents itself when sifting through data on council tenancies.

4. Exchanges, in fact, appear to be more related to individuals than to estates. That is, the impression gained from the house folders is that once a tenant has entered into an exchange successfully it gives him the impetus to use this means of moving again when he so desires. Thus, it is quite common to find some tenants have never entered into an exchange, whereas others, regardless of their present estate, have exchanged tenancies several times.

Table 21 shows exchanges that have been cancelled, and the recorded reason for the cancellation.

TABLE 21: Cancelled exchanges : 24.10.68 to 9.9.75

CHH

Cancelled by the Department	
because CHH tenant 'fails'	3
because other tenant 'fails'	3
Cancelled by CHH tenant	-
Cancelled by other tenant	1
	7

(continued on next page)

CHL

Cancelled by the Department	
because CHL tenant 'fails'	5
because other tenant 'fails'	-
Cancelled by CHL tenant	4
Cancelled by other tenant	2
TOTAL:	11

CFH

Cancelled by the Department	
because CFH tenant 'fails'	1
because other tenant 'fails'	3
Cancelled by the CFH tenant	5
Cancelled by the other tenant	8
TOTAL:	17

CFL

Cancelled by the Department	
because CFL tenant 'fails'	1
because other tenant 'fails'	2
Cancelled by CFL tenant	2
Cancelled by other tenant	2
TOTAL:	7

In this period CFH had the highest number of exchanges cancelled, but the details of these cancellations do not vary significantly from those on the other estates. The highest number were with Blackacre tenants (5), and 3 were with tenants from the private sector. Overall, the details of cancelled exchanges show no notable differences between estates.

In Table 22, the exchange rate is shown as a proportion of all quittings on each estate.

TABLE 22: The exchange rate as a proportion of all quittings.

Quitting and exchange rates	CHL	CHH	CFH	CFL
Quitting rate (2 yrs) excluding exchanges	9.0%	11.0%	25.0%	13.0%
Exchange rate (5 yrs)	5.8%	6.6%	9.6%	5.6%
Adjusted exchange rate $\frac{\text{exchange rate}}{2\frac{1}{2}}$	2.3%	2.6%	3.8%	2.2%
Exchange rate / Exchange and quitting rate	.20	.19	.13	.14

This table shows that the ratio of exchanges to all quittings is lowest for the postwar flats, and despite CFH having the highest absolute rate of exchanges it in fact has the lowest ratio of exchanges to all quittings.

4. The House Folder Analysis

The final section on this recorded data is drawn from the house folders, which include a variety of data on the estates and on their tenants. The estates CHH and CFH were divided for this analysis, so that the high offender rate part of each of these estates could be considered separately.

In this section, then, the tables relate to seven housing areas; The Avenue, CHL, S.E. CHH, N.W. CHH, CFH high rise, CFH maisonettes, and CFL.

Table 23 shows the total number of family tenants per dwelling on the postwar flats since first lettings.

TABLE 23: Total number of tenants per dwelling (excludes TT's) since building (CFH and CFL only).

Total no. of tenants	CFH high rise			CFH maisonettes		CFL		
1	33)			5)		45)		
	) 47.8%			) 44.4%		) 65.5%		
2	34)			3)		33)		
3	28	)		6		13	)	
4	24)	)		2)		16)	)34.5%	
	)	)		) 22.2%				
5	8) 32.1%	) 52.2%		2)		8) 23.5%	)	
	)	)				)	)	
6	11)	)				4	)	
7	2)	)						
TOTAL:	140			18		119		

There is a significant difference at the 5% level between the number of dwellings on CFH (high rise) and CFL, having two or less tenants since the flats were first let. There is no significant difference between CFH maisonettes and CFH (high rise) or between the former and CFL. This

difference between CFH (high rise) and CFL was predicted from information gained on the two estates from other sources. It is even more interesting when it is remembered that CFL is five years older than CFH (high rise), and therefore with no previous knowledge of the two estates one would expect dwellings on CFL to have had more tenants on average than those on CFH. The difference between CFH (high rise), and CFL at the other end of the scale - four or more tenants - is in the predicted direction, but is not significant at the 5% level.

If, however, the difference between these two estates for three or more tenants per dwelling is considered the difference between these percentages, 52.2% on CFH and 34.5% on CFL is significant at the 5% level.

Table 23 shows the year when the current tenant or current tenant's family first took up the tenancy of the dwelling.

TABLE 23: Date of original entry of current tenant or current tenant's family.

Original Entry	The Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W. CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	18	56	13	55			
1	3	37	7	22			16
	55.3%	48.7%	33.3%	48.1%			
2	3	8	4	10		5	37
3	2	14	3	9	34	1	6
					24.3%	33.3%	49.6%
4	2	16	8	12	12	1	6
5	2	18	4	18	17	3	15
6	5	25	13	25	25	4	17
7	3	17	8	9	52	4	22
	21.1%	22.0%	35.0%	21.3%	55.0%	44.4%	32.8%
X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for date of original entry

Pre 1950	= 0	1969 - 1971	= 5
1950 - 1959	= 1	1972 - 1974	= 6
1960 - 1962	= 2	1975 - 1977	= 7
1963 - 1965	= 3	Not Known	= X
1966 - 1968	= 4		

Variation between the prewar housing areas, The Avenue, CHL, S.E. CHH, and N.W. CHH, in the percentage of dwellings that have tenants or their families whose original entry is prior to 1960 was not significant. No difference was expected, as all these areas are known to have a substantial proportion of tenants who have lived there for twenty years or more. Similarly, at the other end of the scale - dwellings having tenancies dating from 1972 onwards - there are no significant differences between these housing areas. As has been shown in a previous table, these areas have very similar mobility rates. The S.E. corner of CHH, however, does show the greatest difference in tenancy patterns in this table - both in terms of the percentage of dwellings having longest and shortest tenancies. My other research has shown that for any tenant who gets 'misplaced' on CHH, i.e. has no desire to live there, the S.E. corner is the least tolerable part of the estate.

CFH (high rise) and CFL show a highly significant (P .001) difference in the percentage of dwellings let to tenants whose original entry was prior to 1966, this difference is again in the predicted direction. 49.6% of the CFL dwellings have residents who took up their tenancy prior to 1966, compared with 24.3% on CFH. Again, at the other end of the scale, tenancies commencing in 1972 or after, there is a highly significant difference in the predicted direction between the two blocks of flats.

There are no significant differences between CFH maisonettes and CFH (high rise), or between the former and CFL in the date of entry of the current tenant. However, the percentages for the CFH maisonettes do fall between those for CFH (high rise) and CFL at both ends of the scale. This again has been predicted from other data.

Table 24 shows the type of entry of the current tenant for the seven housing areas. This is a population sample, i.e. a sample of current tenants, and so is showing different information to that in Table 2. The information in Table 2 is based on a 'reception' sample, being based on new tenants to the estates during the period covered by the quitting book.

TABLE 24: Type of entry of current tenant

Type of Entry	The Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W. CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	3 7.9%	41 22.2%	11 18.6%	36 22.9%	6 4.4%	4 22.2%	21 17.6%
1	3 7.9%	23 12.4%	11 18.6%	11 7.0%	28 20.4%	8 44.4%	24 20.2%
2	11 28.9%	61 33.0%	20 33.9%	51 32.5%	79 57.7%	4 22.2%	26 21.8%
3	-	2 1.0%	-	4 2.5%	18 13.1%	1 5.6%	30 25.2%
4	21 55.3%	58 31.4%	17 28.8%	55 35.0%	6 4.4%	1 5.6%	18 15.1%
X	-	6	1	3	3	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for type of entry

Exchange (private or council tenant = 0
Transfer (council tenant) = 1
House relet (new tenant) = 2
New tenancy (new dwelling, new tenant) = 3
Transfer of tenancy (TT) = 4
Not Known = X

The percentages and differences calculated for this table and all succeeding tables omit category X from the total.

The prewar housing areas are taken as a group for comparison, and the postwar flats are compared separately.

There are no significant differences in the type of entry of the current tenant between any of the prewar housing areas. The highest percentage of type of entry on CHL and SE CHH is house relet to a new tenant (33% and 33.9% respectively), on The Avenue and on NW CHH it is

transfer of tenancy (55.3% and 35% respectively) - that is, the reletting of a house to a tenant who is already resident in that dwelling.

CFL has a significantly higher percentage of current tenants entering by exchange than CFH (high rise) according to this Table, although this did not show up on the exchange book analysis (Table 22), which was for the period 1970-1975 inclusive. Although, again, there is a difference in sample types: information here is based on a 'population' sample, the exchange book analysis is on a 'reception' sample. Additionally CFH has an overall mobility rate much higher than that of CFL. CFH (high rise) has a significantly higher percentage of flats relet to a new tenant than either CFL or the CFH maisonettes; this is consistent with other data which shows CFH has a significantly higher waiting list entry than CFL.

The highest percentage type of entry on CFH (high rise) is flat relet to a new tenant (57.7%), on CFH maisonettes it is transfers (44.4%), and on CFL it is new tenancy let to a new tenant (25.2%). None of these results are inconsistent with previous data. CFL has a higher proportion of its original tenants than either CFH block, and therefore it is consistent with this that 25.2% of the dwellings are still let to the original tenant.

Table 25 shows the number of dwellings in each of the seven areas let to priority rehousing application types, and Table 26 shows the same data on a grouped basis. In Table 26 the 'medical' and 'CPO' cases are taken together and distinguished from the other priority codes, as these cases are not under such pressure to accept the first offer.

TABLE 25: Number of dwellings let to 'priority rehousing' application types.

Priority Rehousing	The Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W. CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	26	134	44	113	108	14	114
1	1	3	6	8	3	-	-
2	1	15	3	5	6	4	4
3	-	-	2	3	16	-	-
4	-	3	-	1	2	-	1
5	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
X	10	36	5	30	3	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for Priority Rehousing

No	= 0	Yes (CPO)	= 4
Yes (special hardship)	= 1	Cancelled for refusing offer	= 5
Yes (medical)	= 2	Not known	= X
Application refused	= 3		

Footnotes to code

1. People who are not allowed to refuse an offer.

3. People who consider themselves desperate enough to request priority on hardship grounds.

5. People who have already had their priority cancelled for refusing a previous offer.

Therefore, all three cases could be described as desperate to accept an offer of housing.

TABLE 26: Grouped analysis of priority rehousing cases

Priority rehousing type	The Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W. CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
1,3,5	1 3.6%	3 1.9%	8 14.5%	11 8.5%	21 15.3%	-	-
2,4	1 3.6%	18 11.6%	3 5.5%	6 4.6%	8 5.8%	4 22.2%	5 4.2%
0	26 92.9%	134 86.5%	44 80.0%	113 86.9%	108 78.9%	14 77.8%	114 95.8%
TOTAL:	28	155	55	130	137	18	119

The most significant difference shown by this table is between CFH (high rise) and CFL in the percentage of current tenants who did not apply

for rehousing on special hardship grounds. Correspondingly, CFL has a significantly higher ($P<.001$) percentage (95.8%) of dwellings let to 'non priority cases' of all categories than CFH (high rise) (78.9%). There is also a significant difference ($P<.01$) between CHL and SE CHH. CHL has less dwellings let to special hardship cases, or those who have been refused this priority, than SE CHH.

The previous type of accommodation of tenants in the seven housing areas is considered in Table 27.

TABLE 27: Previous accommodation type of current tenant.

Previous Accomdn. type	Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W. CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	8 36.4%	64 41.3%	35 66.0%	58 45.0%	73 53.3%	14 77.7%	61 51.3%
1	12 54.5%	86 55.5%	17 32.1%	65 50.4%	57 41.6%	4 22.2%	53 44.5%
2	1 4.5%	-	1 1.9%	2 1.6%	5 3.6%	-	1 .8%
3	1 4.5%	5 3.2%	-	4 3.1%	2 1.5%	-	4 3.4%
X	16	36	7	31	3	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for previous accommodation

Council (can be any type of entry) = 0
Rented private (includes service tenancies) = 1
Homeless (includes hostels) = 2
Owner-occupier (only if the tenant was owner-occupier, i.e. if living with parents who are OO's treated as rented private) = 3
Not known = X

Amongst the prewar housing areas SE CHH shows a significantly ($P<.01$) higher percentage of entries from the council sector, compared with the other three areas, it also shows a significantly lower percentage of lettings to tenants from the private rented sector than either CHL or NW CHH. The postwar flats show no overall significant differences.

This table on its own, however, is not very informative, as the council sector entries include exchanges, transfer, and waiting list applications, and the private sector entries cover exchanges, slum clearance and waiting list applications. Where possible, therefore, I have cross-analysed Table 27 with Table 24.

The only separable entry type coming from the private sector in this house folder analysis is the exchange. An analysis of exchanges from the private sector gave the following :-

TABLE 28: Exchanges from the private sector to the seven housing areas.

Exchanges	The Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W. CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
(0) *	1 7.6%	14 15.4%	-	10 14.5%	2 3.4%	-	3 5.3%
Total entry from private sector (1 & 3) *	13	91	117	69	59	4	57

* See Table 27

There are no significant differences between exchanges as a percentage of the private sector entries in these housing areas, although there is an overall significant difference ($P < .01$) between the prewar houses and postwar flats.

It was possible to split the council sector entries into three groups: exchanges (0), transfers (1) and TT'S (4). In this way the 'missing' percentage for each estate can be attributed to entries from the waiting list.

TABLE 29: Types of entry from the council sector to the seven housing areas.

Type of Entry	The Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W. CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
Exchanges	2 8.3%	27 27.0%	11 26.2%	26 29.2%	6 8.2%	4 28.6%	18 29.5%
Transfers	3 12.5%	22 22.0%	10 23.8%	11 12.4%	27 37.0%	8 57.1%	24 39.3%
TT'S	19 79.2%	40 40.0%	13 31.0%	40 45.0%	3 4.1%	1 7.1%	8 13.1%
Waiting List	-	11 11.0%	8 19.0%	12 13.4%	37 50.7%	1 7.1%	11 18.0%
TOTAL council sector entries	24	100	42	89	73	14	61

There are no significant differences between the prewar housing areas shown by this table. All these prewar housing areas show TT's to be the highest percentage of entries from the council sector. This is consistent with the overall low ratio of mobility and continuous family tenancies associated with these estates.

CFH (high rise) has a significantly lower percentage of dwellings let to tenants who entered by exchange from another council dwelling than CFL. Also consistent with the foregoing data is the highly significant difference ($P < .001$) between dwellings on CFH (high rise), let to waiting list entries from the council sector, compared with the same on CFL. CFH (high rise) also has a significantly ($P < .01$) higher percentage of dwellings let to waiting list entries from the council sector than the CFH maisonettes. Again, this kind of difference was expected between the two parts of the CFH estate.

10 of the 27 dwellings let to transfer entries to CFH (high rise) were from CFH itself.

8 of the 24 dwellings let to transfer entries to CFL were from elsewhere on CFL.

Flats let to waiting list applicants from the council sector constituted the highest percentage type of entry (50.7%) shown by this table, on CFH (high rise). Both the CFH maisonettes and CFL show transfers to be the highest percentage type of entry from the council sector, (57.1% and 39.3% respectively).

The qualitative data collected on the prewar estates suggested that CHL and CHM were popular estates in demand from slum clearance applicants, whereas CHH, as a generally unpopular estate, would not be chosen by slum clearance entrants, who are accorded the greatest choice of housing area. In Table 30 the number of dwellings let to slum clearance applicants is shown.

TABLE 30: Dwellings let to slum clearance applicants.

CPO	The Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W.CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	13	102	44	92	129	14	81
1	9 40.9%	52 33.8%	10 18.5%	38 29.2%	8 5.8%	4 22.2%	38 31.9%
X	16	37	6	30	3	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	110

Code to CPO

No = 0, Yes = 1, Not known = X

Although there are no significant differences showing between the prewar housing areas in the percentage of dwellings let to slum clearance applicants, the percentages are in the predicted direction: that is, The Avenue (40.9%), CHL (33.8%), NW CHH (29.2%) and SE CHH (18.5%).

The postwar flats again show a highly significant difference ($P < .001$) in the predicted direction; CFH (highrise) has only 5.8% of the sampled dwellings let to slum clearance applicants, compared with 31.9% on CFL. There are no significant differences between these two blocks and the CFH maisonettes, although the latter (22.2%) falls between the two, as predicted.

The Housing Visitors' reports on the current tenants of the sampled houses and flats were examined. In the following tables, (Tables 31 to 33 inclusive), data relating to the grading, rent record and housing recommendations are presented.

TABLE 31: Housing Visitors' reports on current tenant or original family tenant.

Report	The Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W. CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	-	2	4	12	6	-	-
1	9	40	20	40	63	4	33
	64.3%	39.3%	57.1%	58.4%	56.1%	33.3%	36.3%
2	5	64	18	37	54	8	57
3	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	33.7%	60.7%	42.9%	41.6%	43.9%	66.6%	63.7%
X	24	84	18	71	17	6	28
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for housing visitor's report

Poor = 0 Very good = 3
Moderate = 1 Not given = X
Good = 2

The 'poor' and 'moderate' gradings have been grouped together for this analysis, as have the 'good' and 'very good' grades.

There are significant differences ($P < .05$) between CHL and CHH in the percentage of dwellings let to applicants graded poor/moderate and good/very good. CHL has the predicted higher percentage of good/very good (60.7%) to CHH's 41.6%. Thus, 58.4% of the dwellings on NW CHH are let to tenants graded poor/moderate, compared with 39.3% on CHL. The difference remains significant if NW CHH and the SE corner of the estate are taken together (2 and 3). This estate as a whole shows a significant difference from CHL.

CFH and CFL again show the predicted significant differences. ($P < .01$) 56.1% of the flats on CFH (high rise) are let to tenants graded as poor/moderate, as compared with 36.3% on CFL. There are no significant

differences between these two blocks and the CFH maisonettes, but again the latter shows percentages more comparable to CFL than to CFH (high rise) - 33.3% of the maisonettes are let to tenants graded poor/ moderate.

TABLE 32: Rent history in previous accommodation.

Rent History	The Avenue	CHL	S.E. CHH	N.W. CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	1	5	2	7	6	-	5
1	6 54.5%	55 79.7%	3 27.3%	24 55.8%	71 83.5%	8 100.0%	67 91.8%
2	4	8	6	12	8	-	1
3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
X	27	122	49	117	55	10	46
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for rent history

Small arrears past, R.B.C. (rent book clear) = 0
Good rent record, G.R.B. (good rent book) = 1
History of arrears, B.R.B. (bad rent book) = 2
Not applicable = 3
Not given = X

For this analysis RBC and BRB are grouped together and GRB is taken as a single category.

The differences between the prewar areas are highly significant ($P < .01$): CHL has a significantly higher percentage of dwellings let to tenants with a good rent history (79.7%) than either part of CHH, which themselves differ significantly (27.3% and 55.8% respectively). This is consistent with the figures for housing visitor's grades in the preceding table, and with other data on these estates.

The postwar flats show no significant differences in percentages of flats let to tenants with a good rent history. This is probably because applicants with a poor rent history usually are allocated prewar or sundry property. CFH (high rise) still, however, has a slightly lower percentage (83.5%) of dwellings let to tenants with a good rent history than CFL (91.8%).

TABLE 33: Recommendation for housing.

Recommendation	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	7 58.3%	53 65.4%	18 62.1%	32 46.4%	103 89.6%	12 100.0%	84 93.3%
1	3 25.0%	13 16.0%	10 34.5%	25 36.2%	10 8.7%	- 0.0%	3 3.3%
2	2	15	1	12	2	-	3
X	26	110	31	91	25	6	29
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for recommendation for housing

Postwar or prewar = 0
Prewar only (occasionally or CFH appears here) = 1
Applicant asks for a cheap relet = 2
Not given = X

Footnotes to Table 33

1. When coding the house folder data I gave all housing visitors' recommendations for a prewar only '1', only where an applicant was asking for a cheap relet and the housing visitor had made no recommendation did I code '2'.
2. A "prewar only" housing recommendation is given when the housing visitor assesses the applicant on domestic or financial grounds as only suited to the council's cheaper and older property.

CHL has a significantly lower percentage of houses let to 'prewar only' applicants than the whole of CHH (P .01). Table 33 does illustrate, however, that CHL has a percentage (16%) of dwellings let to such application types, and is not reserved for the 'better type' of applicant as appears to happen with similar good prewar estates in other Local Authority areas. Similarly, CHH has a high percentage (62.1%) of houses let to tenants who could have had postwar or prewar tenancies. Many of these will have accepted the tenancy because of the urgency of their housing situation.

There are no significant differences between the postwar flats in Table 33, but again this was expected, as only a small proportion of lettings (8.7% on CFH, 3.3% on CFL) are recommended for prewar only and

then allocated postwar property.

Table 34 shows the reason given by the applicant, (and checked by the housing visitor) for the request for housing.

TABLE 34: Reasons for moving from previous accommodation.

Reasons for moving	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	10 50.0%	51 39.5%	11 24.4%	38 34.9%	9 6.7%	4 25.0%	38 34.2%
1	2 10.0%	14 10.9%	5 11.1%	16 14.7%	9 6.7%	4 25.0%	19 17.1%
2	1 5.0%	7 5.4%	6 13.3%	11 10.1%	47 35.1%	1 6.25%	12 10.8%
3	1 5.0%	11 8.5%	5 11.1%	13 11.1%	34 25.4%	-	12 10.8%
4	1 5.0%	3 2.3%	2 4.4%	4 3.7%	4 3.0%	-	1 0.9%
5	-	13 10.0%	3 6.6%	6 5.5%	8 6.0%	-	8 7.2%
6	3 15.0%	5 3.9%	3 6.6%	1 0.9%	3 2.2%	3 18.75%	3 2.7%
7	1 5.0%	2 1.6%	-	1 0.9%	1 0.75%	-	1 0.9%
8	1 5.0%	16 12.4%	6 13.3%	10 9.2%	7 5.2%	4 25.0%	9 8.1%
9	-	3 2.3%	3 6.6%	4 3.7%	7 5.2%	-	5 4.5%
Y	-	4 3.1%	-	3 2.8%	2 1.5%	-	3 2.7%
-	-	-	1 2.2%	2 1.8%	3 2.2%	-	-
X	18	62	15	51	6	2	8
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for reasons for moving

Not given	=	X
CPO	=	0
House too large/too small, want flat/house, Garage/garden etc.	=	1
Living with in-laws, relations	=	2
Living in privately/rented accommodation which is inadequate/ overcrowded/lacks basic amenities/not self-contained/Landlord problems etc.	=	3
Homeless (wartime entries house bombed)	=	4
Want to be near relations/return to area of origina	=	5
'Wrong area' - want to change area/want to be near school/ work/nearer city/away from city etc.	=	6

(continued on next page)

Service tenancy - leaving job	=	7
Medical - includes old age/illness/disabilities, also 'nervous problems' (in the latter case the area is usually held responsible	=	8
Domestic and financial problems	=	9
Council house repairs/demolition of a council pre-fab	=	Y
Trouble with neighbours	=	-

Footnotes to Table 34

1. X category for some estates is rather high - which rather diminishes the value of the table. The X category has been excluded before calculating the percentages.

2. Many tenants give more than one reason for wanting to move from their previous accommodation. In such cases I took the reason on which most emphasis appeared to be laid. The categories are exhaustive, but some are not mutually exclusive and some contain too wide a variety of reasons. These deficiencies I found unavoidable. I did, however, take care to code the most appropriate category when more than one was possible, and I believe the end result in Table 34 gives a fair representation of the reasons given for moving by the tenants in the sample.

There are no significant differences shownby Table 34 between the prewar housing areas. Although the quitting book from which a sample of incoming tenants in theseyears 1973, 1974 did show a significant difference in the number of 'slum clearance' tenants coming to each estate, and similarly it also showed such a difference in waiting list tenants, the house folders, it will be remembered, give a sample of all current tenants.

The postwar flats data in Table 34 does, however, show several significant differences. CFL has a significantly higher percentage of dwellings let to slum clearance applicants (CPO)than CFH (high rise) (34.2% to 6.7% respectively, $P < .001$). CFH (high rise) has a significantly higher percentage of dwellings let to tenants who gave 'living with in-laws/relations' as their reason for moving, than CFL (35.1% to 10.8% respectively, $P < .001$). CFH (high rise) has also a significantly higher percentage of dwellings let to tenants who gave as their reason for moving 'inadequate', or in some other way unsatisfactory privately rented accommodation (coded 3), than CFL (25.4% to 10.8% respectively, $P < .01$).

Although there are no significant differences between these two blocks and the CFH maisonettes, the latter again show a letting pattern more comparable with CFL than with CFH (high rise). The three significant differences outlined above between CFH (high rise) and CFL are all predicted by other data. CFL was originally most popular with slum clearance applicants, and it still has a higher percentage of its original tenants than CFH. Even in recent years, although its popularity with slum clearance applicants has abated - part of the reason for this being the areas being cleared at any particular time - it is still more in demand from this application type than CFH (high rise), whose letting to slum clearance applicants is negligible.

It has already been stated elsewhere that CFH (high rise), being probably the most unpopular estate in the city has been let - until the more recent change in policy - to those in greatest need of housing. From my experience as a participant observer, I have found that the category of families that experience the greatest desperation over their housing situation are invariably those living with in-laws and relatives. Such families are closely followed by those living in grossly inadequate or insecure privately rented accommodation. In both situations families suffer considerable mental and emotional stress, as well as pure physical strain and inconvenience in everyday living. From my limited experience of such families I would agree with the authors of the Report on the Homeless in Sheffield, that often those living with in-laws and other relatives suffer the greatest emotional stress of all arising from their housing situation. This is undoubtedly why so many of these families who, although not technically homeless, accept a tenancy on CFH as the first chance of "having their own home". The damage that has been done to their personal relationships in that time of stress, and their difficulties in coping with the hostile environment of CFH, is often such that on rehousing their problems are not solved but simply take on new forms, and

this has already been discussed in Chapters 6 and 7. Here I just wish to note that the hypothesis of differential letting patterns between CFH and CFL and the associated different social character of the two estates is continually upheld by Table 34 and others in this house folder analysis.

Finally, I think it might be helpful to rank each housing area on its three highest percentages shown in Table 34.

The Avenue	1)	CPO (50%)
	2)	Wrong area (15%)
	3)	House size wrong (10%)
CHL	1)	CPO (39,5%)
	2)	Medical (12.4%)
	3)	House size wrong (10.9%)
S.E. CHH	1)	CPO (24.4%)
	2)	Living with in-laws) Medical) (13.3% each)
N.W. CHH	1)	CPO (34.9%)
	2)	House size wrong (14.7%)
	3)	Living in inadequate privately rented accommodation (11.1%)

It may be noted here that all these prewar housing areas had the highest percentage of dwellings let to applicants being displaced by slum clearance schemes. This reaffirms the popularity of the 'cheap relet' with a high proportion of slum clearance applicants entering the council sector.

CFH (high rise)	1)	Living with in-laws/relatives	(35.1%)
	2)	Living in inadequate privately rented accommodation	(25.4%)

No other category approaches these two, but

	3)	CPO) House wrong size)	(6.7% each)

CFH maisonettes	1)	CPO House size wrong Medical	(25% each)
CFL	1)	CPO	(34.2%)
	2)	House size wrong	(17.1%)
	3)	Living with in-laws Living in inadequate privately rented accommodation	(10.8% each)

Table 35 shows offers refused by current tenants before acceptance of their present tenancy. I have grouped the estates as before to facilitate analysis.

TABLE 35: Previous offers of accommodation: first offer refused.

	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
None	17 77.3%	110 73.8%	42 80.8%	108 83.1%	111 81.0%	15 83.3%	99 83.2%
Prewar Estates	5 22.7%	26 17.4%	4 7.7%	14 10.8%	2 1.5%	-	1 0.8%
Postwar Flats	-	4 2.7%	2 3.8%	4 3.1%	18 13.1%	2 11.1%	16 13.4%
Postwar Houses	-	4 2.7%	2 3.8%	4 3.1%	3 2.2%	1 5.5%	3 2.5%
Sundry	-	5 3.4%	2 3.8%	-	3 2.2%	-	-
Not given	16	42	8	30	3	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Footnotes to Table 35

1. Only the first refused offer is shown.
2. The code for the individual estates has not been included, but it is the same as has been used throughout the analysis.
3. In the analysis of this table the two parts of CHH and two parts of CFH are taken together.

This table shows no significant differences between any of the prewar housing areas, or between the postwar flats.

The only point of interest emerging from the compilation of this table was the number of CFH tenants who refused a first offer on CFH (15), compared with five tenants on CFL, who refused a first offer on this estate. Two CFH tenants refused first offers of CFL, compared with 10

CFL tenants who refused a first offer on CFH. Similarly, 10 CHH tenants refused a first offer on CHH, compared with 3 CHL tenants who refused a first offer on CHL. I have set this out in the form of a table below (Table 36).

TABLE 36: Refusals of offers within the studied estates.

Refused Estates	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	1	3	-	1	-	-	-
1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
2) 3)	-	-	3	7	-	-	-
4) 5)	-	-	-	-	13	2	10
6	-	-	1	-	2	-	5
TOTAL:	1	6	4	8	15	2	15

Of the 15 CFH tenants refusing a first offer on CFH (two parts of CFH are taken together here) 9 did so, stating their reason for refusal that they did not want this estate, one offer was cancelled by the Department, 3 said the flat size was wrong, one that it was too far from relatives, and one replied they no longer wanted housing. Of the 10 CFL tenants who refused CFH, 8 stated they did not want this estate, one that they did not want the specific flat, and one did not reply. In contrast, of the 2 CFH tenants who refused an offer on CFL, one said they did not want this estate, the other that the specific flat was not wanted. None of the 5 CFL tenants who refused a first offer on CFL gave the reason for refusal that the estate was not wanted, but one did not want the specific flat offered, one did not give a reason and 3 said the flat size was wrong. This lends further support to the idea that, although outsiders might couple CFH and CFL together, to those who are familiar with the estates, whether as tenants or applicants, there is a real difference in the reputation, and thus in the desirability of the two.

CHH was refused by four applicants giving the reason that the estate was not wanted - all now live there, four refused because the specific house offered was not wanted, one did not reply, and one refused because the house size was wrong. CHL was not refused on the grounds that the estate was not wanted, but one applicant refused for medical reasons and two because the house offered was the wrong size - all three now live on the estate. The Avenue was refused by two CHL tenants because it was not on the estate required, and one did not reply to an offer on the Avenue, although is now a tenant of another house on this road. The reputation of CHH is such that it is not surprising it has been refused because the estate itself is not desired. The more popular CHL was not refused by any tenant in this sample for this reason - this is consistent with its high demand from slum clearance applicants, so that there is no need for the Department to offer houses on it to applicants who have not specifically requested the estate.

Table 37 shows the reasons given by the tenant for the refusal of his first offer of housing.

TABLE 37: Reasons for first refusal

Reasons for Refusal	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	High Rise	Maisonettes	CFL
0	17	110	42	108	111	15	99
1	3 60.0%	13 33.3%	6 66.7%	10 45.5%	4 16.0%	2 100.0%	12 66.7%
2	-	6 15.4%	2 22.2%	6 27.3%	12 48.0%	-	2 11.1%
3	-	6 15.4%	-	3 13.6%	-	-	-
4	-	6 15.4%	1 1.1%	1 4.5%	3 12.0%	-	3 16.7%
5	-	-	-	-	1 4.0%	-	-
6	2 40.0%	2 5.1%	-	1 4.5%	-	-	1 5.6%
7	-	3 7.7%	-	-	-	-	-
8	-	1 2.6%	-	-	1 4.0%	-	-
9	-	1 2.6%	-	1 4.5%	1 4.0%	-	-
Y	-	1 2.6%	-	-	3 12.0%	-	-
X	16	42	9	30	4	1	2
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	2	119

Code for reasons for refusal

Not applicable (i.e. did not refuse an offer) = 0
Wrong estate (or part of estate) = 1
Specific flat/house not required
(includes too dirty, no inside W.C. too old etc.) = 2
Medical reasons (too hilly, too many steps etc.) = 3
House size wrong, want flat/house = 4
No longer want housing = 5
No reply = 6
Changed area of preference = 7
Too far from relations/area of origin = 8
Too expensive = 9
Department cancels = Y
Not known = X

This table involves working with very small numbers. I have excluded the 'not applicables' as well as the 'not knowns' from the percentage calculations. There is nothing to be gained from working out

significant differences shown by this table, as it only shows percentages of types of refusal made by the tenants of the six housing areas, not the type of refusal given for the house/estate refused. All that may usefully be said about this table is that it shows that for tenants on every estate except CFH (high rise), the highest percentage of refusals made before acceptance of the present tenancy were in terms of the offer being made on the 'wrong estate'. As has been illustrated by previous tables, quite often a second offer is made on the same estate and the applicant has no choice but to accept. This usually occurs if the applicant is pushing the Department for another offer. Sometimes the applicant indicates to the Department that the first offer was on the 'wrong' part of the estate and that he will accept an offer of a tenancy elsewhere on the estate.

CFH (high rise) is the exception, and the highest percentage of houses refused by tenants of this estate were rejected because the specific house/flat was not required. Those in this group of tenants who came via the waiting list would have had to accept CFH as a second offer, or have lost their place on the list.

Table 38 shows the tenant's stated first choice of estate.

TABLE 38: Choice of estate - was this estate first choice?

Choice of Estate	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	3 13.6%	7 4.7%	2 4.0%	17 13.4%	30 21.7%	-	6 5.0%
1	13 59.1%	87 58.8%	26 52.0%	57 44.9%	50 36.2%	4 22.2%	83 69.7%
2	-	14 9.5%	-	14 11.0%	8 5.8%	12 66.7%	3 2.5%
3	6 27.3%	35 23.6%	5 10.0%	24 18.9%	28 20.3%	2 11.1%	4 3.4%
4	-	5 3.4%	8 16.0%	2 1.6%	7 5.1%	-	18 15.1%
5	-	-	9 18.0%	13 10.2%	15 10.9%	-	5 4.2%
X	16	43	10	33	2	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for choice of estates

No	(includes those who want postwar but could only get prewar, those who wanted a house but could only get a flat, those who wanted a different estate etc.)	= 0
Yes	(includes those for whom this estate was 1st choice or equal first and exchanges)	= 1
Yes	(specifically wanted this part of the estate)	= 2
Yes	(general area, includes 2nd and 3rd choice)	= 3
Yes	(changed mind to include this estate subsequent to application - includes those wanting quicker housing)	= 4
Yes	Any	= 5
Not given		= X

Footnote for Table 38

1. Very often on the low demand estates - in this sample CFH and CHH - the housing visitor will suggest the estate if the applicant says he cannot wait, i.e. his housing situation is urgent. The request for the estate will then appear on his pre-tenancy report as if he specifically wanted this estate and is thus coded (1). This may be rather misleading. This table, therefore, should be compared with the following one showing reasons for wanting this estate.

Table 38 does show some interesting significant differences in three predicted directions. CHL has a significantly higher percentage of dwellings let to tenants who asked for that estate as their first choice of estate than does CHH ($P < .05$), grouping the two parts of CHH together). CFH (high rise) has a significantly ($P < .01$) higher percentage of flats let

to tenants who did not want to be housed on this estate than does CFL - despite the bias against such a difference mentioned in the footnote to the table. Similarly, CFL has a significantly higher percentage of flats let to tenants who asked for that estate as first choice than CFH (high rise) ($P < .001$). The CFH maisonettes show a significant ($P < .001$) difference from the other two blocks of flats in the percentage of dwellings let to tenants who specifically asked for this part of the estate. The high figure requesting CFH maionettes supports the idea that these flats are more popular than the high rise blocks of CFH, with which they are normally grouped.

TABLE 39: Reasons for wanting/accepting this estate

Reasons for accepting	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	1 7.1%	7 6.7%	20 43.5%	28 27.2%	54 47.4%	-	13 13.0%
1	1 7.1%	26 24.8%	10 21.7%	16 15.5%	16 14.0%	4 23.5%	21 21.0%
2	6 42.9%	6 5.7%	1 2.2%	1 1.0%	4 3.5%	2 11.8%	4 4.0%
3	5 35.7%	30 28.6%	3 6.5%	14 13.6%	3 2.6%	2 11.8%	24 24.0%
5	1 7.1%	13 12.4%	11 23.9%	27 26.2%	13 11.4%	4 23.5%	23 23.0%
6	-	23 21.9%	1 2.2%	13 12.6%	10 8.8%	5 29.4%	13 13.0%
7	-	-	-	2 1.9%	1 0.9%	-	-
8	-	-	-	2 1.9%	13 11.4%	-	2 2.0%
X	24	86	14	57	26	1	19
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Codes for reasons of acceptance

Not wanted/1st chance of housing/last chance of housing = 0
Area of origin/where relatives live = 1
Nearer to town/work/school etc. want suburbs = 2
CPO's near previous housing = 3
Already on estate = 5
Like area/already in area = 6
Compulsory transfer (includes Blackacre decants) = 7
Housing visitor suggests = 8
Not known = X

Footnotes to Table 39

1. There seem to be two types of applicant to whom the housing visitor will suggest an unpopular or low status estate. The first needs rehousing urgently, the second is assessed as a 'poor' type.

2. If there is a direct reference to a housing visitor suggesting the accepted estate I have coded '8'. Where an applicant has indicated the urgency of his housing situation and accepted the first offer I have coded 'O'. Also, where an applicant has refused more offers than he is allowed to and has received an official warning I have coded 'O'. For the purpose of analysis 'O' and '8' may be taken together.

The Avenue and CHL differ from both parts of CHH in that both parts of the latter estate have a significantly ($P < .001$) higher percentage of dwellings let to tenants who accepted a house on CHH because of the urgency of their housing situation. CFH (high rise) also has a significantly ($P < .001$) higher percentage of dwellings let to tenants in this category than either the CFH maisonettes or CFL. In fact, combining the 'O' and '8' categories, CFH (high rise) has 58.8% of its dwellings let to tenants who did not ask for this estate, compared with 15% on CFL. Similarly, 6.7% of the houses on CHL are let to tenants who did not freely request this estate, compared with 43.5% on S.E. CHH and 29.1% on the remainder of CHH.

The Avenue has 42.9% of its dwellings let to tenants who requested this area for 'convenience reasons', that is, nearer to school, work and so on. This is significantly higher than any of the other prewar housing areas. Both The Avenue and CHL have a higher percentage of houses let to slum clearance applicants (CPOs) who have been displaced by clearance programmes from housing areas on this side of the city. The difference in percentage for this category on The Avenue and CHL, compared with both parts of CHH, is significant ($P < .001$), CFL has a significantly ($P < .001$) higher percentage of slum clearance applicants from that area of the city than CFH (high rise).

Although there are no further significant differences at the 5% level between either the prewar housing areas or between the postwar flats, the general patterns of acceptance of dwellings in these areas is much as predicted, and nothing unexpected has shown up in the table, i.e. it re-affirms the demand for the popular estates and the reasons for acceptance of the low demand ones as have been suggested by earlier research. Overall, CHL appears to be the highest in demand of all the studied housing areas, and this is consistent with other data on the estates.

In Tables 40 and 41 the rent record of the tenant in his current tenancy and Notices to Quit are shown.

TABLE 40: Arrears in present tenancy.

Arrears	Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	35	178	47	137	102	15	104
1	2	3	5	16	4	2	6
2	1 2.6%	10 5.2%	8 13.3%	6 3.8%	32 23.2%	1 5.6%	9 7.6%
X	-	-	-	1	2	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Code for arrears

None	= 0	Continuous arrears	= 2
Occasional small arrears	= 1	Not given	= X

Footnote to Table 40

1. The table is thought to underestimate the arrears of current tenants on all estates as has already been mentioned. I thought, however, that it was worth inclusion as the figures for continuous arrears should be fairly reliable.

CFH does live up to its 'awful reputation' for arrears: in fact, CFH (high rise) shows over a fifth of dwellings let to tenants who are in continuous arrears. This percentage for CFH (high rise) (23.2%) is significantly different at the 1% level from all the other housing areas, except SE CHH (13.3%). It is not significantly higher than the CFH maisonettes, but the latter sample is very small.

TABLE 41: Notices to quit

Notices to Quit	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	37 97.4%	183 95.8%	57 95.0%	149 93.7%	122 88.4%	18 100.0%	115 96.6%
1	1)	6)	2)	3)	14)	-)	2)
2	-)	-)	-)	6)	1)	-)	1)
3	-)26.0%	2) 4.2%	1) 5.0%	1) 6.3%	1)11.6%	-) 0.0%	-) 3.4%
4	-)	-)	-)	-)	)	-)	-)
X	-)	-)	-)	1)	2)	-)	1)*
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Footnotes to Table 41

1. * This tenant on CFL had, in fact, more than eight 'notices to quit'.
2. Code for notices to quit is plain, i.e. 0 = none, 4 = four X = not given.

There is little variation between the housing areas in the percentage of dwellings on each estate in which the current tenant has been served one or more notices to quit. The numbers having received notices to quit are very small on every estate, varying from 0 to 11.6%. CFH (high rise) has the highest percentage, as predicted, and this is significantly different at the 1% level from CFL.

Tables 42-44 show previous council tenancies of current tenants. Table 42 shows the number of previous council tenancies held, Table 43 the tenancy before the current ones, Table 44 shows the tenancy previous to those in Table 43.

TABLE 42: Number of previous council house tenancies

Number of previous council tenancies	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
0	14 63.6%	93 59.6%	25 47.2%	83 62.4%	91 66.4%	5 27.8%	66 55.5%
1	6	45	25	36	30	6	36
2	1	11	3	11	10	5	10
3	1	5	-	3	4	1	3
4	-	2	-	-	-	1	1
5	-	-	-	-	2	-	1
6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
X	16	35	7	27	3	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Footnote to Table 42

1. Previous council tenancies is plain, O = none, X = not given

The only significant difference between the housing areas shown by this table, in percentage of dwellings let to tenants as their first council tenancy, is that the CFH maisonettes have a significantly lower percentage than either CFH (high rise) or CFL ($P < .05$). This is consistent with previous tables (Tables 27 and 29), which show that of the 77.7% of tenants on the CFH maisonettes sample who have lived previously in a council tenancy, 28.6% of these came by exchange, 57.1% by transfer. Data collected during the field research suggested that these maisonettes were very popular with tenants on surrounding prewar council estates, especially when they were first built.

TABLE 43: First previous estate of current tenant with previous council tenancies

First previous estate	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
None	14 63.6%	93 59.6%	25 47.2%	83 62.4%	91 66.4%	5 27.8%	66 55.5%
Prewar Housing	4 18.2%	49 31.4%	19 35.8%	40 30.1%	21 15.3%	4 22.2%	15 12.6%
Postwar Flats	1 4.5%	4 2.6%	8 15.1%	4 3.0%	21 15.3%	8 44.4%	32 26.9%
Postwar Housing	1 4.5%	2 1.3%	-	3 2.3%	2 1.5%	1 5.6%	5 4.2%
Out of Town	2 9.0%	3 1.9%	-	-	-	-	-
Sundry	-	5 3.2%	1 1.9%	3 2.3%	2 1.5%	-	1 0.8%
Not given	16	35	7	27	3	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

Of the 13 CFH maisonette tenants who had held previous council tenancies discussed above, 4 were from Blackacre, 4 from CFH, 2 from CFL, 1 from a postwarperipheral estate, and 2 from similar postwar flats.

There was a significant difference shown by this table between CFH (high rise) and the CFH maisonettes. The latter has a significantly ($P < .01$) higher percentage of dwellings let to tenants from postwar council flats. Among the prewar estates, 12 of the 49 or 24.5% of tenants coming from prewar housing estates to CHL were from the CHL estate itself. 33 of the 59 or 60% of tenants coming from prewar housing estates to CHH were from CHH. Thus, there is a significantly ($P < .001$) higher percentage of tenants in the CHH sample who have held previous council tenancies on this estate than the percentage on CHL who have held previous tenancies on the CHL estate.

There is no such significant difference in the percentage of dwellings let to tenants who have previously held tenancies on the same estate, among the postwar flats.

This high percentage of CHH tenants who have held previous tenancies on the same estate (17.7% of the total sample on which information is available, compared with 7.7% on CHL) is consistent with other data on CHH which suggests a high proportion of long term tenants on this estate and the existence of a close knit community and neighbourhood based subculture among long term residents. This figure for CHH does not include the high number of tenants who have previously lived elsewhere on the estate in someone else's tenancy, for example, with parents or with in-laws, as was suggested by my field research. Nor does it include those who have originated from this estate but have lived in other accommodation since. This is also true of the figure for CFH and Blackacre, that is, only a small number of CFH tenants who have previously lived on Blackacre will show up in this quantitative data. My field research suggested that many more CFH tenants have lived in someone else's tenancy on Blackacre previous to accepting a tenancy on CFH.

TABLE 44: Second previous estate of current tenant with previous council tenancies

Second previous estate	The Avenue	CHL	SE CHH	CFH NW CHH	CFH High Rise	CFH Maisonettes	CFL
None	20 90.9%	138 88.5%	50 94.3%	119 89.5%	121 88.3%	11 61.1%	102 85.7%
Prewar Housing	1 4.5%	14 9.0%	3 5.7%	10 7.5%	8 5.8%	2 11.1%	4 3.4%
Postwar Flats	-	1 0.6%	-	2 1.5%	7 5.1%	3 16.7%	11 9.2%
Postwar Housing	-	1 0.6%	-	1 0.8%	1 0.7%	2 11.1%	1 0.8%
Sundry	-	2 1.3%	-	1 0.8%	-	-	1 0.8%
Out of Town	1 4.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not given	16	35	7	27	3	-	-
TOTAL:	38	191	60	160	140	18	119

The CFH maisonettes have a significantly ($P < .01$) higher percentage of dwellings let to tenants who have held two or more previous council tenancies than CFH (high rise). (This is also shown by Table 42).

8 of the 13 CHH tenants who have held a second previous tenancy on a prewar housing estate had this tenancy on CHH (61.5%), compared with CHL where 2 of the 14 tenants having held a second previous tenancy on a prewar estate had this tenancy on CHL (14.3%). This difference is significant at the 5% level. Overall, the percentage of houses let to tenants on CHH in this sample - on which information is available - who have held a second previous tenancy on this same estate is 4.3%, compared with 1.3% on CHL. No such differences exist among the postwar estates. Table 44, then, shows the same tenancy patterns as could be seen in Table 43.

5. A note on council house sales

Council houses in the Sheffield area were made available for purchase by tenants for a very limited period - about nine months - when the local council was controlled by the Conservatives in 1967-8. Flatted estates such as CFL and CFH were considered unsuitable for selling, for a mixture of owner-occupiers and council tenants on such developments would raise problems of maintenance and repair of the communal areas. Houses on the prewar estates CHH, CHL and CHM were made available for purchase. These three estates in fact had very similar numbers of tenants applying to buy their houses in this period. As far as it is possible to ascertain - the records being somewhat unsatisfactory - CHH and CHL had six applications from tenants wanting to purchase their dwelling, and CHM had seven such applications. Notes on House Sales in the Department - somewhat undecipherable - suggest in fact that only two houses on each estate were sold.

That so few tenants were interested in buying their houses when this became possible is perhaps surprising, particularly for a popular estate such as CHL. Having discussed the possibility of home ownership with many council tenants, I believe that the lack of response to this opportunity to purchase is largely explicable in terms of the overall low status of council houses. A council house is very much seen by tenants as somewhere to rent, a house to purchase is somehow different, that is, it should be on a private estate, or in an owner-occupied area, such a house, I was told, would be worth buying. Additionally, it should be remembered that houses on these estates were needing modernisation and repair even in 1967, when the possibility to purchase was made available, and tenants were well aware of the cost of bringing these houses up to an acceptable standard. As I have attempted to show in preceding chapters, overall the tenants of the prewar estates are not among the most affluent in the council sector - I discuss this more fully in the final chapter. A number told me that although they would have liked to purchase their own home - albeit on a council estate - they realised they would not be able to afford to maintain the dwelling. Tenants lived in hope that one day the council would allocate some money for the improvement of their housing.

6. Some conclusions from the quantitative data

At the beginning of this chapter I stated that the aim of the research within the Housing Department was two-fold. Firstly, to seek out new information not available to me in the role of participant observer. Secondly, to collect and analyse recorded data to test certain hypotheses formulated from the field research. In Chapter Eight I discussed new information on the estates, gained from the qualitative data obtained from working within the Housing Department. In this chapter I have presented the quantifiable data collected within the Department which I have considered in connection with qualitative data

presented in earlier chapters. Generally, I would argue, that this quantitative data is consistent with and supports both the theoretical framework elaborated from the field research in Chapter Seven, and the qualitative information gained from the Housing Department which was given in Chapter Eight.

In particular, patterns of 'demand' for all estates are as predicted from the qualitative data. According to the allocation system in Sheffield, described in the previous chapter, popularity of an estate can be measured by the number of slum clearance families housed there. (This allocation type being given first priority in housing and being awarded the widest choice of housing and the highest number of offers.) CHL and The Avenue on CHM have significantly higher slum clearance entrants than CHH. CFL has a higher percentage of slum clearance applicants than CFH (which has the lowest figure of all), but this percentage is not so high among recent lettings as it has been in the past on CFL. Conversely, unpopularity may be measured by waiting list entrants to an estate, in particular, those seeking housing on priority hardship grounds. Again, the figures are in the predicted direction. CFH had the highest percentage of waiting list entrants of any estate and followed by CHH CHL and The Avenue on CHM had the lowest percentage of waiting list entrants. Looking at applicants requesting priority rehousing, not only do the same predicted differences appear, but CFH (high rise) suggested to be the least popular part of the estate has the highest percentage of all, followed by S.E. CHH, which was suggested to be the least popular part of this prewar estate.

Mobility rates were also as predicted by the qualitative data for all estates, the prewar estates having relatively low mobility rates, as did CFL. CFH again stands out as having a mobility rate more than twice that

of the prewar estates and about twice that of CFL. Transfer requests also showed the same predicted pattern with a significantly higher percentage of tenants on CHH requesting a transfer at some time in their tenancy than tenants of CHL. Again, CFH has the highest overall transfer request rate which is significantly higher than that for CFL. Table 38 showed dwellings on CHH and CFH were more likely to be let to tenants not wanting this estate than was the case on either CHL or CFL. On all 'measures' of demand CFH shows up as the estate least desired by applicants in the council housing market, followed in this respect by CHH. Letting patterns suggested by this data support the suggestion in earlier chapters that unpopular estates tend to be let to those who did not hold a council tenancy already, and who are accorded the lowest priority in housing within the Sheffield system, the waiting list category, and within this category to those showing greatest housing need (applications for special priority on hardship grounds). This quantitative data, taken overall, both supports the explanation revolving round the reputation of the estates, and the effect of these reputations on the housing market elaborated in Chapter Seven, and the effects of allocation policy on the housing market as described in Chapter Eight.

Moving on to characteristics of residents on each of these estates. The data is again supportive of estate differences discussed earlier. Table 40, for example, shows CFH (high rise) has the highest rent arrears, followed by S.E. CHH. Data contained in Housing Visitor Reports shows that a significantly higher percentage of tenants on CHH had histories of rent arrears, poor character assessments and prewar only recommendations than on CHL (though it should be noted that CHL does have some tenants falling into this category - that is, they are not excluded from this estate). The population differences between CFH and CFL, as shown by the Housing Visitors Reports are not so apparent, as

both estates constitute postwar property. Nevertheless CFH (high rise) does have a lower percentage of dwellings let to tenants with good rent records than CFL. This part of CFH also has a significantly higher percentage of dwellings let to tenants assessed as only 'moderate' or 'poor' than CFL. This data, taken overall, does lend support to the estate differences already noted, CFH and CHH having, on these measures, a more 'deviant' population than CHL or CFL respectively.

Finally, Tables 43 and 44 show more tenants on CHH having held tenancies elsewhere on this estate than have CHL tenants on their estate. This is supported in Table 39, where 23.9% of tenants on S.E. CHH and 26.2% of tenants on N.W. CHH gave as the reason for accepting their current tenancy that they were already resident on the estate. This contrasts with CHL where only 12.4% gave this as the reason for accepting their current tenancy. This again supports earlier data on the prewar estates given in Chapters Five and Seven, from which I have argued that the extensive kin and neighbourhood ties on CHH form the basis of the local subculture.

Footnotes to Chapter 9

1. This particular area of CHM was included in the analysis, despite the research brief being confined to the comparison of the two matching pairs of estates. This decision to include "The Avenue" was taken because during the fieldwork it was discovered that "The Avenue" was rapidly gaining an infamous reputation, quite out of keeping with the reputations of CHM and CHL, and according to many informants rivalled the notoriety of CHH. It was, therefore, hoped that data on "The Avenue" might give some interesting information on a housing area in rapid decline.

2. Blackacre decants are tenants moved from Blackacre to CFH on a temporary transfer while modernisation of Blackacre was under way. These tenants were guaranteed the return of their Blackacre tenancy after modernisation if they so desired.

CHAPTER TEN

The Problem Estates in their Housing Context

1. Working class housing in Sheffield

In a city such as Sheffield where the Council owns some 40% of the housing stock, and therefore an even higher percentage of the city's working class housing, council tenure is the norm for the city's working class inhabitants. Council housing is the norm for the city's working class families in a cultural sense, as well as in statistical terms. For a young couple seeking to set up their own home, whose parents, family and friends are already tenants of the Council, 'putting their name on the list' is the obvious action to take to secure a home of their own. From my work as a participant observer I found few council tenants aspired to owner-occupation, but rather to a 'better' council estate. Where owner-occupation was considered it was rather as an unattainable dream, only to be realised if the informant 'won the pools', rather than as an attainable reality. Indeed on the 'newer' estates (with which my research was not directly concerned) residents felt their housing to be as good if not better than anything they could afford to buy in the private sector, and then it was realised that mortgage repayments and upkeep of a house would be a far greater financial burden than the council house rent. Residents instead sought to use their income in improving the home and in the purchase of furnishings and consumer durables such as T.V.s, washing machines and deep freezers. On the poorer estates few residents I met could afford such luxuries. Some tenants on the 'problem' estates, desperate to move in 'one way or another' had tried unsuccessfully for a mortgage, others felt that even if they could qualify for a mortgage they would be unable to maintain repayments. This lack of aspiration to owner-occupation among council tenants was also borne out by responses to this

question on the survey conducted as part of the Sheffield Study.

The data presented in the previous chapter showed little movement between the private and council sectors of housing, with the exception of the slum clearance tenants who did not themselves initiate the move.[1] An analysis of incoming tenants showed that apart from the clearance category the majority of those taking their first council tenancy, in fact, came from the council tenancies of their parents. In Sheffield, as elsewhere in Britain, the privately rented housing sector is steadily diminishing in supply. There remain, however, in this city a number of predominantly owner-occupied areas of working class terraced housing. My personal experience of these suggests that children from such homes aspire more often to similar owner-occupation themselves than do those brought up on council estates. This, combined with the different life style characteristics of such areas, which is beyond the scope of this research, might possibly be taken as evidence that within a social class housing classes may be distinguished.[2]

The normalcy of council housing in the city has a particularly disastrous effect on the least desirable of the council housing stock. The C.D.P. report on Ferguslie Park makes the point that,

> "In Paisley and other areas with a high proportion of council housing local attitudes which elsewhere attack and demean the public sector in general may be directed at certain estates such as Ferguslie Park."
> (p.82)

In Sheffield the 'problem' estates are more highly stigmatised and shunned by the more fortunate council tenants and applicants than by middle class citizens, who, living in other parts of the city, may be unaware of their 'dreadful' reputations. This introduces bitter divisions within a housing class whereby a minority of disadvantaged families have to accept the worst type of housing and are socially, as well as

geographically, isolated from other members of their class. In these enclaves of disadvantage some may live out their lives quite happily, surrounded by family and friends forming a very inward looking community, which can itself produce and perpetuate disadvantages for its successive generations. Others, grossly unhappy with their housing situation, see all the problems of their housing area as a result of 'the type of people' living in their neighbourhood put there by remote housing officials, rather than understanding their housing situation in the more politically aware terms of housing scarcity, socio-economic inequality and disadvantage in our society. In such circumstances little is likely to emanate from the residents of 'problem' estates themselves in terms of fighting for improvements in their housing, their estate and the life chances of their children.

2. Council tenants as a housing class

In the last section I suggested tenants of 'problem' estates are unlikely to fight for improvements in their life chances. I mean by this that residents are unlikely to look at the overall politico-economics of council housing and demand certain rights as a housing class. Residents may well make individual demands for improvement of their house or even try to form action groups for the overall improvement of their estate. There was, however, no common identity or awareness of shared interests as council tenants *per se*, no identification with a class. In fact, I found, as Tucker (1966) did, that there was much hostility and enmity between residents on an estate when neighbours were perceived as a different social type. Moreover, those tenants of the new prestige estates, that I met as a taxi driver, certainly did not see themselves as sharing a commonality with tenants of such estates as CFH or CHH.

In the next section I discuss the overall impoverishment of the pre-war estates and suggest that overall the population of these estates are poorer than the populations of new expensive council estates. Rents are socially divisive, families on low incomes who the Department feels cannot afford the post-war rents, or who themselves feel they can only afford a "cheap re-let" will be concentrated in the pre-war housing stock. Obviously poverty alone cannot be equated with criminality, and in this research I have attempted to show some of the determinants of high offender rate disreputable council areas, and contrast these with the low offender rate prestigous pre-war estates where residents also are likely to be of a low income group.

On empirical grounds, then, I would suggest that the concept of a 'housing class', as applied to the council house sector, is not very useful. There are wide variations of economic status within the council sector, there are social divisions perceived by the tenants themselves, both within and between estates. More importantly, perhaps, in considering the idea of council tenants as a housing class, there are vast differences in people's access to council housing, in part related to their socio-economic position, their housing and other material circumstances before becoming a council tenant, and in part related to the bureaucratic allocation procedures and priorities laid down by the local authority. In short, the disparity in the council owned stock of housing, the eligibility and allocation rules and the disparity in material terms between applicants ensures that deep divisions persist within the council sector.

Lambert et al (1978), in their study of housing areas in Birmingham attack the concept of housing class on two levels. On the empirical level from their studies of urban localities they show that people, nominally of different housing classes, spatially co-exist and share both the same current housing situation and the same access to housing

My study also lends support to the criticism of the concept of housing classes on empirical grounds, showing people nominally of the same housing class do not share comparable housing situations, or the same access to future housing.

On the theoretical level Lambert et al attack the idea of housing classes and with it the concept of a housing market as an independent and autonomous market situation.

> "The focus on housing as a separate and distinct set of interests with a market or markets of their own as is implicit in the idea of housing class, is misleading." (p.149)

Lambert et al argue that a person's position in the housing market is primarily determined by his social class position in the labour market. I would be more cautious in dismissing the concept of an independent housing market with the rejection of the housing class concept. Certainly the housing market is not wholly independent of the labour market, nor totally autonomous. Nevertheless, there would appear to be a multiplicity of factors involved in determining position within the housing market that are independent of socio-economic status. Local conditions such as the overall housing stock of a city, for example, will affect the individual's position in the housing market, the availability of low cost housing to rent, either privately or from the council, or to purchase. Local authority mortgage schemes for owner-occupation and their eligibility and allocation rules for council housing will also affect the housing situation and access to housing of people living within that area, as do the existence of slum clearance programmes and the use of housing improvement schemes. Local Authority intervention in the housing market - not just in relation to council housing, but over the whole area of their housing interest - ensures that the housing market is not a mere reflection of the labour market. Lambert et al recognise the existence of

local authority intervention in the housing market, but see this intervention as reflecting the economic system within which local authorities are encapsulated. While accepting that this intervention is based on economic principles emanating from the wider economic system, I would still argue that the forms of intervention can produce independent effects which are not themselves direct reflections of the economic system. The idea of a housing market as anything more than a reflection of the labour market should not be dismissed simply because the concept of housing classes is proven unsatisfactory.

3. Residence on the five Sheffield estates

3.1. The pre-war estates

Although I came across more economic and social deprivation on CHH than I did on either CHL or CHM, my final impression of all three estates, and of other pre-war estates in the immediate area, was that being a council tenant on one of these old suburban estates involved a very distinctive way of life that is not comparable in any way with middle class life in owner-occupied areas. Nor is it comparable with life in an inner city 'twilight zone' of privately rented, multiple-occupied housing, where mobility rates are high and the population is typically socially and racially heterogeneous. Life styles on the prestige post-war council estates of the city also seemed to differ, in that they were markedly more affluent than the styles of life of the vast majority of tenants on CHH, CHL and CHM. Life on these old pre-war estates, where long length tenancies are the norm, incomes are generally low, and the population is socially and racially homogenous, is more comparable with life in the old terraced privately rented housing districts of the working class in the industrial north - the main difference being that the private landlord has been replaced by the local authority. The environment on these estates may be

more residential and the houses have more facilities, but the problems of dilapidation, disrepair and sometimes overcrowding remain. The quality of life is not so different from that in the old terraced areas - there may be less 'neighbourliness' and 'community', especially on CHL, but there is certainly not anomie and social isolation as the norm which researchers on newly built estates have found. There appeared to me to be more widespread discontent with housing conditions on these estates than other researchers have found in the old privately rented areas, but this is possibly because a council house is the ultimate objective of most people who are destined to be 'renters' rather than 'owhers' of their homes, and so expectations are aroused and the reality is more disappointing. Similarly, the level of discontent was higher on these estates, especially on CHH and CHM than might be expected from the findings of other estate researchers, quoted in Attenburrow, Murphy and Simms (1978), who argue that dissatisfaction with an estate and perceptions of it as a 'problem' decrease with long lengths of tenancy.

The most distressed tenants on any of the three estates were to be found on CHH - here many families felt themselves to be "trapped in a slum". Some had seen the estate decline, more had accepted a tenancy on the estate out of sheer necessity after it had become a 'blighted area', and found they could not move out as quickly as they had hoped. In fact, many could not arrange an exchange, despite continuous attempts at this and so were facing long waits for a transfer away. The most satisfied tenants on all three estates, predictably, were those who had been allocated a tenancy on the estate of their choice. On CHH, these were usually tenants who originated from the estate; on CHL and CHM, these were usually slum clearance tenants who had specifically asked for their estate, and other long length residents who were not too dismayed at the "decline in standards" on their estate.

3.2 The post war flats

On the post war flats affluence again was not evident. On CFL there was a certain indefinable spirit of 'comfortable community' amongst the tenants who identified themselves as local people, and these people were most likely to express satisfaction with life on the estate. On CFH I found the most cosmopolitan of all council estate populations, which is attributable both to its lack of local demand and its short waiting list. On this estate poverty again was much in evidence, and the lack of community support for families with multiple problems increased their difficulties. Life was characterised as lonely and isolated, and many told me how much they missed the old council estate which was their parents' home where a sense of belonging was possible and 'neighbouring' was the norm. CFH is unlike any of the other estates studied, in that it more closely resembles, from residents' accounts, the life style characteristic of the 'twilight' privately rented inner city areas, where mobility rates are higher than in traditional working class areas, and where populations are more socially and racially mixed and do not share common origins. In a sense, an estate such as CFH encapsulates within one architectural unit many of the problems more commonly associated with the highly mobile privately rented housing areas. Arguably, an estate such as CFH is more socially disorganized than even a 'twilight zone' of high residential mobility, for other researchers such as Davis (1972) do indicate a certain amount of community in terms of some social network formation.

4. Some disadvantages of council tenancy

Although tenants, themselves, will point out certain advantages of having the Council as landlord, and often compare their present home favourably with their previous housing condition, many also mention the

debit side of council housing. Most obviously on this debit side is the fact of continuous payment for something that will never be owned - that is, the council tenant is committed to continual expenditure without the benefit of capital accumulation. A disadvantage of council tenure of somewhat lesser proportions but still frequently mentioned, is that the passing on of a council tenancy to kin is regulated by the local authority. Investigations are made, certain conditions have to be met, the situation and eligibility of the relative applying for the tenancy assessed before a transfer of tenancy may be granted. Similarly, a nearby council dwelling can only be acquired for a son or daughter when special conditions are met. (For example, the applicant must be registered on the waiting list and their registration be mature for the particular estate.) Council tenants often complain of having to cope with a bureaucracy when making such requests. The old approach to a private landlord was a much simpler, straightforward process, the decision-maker could be faced in person and a decision extracted on the spot. On popular estates such as CHL, residents in fact fare worse in trying to obtain nearby tenancies for family members than on low demand estates such as CHH or CFH.

Council tenants also point out that they cannot just leave a tenancy and obtain another through the Council, as tenants in the private sector can change landlords. A council tenant must arrange an acceptable exchange or accept a long wait for a transfer. For tenants of unpopular estates such as CFH and CHH, the chances of an exchange, while still possible, are reduced both by the number of other residents on the same estate also seeking an exchange, and by the difficulty of finding someone wanting to move to such an estate. Exchanging to other unpopular estates is probably the quickest way of moving from an

unpopular estate. Transfers are permitted but involve waits of several years, dependent on the popularity of the chosen estate.

Conditions of tenancy are also inflexible, and if the conditions are not agreeable to the tenant there is no chance of moving within the council sector to accommodation where the tenancy conditions differ. The one exception to this is the prohibition on keeping pets in flats which is not extended to council housing, where a limit of one cat and dog per tenancy is allowed. However, the flat dweller who wants to move to a house in order to keep pets is faced with the prospect of a long wait.

The tenants are, as a whole, not well-informed of their tenancy rights, actions of council officials appear arbitrary, and eviction is always a threat, which causes anxiety over rent arrears and contraventions of tenancy regulations. Many of the latter appear to the tenants inexplicable and unreasonable. Council tenants also live with the fear that if they should annoy or upset their neighbours they may be investigated, visited by a housing official who, if any tenancy contraventions are discovered, will warn them of the possibilities of a 'notice to quit'.[3] There are also continual problems on the pre-war estates of keeping houses maintained and getting repairs carried out. The overriding impression gained from talking to council tenants about their housing situation is their lack of autonomy in their own lives, resulting from council tenure - not only in the rules that govern the tenancy, but also in their choice of residence and their ability to move house where and when they want.[4] This significant aspect of being a council tenant is brought out by Wilson (1963), when he says that large numbers of people whose natural inclination would have been to use their own judgement about where to live, with the help of a

mortgage, have been able to get a house only by taking their turn on a local authority waiting list, and then more often than not have had to accept a house other than where they would have freely chosen.

It is the tenants on the problem estates who are generally most unhappy with their housing and it is often just these people who have had the least choice in the housing market. Alternatives in the privately rented sector offering comparable family accommodation are scarce and excessively expensive. Mortgages are usually not available to those in the lowest income brackets, those who are unemployed or irregularly employed, and those who are dependent on various types of state benefit, and besides which such families are unlikely to be able to save for a deposit. Within the council sector itself these poorer tenants - with the exception of those coming from clearance areas - have the least bargaining power and typically do not have the resources to wait for a 'good' estate. The result is large concentrations of the poor and disadvantaged on the Council's least popular estates, which only serves to increase their problematic nature.

5. The problem estate and the urban poor

The 'select' estate and the 'problem' estate are polar types. Between these polar types are a range of estates of average popularity, with no clearly defined reputation. These estates approximate more or less to the 'select' estate. In this sense the 'problem' estate stands out on its own, there is a clearly definable gulf between the 'problem' estate and all those of average popularity.

The select estate is easily characterised, as it is the nearest thing in the council sector to semi-detached middle class suburbia. The houses whether old or new will be in good order, the estate outside the home will be pleasant and well cared for, and situated in a 'good' part of the city. It will be suburban rather than peripheral. The

estate will be well known as a 'good' one in a 'nice' district; the houses will be much in demand and few vacancies will occur. Residents of such an estate can take a certain pride in their address - there will be no such evasions and misnaming that are common among residents of 'problem' estates. They are the elite of the council sector envied by other tenants.

Problem estates appear in the literature under a variety of names; council 'slums' or 'dumps', 'blighted neighbourhoods', 'dreadful enclosures' and even 'Botany Bays'; these are areas which house the 'disreputable poor', the 'lumpen-proletariat' or more simply 'the roughs' or the 'problem' families. Certainly being housed oh such an estate can cause problems of a varying kind for the resident, and the problems caused to outside agencies through the existence of such an estate is one of its defining characteristics. A social worker describes such an estate in the Shelter Report as one where there is "no hope, no colour, no care, no incentive" and although not all problem estates are like this, it is an accurate representation of life for many on these estates. In particular, it is typical of certain post-war high rise flat developments of which every large city has at least one with an "awful reputation". These estates, characterised by high mobility rates and low demand have become 'transition camps' for those in urgent housing need. The great dissatisfaction of the tenants is expressed in such graphic terms as 'battery cages', 'prison camps', 'Alcatraz', which occur repeatedly in the literature on such high rise developments and have been repeated to me by tenants in Sheffield. The problem housing estate, particularly the older ones, have often developed a non-conforming subculture which to an extent combats for some residents the deprivations of living in a depressed area where otherwise there is

'no hope, no colour, no care, no incentive'. A community can evolve based on familial and neighbour ties which alleviate some of the problems experienced by others who live on such estates. Where one can sensibly speak of demand for 'problem' estates - rather than acceptance through lack of choice - this is invariably from people who have links with the estate through family and friends, and would prefer a tenancy where they are known and know people than on a 'better' estate where they would be strangers.

My particular interest in problem estates is that one of their defining characteristics is a high offender and often offence rate, but problem estates share a number of other characteristics. Many are run down, not through deliberate council policy, but through a lack of finance available for their modernisation, repair and maintenance, and a succession of depressed, disinterested tenants. They are often heavily vandalised and everywhere is evidence of neglect, decay, and on many, desolation. Geographically, such an estate is usually located in the least desirable part of the city, sometimes its original tenants were from slum clearance housing or from other disreputable parts of the city, on other estates tenants have come from diverse parts of the city, but were all highly deprived in terms of their previous housing. A problem estate always has the reputation of being rough and if it is rough in reality this is sometimes acknowledged by residents themselves. The tenants are seen as being of the lowest order of council tenants who are on the whole a stigmatized group of people in our society anyway. The estate will probably be known to the police as an area where many criminal offenders reside, and possibly where there are an inordinately high number of domestic disputes and petty crimes committed. The various welfare agencies and probation services will know it for having an unusually high number of cases residing there.

The Housing Department will know it for having a high number of tenants in arrears, regular supervision cases and so on. A problem estate is sometimes characterized by high mobility patterns, others have few vacancies occurring but low demand for these when they do.

The problem estate for the Housing Department is sometimes a 'letting difficulty' as is the case with CFH, and one can presume that it is only the overall housing shortage that prevents it from becoming a 'letting impossibility'. This is the essence of the problem estate, whatever the appearance of the houses or the behaviour of the tenants in the past, or in the present, in local mythology or in reality, its popularity rating and the consequent demand for its housing will be low, the vacancy periods may be longer and the percentage wanting to leave is usually higher than on other council estates, although this may not be formally expressed in numbers of transfer applications. Problem estates, then, present 'problems' to the Housing Department, to the welfare agencies, to the police, to other local residents, but whether they are a problem to the estate's own residents is dependent upon the individual characteristics of an estate.

I have already mentioned that I found more dissatisfaction amongst the residents of an estate which started well and then experienced a decline, than Baldwin did on another Sheffield estate which started with the stigma of being a slum clearance estate (Baldwin found 71.4% liked living on the estate). This high rate of satisfaction may also be related to the fact that on this estate there is much evidence of 'community'; a sense of belonging re-inforced by lengths of residence and familial links between tenants of different houses on the estate. The Housing Department does recognise this as an important source of satisfaction with an estate among tenants and it is already trying to let CFH - Sheffield's least popular estate - to relatives of existing

tenants and those coming from estates in close proximity 'so that a community atmosphere can be built up'. These applicants are also seen as those most likely to stay, thus helping to reduce the high mobility rate which re-inforces the estate's reputation. Dissatisfaction, then, can be related to the individual characteristics of the residents as well as to the individual characteristics of the estate. The degree of satisfaction with a problem estate will vary according to whether the tenant chose the estate or was forced into acceptance by the urgency of his housing situation.

On CHH this difference in estate satisfaction according to why the tenant accepted a house on the estate is quite pronounced. But even those who have family and friends living on the estate and feel themselves to be part of the community are generally dissatisfied with the neglect of maintenance of the houses.[5] Those 'misplaced' tenants who never wanted to be housed there in the first place, or who have got left behind since the estate's decline are usually the most socially isolated, and are dissatisfied not only with the physical appearance of the estate, the condition of the houses, but above all, with their neighbours. To these tenants, as to many who do not live on a problem estate, the defining characteristic of the problem estate is that it is filled with problem families.

In fact, to the outside researcher it seemed that it was poverty which lay at the heart of every 'problem' estate. It is the unpopular city estates, whether run-down pre-war housing or post-war flat complexes, which house the urban poor. As the privately rented sector steadily diminishes in size concentrations of the urban poor on such estates will increase. The demolition or improvement of the council's own sundry housing stock also accelerates this process. The problem then

is not simply one of housing, it is intimately bound up with inequality, disadvantage and material deprivation in our society.

An understanding of the high offender rate council areas of a city may be reached not only through the intricacies of housing allocation policy and tenant self selection in a situation of a disparate housing stock, it is poverty too, which must be considered both in its effect on housing allocation and tenancy acceptance, and in the everyday lives of the people who endure it. Much of the deviancy and crime I encountered amongst the residents of the 'problem' estates with which I was involved are comprehensible as individual and subcultural responses to poverty and deprivation.

On a problem estate the straightforward economic poverty experienced by many residents is compounded by the poverty of the area. The multiple problem family is surrounded by other multiple problem families and the odd social isolate who is trying desperately to move away. The depression of such areas has long-term effects on the social and educational facilities available. On CHH, for example, the school on the estate and the senior school serving the estate were quite notorious, not only for pupil behaviour but also for lack of interest attributed to the staff. Similarly, the youth club was a poor affair, despite the enthusiasm of several of the workers. No interest or initiative could be whipped up among the parents for whose children the club existed and no money was forthcoming for good facilities.

6. Housing policy and the problem estates

The form and nature of British council house provision and management can, I would argue, only be adequately understood by adopting a political-economy analysis, such as that suggested by Gray(1976) and

undertaken by Merrett (1979). Council housing is linked to the politico-economic structure of British capitalist society and to the history of this society through its period of industrialisation, the evolution of urban centres, the use of space, land values, the financing of local authority building, and so on. The functioning of the local housing department has to be viewed within this context. Similarly, I would argue, the urban poor housed in the squalid sections of council housing cannot be viewed in isolation from the socio-economic structures and processes of the wider society.

Merrett relates the shape of current council house provision, its allocation and its management, to the political and economic structures of society both past and present at a national level, and to the complex relationship of these structures with political and economic conditions at a local level. The role of the local authority is to mediate between supply and demand in the council house market within the context of an inherited housing legacy and other "unique local conditions" (p.198). In the short term, Merrett considers the supply of council housing is outside the control of local authority management,

> "decisions about the quantity and quality of building are influenced by central government, and other external pressures such as the wider economic situation." (p.201)

Merrett sees the major task of the local authority in the housing market as the organisation and control of demand, although the local authority has to accept some of the blame for low quality housing and problem estates through persistent under investment in repairs and maintenance, and through the pursuance of certain allocation policies. Merrett argues that it is in the area of housing management the local authorities are allowed,

> "the greatest degree of discretion and autonomy from external forces and particularly central government." (p.205)

In the area of council house management, central government plays an advisory rather than supervisory role.

In this section I want to consider some of the principles outlined to me by housing staff in Sheffield, which are said to underlie some aspects of their housing management policies. Merrett warns that;

> "Increasingly today the council sector is viewed both locally and nationally as a welfare net for those unwilling or unable to provide themselves with adequate private sector housing". (p.214)

Although generally accepting that there is an increasing tendency to view council housing as a welfare provision for the socially inadequate, and I consider this in more detail in the next section, in Sheffield, with some 40% of the housing stock council owned, council housing is not seen in this light by staff of the housing department. (In fact, many of the more junior staff were themselves council tenants.) Neither, as I have suggested in Chapter Eight, was council housing seen by staff as a welfare service to provide social justice and equality or to redistribute wealth. Rather, council housing is seen as a necessary provision to meet the housing needs of the working class, run on viable economic principles. At the same time, however, ideas of social justice such as equality and freedom did permeate the ideology of council housing as adhered to by staff in Sheffield. While not granting the 'urban managers' the powerful role of creating inequality, I would argue that through allocation and management policies they have the potential of either limiting or fostering existing inequalities between current and prospective tenants. I have, therefore, tried to consider, at the micro level of one local authority, how far social

justice ideals are pursued by the housing management within the constraints of an overall housing shortage, on housing stock of unequal quality and popularity, and a demand for economic viability.

In Sheffield, freedom of choice to the applicant is emphasised at the expense of equality of opportunity in the competition for the city's council housing. The housing allocation system allows, to a considerable extent, the free play of market forces which characterises a capitalist economy. Exceptions are made to this policy of maximising freedom of choice in housing where economic principles supersede. The most obvious exception in Sheffield being the granting of priority to clearance applicants which is an interference with the market situation. This has an economic rationale, as this policy facilitates clearance programmes. Another example of policy interference in the market situation (on economic principles) is the restriction of low income group applicants to the cheapest housing. The results of this policy of emphasising freedom in a situation of housing shortage and differential demand for the city's estates has already been discussed in Chapter Eight. Those with the least resources, in the most urgent need of housing, and with the least bargaining power receive the worst housing. A polarisation of estates, with large concentrations of the poorest tenants in the most undesirable housing is the end result of such a system, just as surely as it is under local authority systems which operate a rigid grading policy, minimising freedom of choice to achieve this end.

In Sheffield, the date order allocation system is designed to promote equality of opportunity for housing among those eligible for council housing. But again, the disparity between individual applicants' material circumstances and the disparity in demand for estates ensures that the most needy will go to those housing areas in least demand,

just as 'points-systems' operated by other local authorities apparently also achieve this situation. Although again here it is necessary to emphasise that the priority policy for slum clearance entrants to the council sector in Sheffield does act as a balance. "Needy" slum clearance applicants can resist the problem estates.

In other ways too, in Sheffield, the premium put on freedom of choice can encourage the formation of 'problem' estates. Houses on low demand estates are readily available to the family and friends of existing residents, so that the growth of deviant subcultures that has taken place on such estates as CHH are actively encouraged by this allocation policy. Similarly, the satisfactory tenants on such estates are free to request a transfer or negotiate an exchange, and so move away from the estate. The economics of council housing also encourages the growth and formation of 'problem' estates. Unsatisfactory tenants - those who are in arrears or who have not kept their houses in good order - are not allowed to move away. There is an economic rationale for the policy of allocating the cheap re-let or sundry house to the low income applicants and those who are assessed as potentially unsatisfactory tenants. (The latter category includes those who have been evicted from a previous council tenancy.) Although technically such applicants could receive an allocation on any cheap re-let estate, the fact that more vacancies occur on the unpopular estates, and that these categories of applicant usually lack the resources to wait for a better offer, means that the poor and the deviant typically are allocated the least desirable housing. The freedom and priority accorded to slum clearance applicants in principle militates against the formation of 'problem' estates which are stigmatised by their incoming tenants. In practice, however, this policy means that estates

old and new close to clearance areas can become 'flooded' with this type of tenant who is still stigmatic in the eyes of other tenants.

There is no evidence of a housing authority which places equality above freedom as a guiding principle of allocation policy. No authority on the available evidence intervenes to prevent the least desirable housing going to the poorest, most needy applicants, and to this Sheffield is no exception. Some authorities deliberately allocate their poorest housing to the most needy, others, like Sheffield, allow this to happen through the mechanism of market forces. No authority is on record as implementing a social mixing policy, no attempt is made to allocate guided by the principle of 'social balance', or by the principle of 'equalisation of housing choices'. This neglect of the principle of 'equality' in the allocation of council housing may be attributed to the unpopularity an autocratic housing bureaucracy would incite amongst tenants, for allocating to achieve social balance and parity amongst tenants would necessitate an autocratic system. In fact, a recurrent criticism expressed by tenants of good estates such as CHL is that the council are pursuing a policy of social mixing and this is bitterly resented. More important, however, an emphasis on 'equality' in housing allocation would conflict with the economic principles on which council housing is run; it would challenge the whole political economics of council housing - its role and purpose in British society.

It is in the area of housing management that the bureaucracy can emphasise principles of equality as against freedom. Thus, all tenants have to submit to the same tenancy regulations on a wide range of matters, such as rent payments, upkeep of the dwelling and domestic standards, visitors and subtenants, keeping pets, trading from the

dwelling, and so on. In my experience such tenancy regulations, as an inescapable penalty of council housing, aroused widespread discontent amongst tenants. The housing authority, therefore, incurs tenant discontent in both its allocation and management policies. In the case of the former, discontent is most marked amongst residents of 'problem' estates, and those that are perceived as 'declining in standard'. Tenants on such estates feel they had no choice in the allocation of their tenancy, either because they had been granted priority or because they could not wait for a better estate, and tenants who believe their estate is being used by the local authority for 'dumping' the 'problem' families are equally vociferous in their denouncement of the city's housing allocation policies. Discontent with management policies may be encountered amongst tenants of all types of estates. In particular, many of the tenancy regulations are considered to be unreasonable, or at least unreasonably inflexible. Many tenants resent their lack of choice in matters which are governed by tenancy regulations, and this resentment is increased by the knowledge that movement within the council sector will not alter these conditions of tenure.

7. The problem estate, the attack on council housing and recommendations for improvement

In recent years there have been two types of attack on council housing, both of which derive more impetus from the 'problem' estates than from council housing in general. The first, which I have called the 'conservative' attack on council housing, tends to see this tenure type as the cause of social malaise *per se.* The council tenant is perceived as a scrounger, council tenancy sapping initiative and enterprise, and encouraging a complacency and indolence which fosters social problems such as crime and delinquency, unemployment, false

benefit claims and so on. The second attack which I have called 'radical' has very different origins and interests. The council tenant is seen as a victim; we read of council 'slums' atrocious housing conditions, poverty, neglect and decay; of individual families battling against autocratic bureaucracies. The social policy implications of both attacks are very similar - to encourage alternative types of tenure. The 'conservatives' favour an expanded owner-occupied sector, leaving council housing to those who fail to achieve this norm, and who remain in great housing need.[6] The 'radicals' advocate tenant co-ops, housing associations and any kind of housing organisation that encourages tenant participation. The effect of both types of proposals might, however, be to further undermine council housing as an accepted and respectable type of tenure, and make it more stigmatic. Council housing could become housing for these types of tenants usually found on the 'problem' estates, the poor, the needy and the inadequate. Merrett (1979), it has already been noted, warns of this threat to council housing if other types of tenure are to be encouraged at its expense. Those who suggest alternative types of tenure as a solution to the deficiencies of council housing would appear to believe that the problems associated with council house allocation and management are beyond the possibility of solution within this sector of housing.

Proponents of council housing have suggested actually expanding council housing to entice middle class tenants and to attempt to obtain a social balance within this sector. Unless, however, an autocratic system of housing allocation were introduced, something that would never be tolerated by middle class people with the material resources to exercise real choice in their housing situation, a further polarisation within the council sector between the 'haves' and 'have-nots' could be reliably predicted.

The alternative to solving the 'problem' of 'problem' estates by either reducing all council housing as a form of tenure, or attempting to popularise it, is to look at the 'problem' estates themselves for a solution, in the realisation that not all council housing is like this.

Unfortunately, focussing on the problem estates themselves reveals the depth and complexity of the problem, it cannot be a matter of simply 'equalising' estates, if this were possible, by financial expenditure and allocation policy. It is the disparity of resources amongst the existing and prospective council tenants, and the very real problems of poverty experienced by those with least resources which makes attempts to improve the housing stock itself at best a partial solution. Nevertheless, as I have shown in Chapter Three, various of the more recent commentators on council housing have indicated areas in which the improvement of council housing in general and the problem estate in particular might be possible. Briefly, there appear to be two suggested avenues for improvement of problem estates. Firstly, the improvement of the actual estates in physical terms, that is, repairing and modernising housing: cleaning up the environment, and so on, is seen as essential by concerned organisations such as Shelter and the CDP, as well as by individual researchers such as Ward and Lambert. The improvement of the worst of the council housing stock is seen as both essential to improve resident morale on the 'problem' estates, and thus to cultivate resident interest in the area, and also to increase the demand for such estates, so that it would no longer be the most desperate applicants who accepted tenancies on such estates. Implicit and explicit in these accounts of council housing is the realisation that certain highly stigmatised estates of the post-war high rise or middle rise type are really beyond salvation, at the same time the fact

of a housing shortage and the financial constraints on local authority building make it unlikely that such estates could be abandoned, demolished or turned over to another use.

Secondly, it is recommended that the population of problem estates should be altered by changes in allocation policies. These suggestions include the adoption of policies by local authorities directed towards social mixing (Tucker 1966), the reduction of child densities (Shelter 1975, CDP publications), the cessation of grading policies which ensure the worst accommodation goes to the lowest graded tenants (Shelter 1975, Ward 1976, Damer 1976, CDP 1974, 1975), delegation of allocation and management responsibilities to tenants (Shelter 1975, Ward 1976), and the more radical socialist housing policies suggested by Gray (1976), Damer (1976) and Merrett (1979).

In the final section I wish to consider some of these recommendations in relation to my findings on the Sheffield 'problem' estates, and in particular to consider their feasibility.

8. Housing policy recommendations and the Sheffield estates

8.1 The nature of the housing stock

CHH is just one of half a dozen or so pre-war Sheffield council estates which has gained the reputation of being a 'problem' estate. From my knowledge of CHH, and of certain other Sheffield estates in this category, it would seem that extensive repair and modernisation of the housing is an essential first step in both improving current tenant morale and increasing demand for the estate.[7] The City Council has already taken such measures for one such estate in the city (Blackacre) - but although tenant satisfaction has undoubtedly increased and there is a greater demand for the estate than previously, this estate still retains the pejorative label of a 'problem' estate. This must be partly attributable to the peculiarly indestructible

quality of a negative reputation, which once established, however the reality changes, tends itself to remain unaltered. It is, however, the case that on this estate, despite increased popularity with 'outsiders' the social composition of the estate remained largely the same as before modernisation. On this estate, as on CHH, long length tenancies are the norm and there is a flourishing community based on familial, neighbour and friendship ties which remained more or less intact throughout the modernisation process.

If the objective of such a modernisation programme is taken to be the improvement in housing standard of some of the city's poorest council tenants and their increased satisfaction with their housing, then the financial expenditure has been justified. On the other hand, the experience of Blackacre shows that modernisation and financial expenditure on a 'problem' estate cannot be expected to erase or substantially reduce its 'social problems', such as high levels of offender residence, juvenile delinquency, and other types of deviancy among its resident population. Nor has it done a lot to redeem its tarnished reputation. This estate did increase in popularity with the improvement in the housing, but it still does not rank as a 'popular' estate in the city. It is perhaps interesting to note here that Sheffield's pre-war low demand estates are all concentrated on one side of the city, four of them adjacent to each other and CHH, although some way away, is also situated in the east, close to the heavy industrial sectors. This suggests that simple geographical differences make the standardisation of the housing stock and 'equalisation of demand' unattainable ideals.

CFH, although the most unpopular and problematic of the city's p ost-war estates, is only one of a number of similar post-war 'concrete

jungle', developments, several of which suffer from 'dreadful' reputations. The local authority has ceased building such developments, but the problem remains of the unpopularity of the existing estates. Improvements may be made through financial expenditure on these estates, particularly on the 'estate outside the dwelling', but it is extremely doubtful if such blocks could ever become popular, and I would argue that the existence of such estates militates against any attempt to achieve parity amongst the local authority's housing stock. That is, estates such as CFH, whatever expenditure could be allocated for their improvement are destined to remain low demand estates.

CFL is of a similar block type construction, and although not as unpopular as CFH, nor suffering such an undesirable reputation, it is still not particularly favoured by council house applicants - it is certainly not a high or even average demand estate. In fact, CFL as I have sought to show has only escaped a much higher level of social problems through a particularly fortunate social history.

9. Changes in an estate's population

The most frequently mentioned recommendation in the literature for changing the population characteristics of a problem estate is the cessation of a grading system that allocates the worst of the housing stock to the poor and to the low graded applicant. This is of limited applicability in Sheffield. In this city, a very small minority of the residents of a 'problem' estate will have been allocated their housing because they were either classified as potentially unsatisfactory tenants by the housing visitor on a pre-tenancy visit, or because they applied for priority housing on special hardship or homelessness grounds. Those with low incomes or low grades will not usually be allocated a

post-war tenancy, and although not restricted to the problematic pre-war estates in practice they are unlikely to get a tenancy on a good pre-war estate as these are in great demand and vacancies are few. Slum clearance applicants are the exception here, and both the low income and the low graded may obtain a tenancy on a good pre-war estate. The cessation of the policy of restricting low grade applicants to pre-war estates, which involves such a minority of tenants overall, would have little effect on the populations of the city's problem estates.[8] As I have shown in Chapter Eight, this aspect of grading and allocation policy is not as important as the process by which the most 'needy' select themselves for the low demand estates. To prevent this process occurring the authority would have to implement a more autocratic allocation policy, whereby the less needy are forced into acceptance of the less popular estates. And the low graded were actually banned from tenancies on 'problem' estates. In such a situation the less needy may elect not to take up a council tenancy at all, creating vacancies on unpopular estates which would further re-inforce the reputation and the demoralising reality of living on an estate which others reject. In the case of the low income tenant, the use of a rent rebate system to widen their choice to include post-war estates should have the effect, not only of giving the poorer applicant greater choice than he enjoys at present, but also such a policy might help to disperse the poorer families a little more evenly throughout the housing stock. Nevertheless, the effect of such a policy on the 'problem' estate would be fairly minimal as it would remain the case that the materially poor are often those with the greatest housing need before being granted a council tenancy, and they are, therefore, most likely to accept tenancies on short-wait low demand estates.

Other suggestions for 'balancing' the population of 'problem' estates is the reduction of child density. This is particularly pertinent to CFH, and the city Council is at present pursuing such a policy. High child density is a characteristic of many 'problem' estates, where mobility rates are high and the waiting list is short. On such estates low demand and high vacancy rates ensure that dwellings are continually let to those in greatest housing need, and typically those in greatest need are families with young children. The continual turnover in population means that only a minority of families will live out a normal life cycle on the estate. Excessive numbers of children on an estate brings problems of noise - which is objectionable to many residents, but in particular to the older age group - and vandalism and delinquency. The CDP Report (1975) on council housing in Southwark argues that even the best designed estate, if it has excessive numbers of children, will decline rapidly and become problematic, not only in terms of the direct effects of wear and tear on the estate and environment, but also indirectly through the effect of this on the popularity and ultimately the reputation that the estate will establish.

To prevent high child density on certain estates it would be necessary for a local authority to put a bar on letting dwellings on such estates to young couples and families with young children, or alternatively to automatically transfer away families with more than an 'allowed' number of young children.[9] Such a policy is, in fact, difficult to pursue in a situation of overall housing shortage and where greatest housing need is typically experienced by those with young children.

The recommendation of the Shelter Report (1975) and Ward (1976) amongst others, that tenants should take over the responsibilities of

allocation, either in participation with the local authority, or by forming housing co-operatives or associations, in an attempt not only to allow all council tenants greater freedom of self determination in their housing situation, but also to alleviate conditions on 'problem' estates, is criticised by the CDP team (1975). The latter argue that such tenant allocation schemes would lead to greater social injustices than present local authority allocation policies do, and that certain groups such as coloured immigrants and 'problem' families might be effectively barred from council housing. This prediction is, I believe, supported by my own research, which suggests that the majority of tenants on 'problem' estates lay the blame for the estates' problems at the doors of certain families, who, if they had the power, they would not only oust from their present tenancy, but also prevent from returning to their estate. Among the 'right minded' residents of CHH, for example, there was a consensus of opinion that certain families should be removed from the neighbourhood and housed in special sub-standard housing away from other council tenants. Again, when the residents of CFH were approached for their ideas on improvements to their estate one of their first demands was the removal of 'problem' families.

The proponents of tenant allocation and management systems argue that the exclusion of stigmatic minorities would not occur if the residents were in control of their own housing situation, in effect, scapegoating is seen as a function of alienation from housing policies. To support this contention examples of successful tenant co-ops are cited. The CDP team (1975), however, show that these tenant co-ops are in no way typical in that they were not formed by council tenants on already established estates. Rather, they consisted of groups of families who, living in poor housing conditions, got together from

the privately rented sector, or were otherwise untypical being suggested for such housing groups by official agencies such as the local Housing Aid Centre.

The situation on CHH and CFH leads me to support the CDP argument that the delegation of powers of allocation of housing to tenant groups, formed from the residents of a council estate, would lead to greater social injustices than exist at present. If allocation were delgated to the residents I would predict only an active minority would be able and willing to take on these duties. In my experience it is just this minority who are most vociferous in their accusations that certain individual families, and on CFH these were often 'coloured' families, and types of families are responsible for the problems of the estate. Furthermore, in working towards the solution of one estate's problems in this way new dilemmas are created. The unwanted neighbours would have to be transferred elsewhere, and tenant groups on other estates are unlikely to want them. The answer, it would seem, might be sought in the creation of housing schemes for the unacceptable minority who would be further stigmatised, isolated and ostracised by the rest of society.

The social status divisions within a housing class that I have come across in my research lead me also to reject the solution of a socialist housing authority suggested by Damer (1976).

> "I do not for one moment believe that under socialism we will be able to abolish all conflict over the allocation of houses, but then, housing will be under the control of the working class, not of a bureaucracy, and priorities would thus be a matter for democratic discussion." (p.74)

Apart from the unconvincing argument that socialism would eliminate the need for a housing bureaucracy, Damer is able to argue such a position just because he sees the differences in estates as not

reflections of real differences within a class, but producers of them. My analysis suggests, however, that it is the real material differences within the class, coupled with a differential housing stock, which enables a situation to arise whereby the most disadvantaged are concentrated in certain highly specific housing areas. This is not to deny that differences within the class are perpetuated by residence on different estates, particularly with successive generations being brought up in these different housing areas.

10. Some conclusions

The Sheffield experience suggests that policies are possible which would alleviate the situation on 'problem' estates to a limited extent, both by tackling the 'physical' problems of an estate which would require considerable finance being made available by central government, and by initiating certain fairly minor changes in allocation policy, which the majority of tenants would not find objectionable, to produce more of a 'balance' in an estate's population. Ultimately, however, my analysis is in agreement with that of Shelter (1975).

> "The development of 'dump' estates is primarily the result of inequalities in the distribution of resources and of the continuing existence of multiple deprivation: changes in housing department policies, procedures and attitudes will not alter these factors."
> (p.65)

Problem estates will persist, not only as long as there is disparity in the council housing stock, or as long as local authorities operate selective allocation policies, Their existence is related to the overall housing shortage for low income groups in our society. Problem estates will continue to exist as long as differences persist in the resources with which people come into the council sector, and for as long as local authorities have a disparate housing stock in which to house large numbers of materially deprived people in a situation of

acute housing shortage. Individual estates will continue to be problematic as long as they house materially deprived families who are destined to live among similarly deprived people for long lengths of time in disadvantaged communities.

As I have tried to demonstrate, the criminality of residential areas is intimately linked with disadvantage. It would seem likely, therefore, that estates with high offender rates will continue to be a persistent feature of urban Britain.

N.B. A note on council house sales under the 1980 Housing Act : some predictions

The effect of the sale of council houses, made possible under the 1980 Housing Act, on the disparity within a local authority's stock of housing is likely to be a widening of the divisions between 'select' and 'disreputable' housing areas, and these divisions will be given greater permanence and immutability. Firstly, the more modern the house and the better the state of repair, the more attractive it becomes as a commodity to purchase rather than rent. Conversely, despite lower valuations, houses in great disrepair with outmoded facilities make a less attractive purchase to someone without the financial means to improve the property. Secondly, a house in a prestige area which is in high demand constitutes a better investment in terms of appreciation than one in a low demand stigmatised locality. Thirdly, owner-occupation is most likely to attract the higher income group council tenants who are generally housed in the high rent modern property. Fourthly, dwellings on multi-storey flatted estates, even now purchase of individual flats has been made possible, are a less attractive purchase, both in terms of satisfaction with dwelling and investment for future sale. This brings up the general point that despite the favourable conditions of purchase made possible under the Act,

and the very considerable discounts available, tenants living in houses they are basically unhappy with, whether it is the general area, the estate, the neighbours, the type of housing or whatever, that is at the root of their dissatisfaction, are unlikely to want to purchase their house and so give their present residence a greater permanence. It is some of the 'problem' estates, particularly the multi-storey flats that fall into this category, but also on housing estates such as CHH, that great numbers of dissatisfied tenants may be found. It is reasonable to predict that on such estates only a small minority of tenants will be interested in purchasing their dwelling.

Over a period of time I believe it would be reasonable to predict that a substantial amount of the desirable stock of council housing will turn over to owner-occupation, which will result in the overall reduction in availability of such houses for council tenants through exchange or transfer. Moreover, unless council building keeps pace with demand, which seems unlikely in the present economic climate, a lengthening of the waiting list may result and the situation of the poorest, most deprived section of the population will be further exacerbated, both by long waits for housing and the availability to such people of only the worst of a city's housing stock. In brief, the result of the factors outlined above, which will influence the decision to purchase a council house or to remain a tenant, will be that the 'respectability' of the modern and select housing estates will be further enhanced by the existence of substantial numbers of owner-occupied houses on such estates. The 'problem' estates which house the dissatisfied tenants, many of whom are too desperately poor and demoralised to even contemplate owner-occupation, are likely to remain predominately council owned. It is this stock of housing which the local authority will be left with, to allocate to incoming and existing tenants.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Shelter Report, Homeless Families in Sheffield (December 1974), states that in 1972-3 only 9% of the slum clearance applicants in Sheffield had waiting list registrations.

2. After this research was completed I bought a house in an area of the city which comprised entirely of small terraced houses. This area was free from the blight of slum clearance, and the houses were rapidly being bought and improved by working class families. There was a small percentage of privately let housing remaining, but even these were often being sold to 'sitting tenants'. I was immediately aware of a very different type of community than I had found on any of the estates. Families were very 'home' centred, and attention was focussed on home improvements, time and money being continually invested in the house itself. The emphasis was on "respectability", and a measure of this in the eyes of the residents was the condition and standard of modernisation of the home. Families were typically small and close knit, little use was made of public space. Children on the streets - a rare occurrence - was not acceptable to the community, and parents were visited by neighbours on even a suspicion of a misdemeanour by a child. In fact, on several occasions police were called because unidentified boys were seen hanging about at the end of the street. A one-parent family living in the area was the focus of great hostility and the children were kept under constant surveillance by neighbours. The male friendships of the mother were constantly criticised in an area where stable marital relationships were the norm and spouses rarely went out socially without their partner.

3. The 1980 Housing Act has certainly improved the position for council tenants in terms of their security of tenure. One of the principal elements in the "public tenants' charter" introduced by Part 1 of the Act is statutory security of tenure. The details of this part of the 1980 Act are discussed by David Hoath (1980) in Housing Act 1980, pp.15-18. It may be predicted, however, that it will be some time before the effects of this legislation filter down to the tenants themselves and they will be aware of their increased security of tenure. The 1980 Act also gives council tenants certain information rights previously denied to them. The local authority is now under statutory obligation to publish details of their priority and allocation procedures and the rules governing transfers and exchanges. Tenants and applicants now have the right to see information given by themselves to the Housing Department in their application for housing. Again, details of these information obligations on local authorities are discussed by Hoath (1980, pp.27-30) who concludes that despite these information rights laid down by the 1980 Act,

> "Much information of importance to tenants still does not have to be supplied (e.g. as to their remedies for disrepair), and the scope for tenants actually to influence their authorities' decisions on management matters remains severely curtailed."
> (p.30)

4. This lack of autonomy experienced by council tenants is much stressed by Ward (1974).

5. Despite modernisation on CHH, some eight years before this research, residents were still not satisfied that their houses were of an acceptable standard, that problems such as damp had ~~not~~ been tackled, nor that their houses had subsequently been properly maintained.

6. Since this was written the 1980 Housing Act has come into force. I have, therefore, included a final section to this chapter to consider the implications of the sale of council houses for a local authority's housing stock in terms of the existing disparity between council estates.

7. It has already been noted that Sheffield City Council has spent some money on repair and modernisation of CHH in the last decade, but this did not go far enough. The financial expenditure on this estate was limited, and the houses so outmoded and in such a state of disrepair, that they could not be brought up to a standard comparable with council housing built in the sixties and seventies.

8. This is not to discount the 'social justice' argument for allowing such applicants the same freedom of choice as others enjoy.

9. Sheffield has adopted a mixture of these policies for CFH, offering transfers away to families with young children, and discouraging reletting to this family type.

APPENDIX

AN ETHNOGRAPHIC NOTE ON THE PRE-WAR ESTATES

(with special reference to crime)

1. SETTING THE SCENE

1.1 The selection of people for this ethnographic note

In this appendix I give a more detailed account of the way of life of the more 'criminal' people I met during my field research on the pre-war estates. These people include some of the personnel of the second taxi office 'Dial-a-Car' who live or have familial connections on south east CHH. I have also focussed on four specific families living on south east CHH who like the personnel of 'Dial-a-Car', I would argue, are more consistently criminal in their activities than most other residents of this estate. The individuals singled out for discussion in the following account are, therefore, not representative of the majority of people living in the area. At the same time I met and have heard of other families on CHH, particularly in the south east corner, who live comparable life styles and engage in criminal activities in much the same way as those described here. It is obviously not possible if a detailed account is to be given, to include all such families. At times I mention other families and individuals who live on CHH who, while not participating in the criminality ascribed to the people under discussion, have to be brought into this account either by their relationships with the 'criminal' families or by their involvement in the episodes that I describe.

The four families have been chosen because they well illustrate the type of families described in Chapter Five who are members of the deviant

subculture on south east CHH, and who are often related by marriage and kinship ties and who also interact with one another as friends and neighbours. I have argued that through the inter-marriage and social interaction of such families a deviant subculture is kept alive on south east CHH, into which the young of these families are socialised over successive generations. Children from other families are often drawn into deviant behaviour through their friendships with the children of the 'criminal' families. Such families as those described here contribute to the offender rate of CHH out of all proportion to their number.

1.2 Types of deviant

From the deviants I met living on CHH I would identify three broad types. In the detailed description of the people selected for this ethnographic note I relate these three types to the life style on CHH and the deviant subculture.

The first type, numerically greatest by far, is what I shall call the 'opportunist deviant'. On CHH this type is most often a member of the deviant subculture. These people vary in the amount of crime they commit from those who are constantly violating the law to those who occasionally "get tempted". Typically these people commit offences when the opportunity occurs, to supplement income, to acquire desirable goods, or to stave off a financial crisis. The children who come into this category also offend to acquire money or goods otherwise unattainable to them, but more often their offences in childhood relate to boredom.

The second type is almost invariably a subcultural member. The criminal activities of this type are less a spontaneous response to an opportunity or a situation; rather they are more a consciously chosen way

of life: these people I shall call the 'career deviants'. Such deviants do not wait to 'get tempted', nor are they only prompted to commit offences when money is short or when opportunities occur. These people are constantly and consistently criminal and seek out opportunities for crime. They are usually materially deprived people who have consciously rejected the strain and monotony of the respectable alternative of an accepting life of poverty.

The third type is the person with the entrepreneurial spirit who I shall call the 'entrepreneurial deviant'. On CHH such a person is likely to be a subcultural member but this is not necessarily the case. Poverty is, of course, the background which gives incentive to the 'entrepreneurial deviant' and the deviant subculture is the background which channels actions into illegal enterprises. In the same way those who reject conventional living need not be subcultural members, but being brought up in a deviant home makes the routine and discipline of convantional living more difficult to accept. While all social strata produce their own deviants, all social strata can conceive the 'entrepreneurial deviant'. But on CHH, where people are materially poor, live in a disadvantaged neighbourhood where crime is commonplace and the opportunities for legitimate social and economic advancement are slim, the entrepreneur is more likely to violate the law than if he had been born into a more privileged socio-economic position.

The 'entrepreneurial deviant' may be distinguished from the 'career deviant' in that although his life is also organised around criminal activity it is not crime itself which attracts but the dream of 'making good'; that is, the dream of making money and living an affluent lifestyle. Crime is an avenue for the realisation of this dream. If legitimate opportunities occur for attaining this objective the 'entrepreneurial deviant' will take them; he does not seek out illegitimate opportunity

in the same way that the 'career deviant' does. For the 'entrepreneurial deviant' recognises that ~~opportunities~~ apprehension for illegal activity makes the possibility of realisation of the dream recede.

The 'entrepreneurial deviant' is also distinct from the 'opportunist deviant'. He is not content with "making out" - that is, supplementing his meagre existence by the occasional acquisitive offence. The 'entrepreneurial deviant', like the 'career deviant', differs from the 'opportunist deviant' in that the material limitations of his life are unacceptable to such a person and the life of accepting poverty is rejected.

I am not suggesting that people become prisoners of a type, that they are in some way locked into a particular type of deviancy. As is suggested by some of the characters described in the following account 'opportunist' deviants can become 'career' deviants or vice versa. Similarly 'entrepreneurial deviants' can become 'career deviants'. Any of the deviants can cease in their deviancy or change their deviant approach. Nevertheless taking any moment in time the deviants I met on CHH approximated more or less to one of these three deviant types, sufficiently closely to be included in a single category of deviant.

2. THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES

2.1 The Williams Family

I start with the Williams family (1) because not only is the family notorious in the immediate area and is linked to one of the central criminal families of the south east corner of CHH, but also because Jane who worked at 'Dial-a-Car' was herself a member of this family. Jane's mother and father, although now divorced, both still live on CHH. Mrs. Williams lives in the family tenancy on Cherry Road (2) which is on the south east corner of the estate.

Mr. Williams left his wife for another woman who lives on Bilberry Avenue on the north west side of the estate. Mrs. Williams has subsequently had a series of cohabitees, some of whom Jane reported as being kind to them as children, some indifferent, and others violent and uncaring. Mrs. Williams still has two school age children living at home. Of her three adult children, the eldest son is married with three children of his own, and lives on a nearby disreputable pre-war estate. Jane, who left home after falling foul of her mother's current cohabitee, tried living with this brother but found she could not tolerate the filth and squalor of her brother's household. Subsequently she moved in with her older sister, Marie, who has a tenancy on Apple Avenue on south east CHH - in fact, just round the corner from her mother. Marie's house is by most standards dirty, neglected and dilapidated, but Jane says it is of a much better standard than her brother's. Marie is herself only twenty five years old but she has three young children. Her husband, Nick, is prone to drinking bouts and violence. At such times Jane escapes the house and finds somewhere else to stay. Nick is casually employed in the building trade and spends periods of time away from home, when the house is relatively peaceful and Jane and Marie are given a respite against the threat (and reality) of violence. When Nick is away, no-one in Marie's household gets up much before lunchtime, or goes to bed before midnight, including the three children. Marie was dreading the oldest going to school knowing that she would have to try and get up in time to get her off in the mornings. Marie explained to me,

"Five, six, seven, they're the worst ages. Before that you make them fit in with you, after that they can look after themselves. When Donna's eight she'll be able to get herself off to school."

Marie did not want any more children. In fact she didn't want three,

but "it just happens doesn't it?". I think that Jane, in fact, had recently explained to her how pregnancy could be avoided because Marie had obtained the 'pill' from her local G.P. Marie would not go to the family planning clinic. She was suspicious and afraid of anything sounding "official". She did not attend the ante-natal clinic either. "I went once but they treated you like a nobody. They looked down at me, I'd not go back." Health visitors, housing welfare visitors, social workers are all seen as "nosey parkers - just looking for an excuse to take your kids away from you." Marie may not have wanted three children, her standard of child care may be poor, but she is in no doubt that she loves them now and no one is going to take them from her. For this reason she does not complain outside the family about Nick's drinking and violence.

When Marie's children wake up in the morning they amuse themselves around the house. If they get too noisy for Marie and Jane they are given milk and bread and butter and are taken into bed with them. All three children sleep in a bed in Marie's room anyway. Sometimes Jane slept with Marie when Nick was away.

Jane's working day started around lunchtime at the sauna baths where she was a masseure. Before leaving for work she went to the local chip shop and bought lunch for Marie and the children. Before Jane was living with them this lunch was usually "chip butties" or sometimes fish cakes and chips. But Jane's affluence enabled Marie and her children to have fish and chips every day. When Jane had left for work Marie would either watch television or, on a fine day, take the children to the local park. Occasionally she persuaded her mother, Mrs. Williams, to babysit for her. This left her free to shop in town. More frequently, her younger sister Jenny who was fourteen years old and frequently truanting from school, would come and look after the children in the

afternoon. It was on one such occasion that Marie went into the city centre with her mother and both women were caught shoplifting. Marie told me :

"It was that old cow watching us. I think she recognised my mum from before(3); there was no way they were going to let us off."

Marie was most worried that her children would be taken away from her as a result of this offence. Mrs. Williams did not want probation, she had had this before and did not get on with the probation officer- 'a patronising bastard' she told me. 'What could he know of the likes of me? I could have told him a few things about life.' In fact, both women were relieved to be fined - both fines were paid by Jane.

I asked Marie how Nick had taken it. "He was mad, he's never been in trouble for thieving, fighting yes, but not thieving. He said it was typical of us Walkers." (4)

Nick drank heavily and gambled, a combination that kept Marie very short of housekeeping money. Nick had lived in the Apple Avenue house all his life. After his mother's death his father remarried and left the estate relinquishing his tenancy to his son. Nick was the only member of his family to have a criminal conviction (this was for assault) and he was rather contemptuous of Marie's family. He was, however, quick to point out his wife's grandfather was Mr. Walker, when it seemed necessary to impress others with his "toughness". It was Jane who supplied the few luxuries, like the rented colour television set and Marie's night out at the club on the weeks Jenny could be persuaded to babysit.

Jane told me that her father, whom she rarely saw now, had been in prison at least twice,

"For burglary I think although he's not been in trouble since he took up with that woman on Bilberry."

Her eldest brother had been in detention centre and borstal, but she thought he had stopped committing offences now. Jane herself had escaped the attention of law enforcement agencies but was in trouble during her school days for truanting, as her two younger siblings were at the time of my fieldwork. The main problem, Jane said, was that her own mother never got up until midday and so the children continually overslept. When Jane lived at home she was expected to "housekeep" and "babysit" which also made school attendance difficult.

Nick and Marie's house, as I have already noted, is dirty and neglected. A number of the windows are broken as the result of both local children's "play" and Nick's drinking bouts, consequently there is much cardboard stuffed in the broken panes. Outside the garden is unkept and full of rubbish. While I knew Jane she passed her driving test and wanted to buy a secondhand car. A friend of mine in the motor trade attempted to fix her up with finance. The first finance company approached did not like the address - Apple Avenue, CHH - or the occupation of the applicant - masseuse in a sauna bath. The second company approached sent a representative to interview Jane, but he got no further than the road outside the house. Later he phoned my motor trader friend, extremely annoyed at having his "time wasted". He said no company would give finance to a person who lived in such squalor. He mentioned the broken windows, the guttering and fall pipes coming away from the house (the children play on the fall pipes) and the rubbish-strewn garden. Jane was unsurprised with the refusal, although we did not reveal the details in full :

"Nobody likes lending money to people like us."

Jane, in fact, saw her work as a means of escaping the fate of Marie and others like her.

"I don't want to end up like her - every girl down our way ends up like her. Not me. I'm going to make money, own things, be a person, have some self respect."

Jane therefore differed from her family who were 'opportunist deviants' in that in both her attitudes and her lifestyle she is an 'entrepreneurial deviant', rejecting the lifestyle of her mother and sister in her dream of making good. Jane's father and brother also do not fit the category of 'entrepreneurial deviant'. Her brother was like her mother and sister ar 'opportunist deviant', but his criminal activity was apparently confined to the time when he was young and unmarried. Jane's father was a 'career deviant' who apparently changed his way of life and stopped committing offences when he left Jane's mother and went to live with another woman.

2.2 Jane and other personnel of 'Dial-a-Car'

In my time on the taxis I knew well four girls who worked in various saunas in the city. All, except Jane, presented as really tough girls who, I would say, were fully in control of their situation. All, including Jane, did it for the money.

Christine Mason (see the Mason family described on page 260 of this thesis) was one of these girls. She offers a complete contrast to Jane in her self-assurance and understanding of the work she had chosen to earn her living. Of the sauna girls I knew, Christine had the greatest contempt for and the most uncharitable insights into her clients, but she liked the money. Like Jane, however, she used her money to lavish all kinds of consumer goods on her family and friends. Once a week we would go out in the taxi to buy presents for her child and for other

relations and friends.

Jane, as I have said, was different from the other girls, not in her spending patterns, but in her vulnerability and lack of self-assurance. Jane was at the time I knew her just nineteen. She came from a family that was not good on caring. The effect of this childhood on her sister, Marie, was to propel her into early marriage. Early marriage was, in fact, common among girls from this type of background. Jane reacted to her family background by trying to show her independence, in this she was an exception among the girls I met on CHH. She was determined to "make it on my own". Nevertheless her chosen way of making it did worry her at times; such doubts never seemed to occur to Christine and the other sauna girls.

Jane often confided in me the "strange things" she was asked to do. 'Was it wrong?' 'Was it right?' 'Was it natural?' She did night escort work and some of her clients were "not so nice". I was with her before her interview for her first 'blue movie'. She was filled with doubt. "Could she do it?" "Should she do it?" "Would it be alright?" "The money is good".

I have described Jane as an 'entrepreneurial deviant'. Equipped with an entrepreneurial spirit, Jane's deviancy took these particular sexual forms because of the fact of being female. The form of deviancy chosen is related to opportunity structures in society. Other women I met on CHH who could be considered deviants had criminal convictions for petty larceny, shoplifting, social security frauds - ways of making out in financial need or crisis, or of acquiring desirable goods that could not be purchased. Jane is not representative of the women I met on CHH who, I would argue, generally committed crimes out of simple poverty or felt deprivation when opportunities arose. In committing such

offences they usually knew other family members, friends or neighbours who did the same. Jane was not in the typical female poverty trap with responsibilities to a husband and children. Jane was all too aware of this trap of which her sister, Marie, and her own mother had been victims. She was not interested in 'making out' but in 'making good'. To do this she had to look for opportunities to make substantial amounts of money. Being young and pretty, various form of 'fringe prostitution' offered an obvious opportunity to Jane to pursue this objective.

Like others that I would cast in the 'entrepreneurial deviant' type, Jane had no acquisitive feelings about the money she earned, no detailed long term plans. On the surface people like Jane, despite their avowed intentions to 'make good', do not appear to value the money they make. Jane spent on everyone, her generosity was overwhelming. Goods long coveted, once gained, were quickly discarded, given away or treated with little care. In fact people like Jane do value money but they do this in an unconventional way. Money and goods do not hold an intrinsic value, nor are they used to "accumulate security". They are only useful and valuable in the enjoyment they give in the here and now.

If Jane needed a taxi home at night she would always ask for me. This was typical of her basic lack of self-confidence and maturity that marked her as different from the other sauna girls (although in time she may well become as self-assured as those girls). After a night out Jane would call in the office or phone up and ask for me :

"Polii take me home - I feel safe with you".

She lived less than a mile from the taxi office, the fare would have been minimal but on these occasions I had no intention of charging her. From the first time I took her in the taxi, however, she insisted on paying me - not the fare but two or three pounds at a time. I tried to

refuse it but this hurt her. "No you are my friend, I want you to have it ... What's wrong with my money?". I spent my time devising ways of getting the money back to her, unnoticed. Other interpretations of Jane's generosity are obviously possible but I should stress that I found that this type of spending in the 'money making' deviant to be the norm. For instance all the masseur girls were unusually generous as were many of the taxi drivers themselves.

I came to realise that Jane's uncontrolled and uncontrollable temper, so often seen in the taxi office, her demands and her tyrannical behaviour covered a very fragile person. I think I was the only one in the office to realise this. John, who to all intents and purposes ran the taxi office was infatuated with Jane. In his thirties, John was married and his wife was expecting their fourth child. He also originated from the south east corner of CHH. He had held his own tenancy on the estate before being evicted for arrears. Subsequently he had cleared his arrears and he and his family now lived on a neighbouring estate. His marriage was in difficulties, not least as a result of his infatuation for Jane, and he tended to spend more time at his parents' house on Orange Close (south east CHH) and at Nick and Marie's with Jane than he did with his own family. His parents were "very respectable" working class and John had caused them much distress. They explained his behaviour in terms of his upbringing on CHH - he has been in continuous trouble since he was a child. John may indeed be taken as a classic example of a child drawn into deviancy through association with his neighbourhood peers, a deviancy he had taken with him into adult life. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Swale, had apparently lived on CHH when it was 'respectable'. Now they desperately wished they had moved away but felt too old for such an undertaking by

the time I met them, besides which they felt the damage had been done to John. The Swales had two sons: John's elder brother Jim has never been in trouble with the police. He married a girl from another part of the city, and bought a semi-detached house in that area, where he still lives today. Jim has held the same job all his working life in one of the Sheffield steel firms. John is the "black sheep" of the Swale family; the years have been spent in and out of penal institutions, his offences often being committed in the company of his friends living on CHH.

John's infatuation for Jane extended to a mildly protective attitude towards her - although he was also fascinated by the opportunities for moneymaking that he discovered in certain "vice industries". He made himself paid mediator in the blue movie episode. When I last saw him he was launching his own escort agency with Jane as his leading lady.

John is another 'entrepreneurial deviant', and the taxi office also presented ways of making illegitimate quick money. As I suggest in a later section, any occupation involving secondhand cars offers many opportunities for criminal activity such as insurance claims on "lost" vehicles, "ringing" (5), and so on. The male 'entrepreneur criminals' 'makihg good' as opposed to the 'opportunist criminals' 'making out' (both of whom I met on CHH) all had associations with the motor and/or scrap trades. In the search for illegitimate opportunity the motor trade offers much potential, and in a steel city such as Sheffield illict dealings in the scrap trade can be exceptionally lucrative. Such activity associated with the 'entrepreneurs' and to some extent with the 'career' deviants, do not carry the same amount of risk of detection as, say, straightforward thefts more often associated with the 'opportunist criminals'. Additionally, they are not so apparently criminal to the actors who tend to see such activities as

'business practice' rather than plain straightforward crime. This is an important distinction to the 'entrepreneurial deviant'. (In this there is also a difference between 'entrepreneurial' and 'career' deviants: the latter are quite accepting of the criminal label - they openly espouse it and often are quite proud of their life of crime.)

There were others in the taxi office more openly criminal with no pretentions of being businessmen. Richard Shelley, a man in his mid-twenties lived on Cherry Road (south east CHH) and had adopted the life of the 'career deviant'. The Shelley's are another 'criminal' family linked distantly to the Williams through the Walkers. According to Richard his mother is unhappy about the family she married into, but has stuck her marriage out despite this. Her mother-in-law was a Walker and her husband is a key figure in the south east CHH enclave. Neighbours are not surprised to see the police knocking on the Shelley's door; they just speculate whether it is the father or one of the four sons who is to be arrested. Richard made a quick exit from the taxi office some weeks after I had been there. The police had called the day before to question him, as I found out later, about a 'break-in' to one of the local shops. At the time I was alone in the office, and being well aware that one rule of this community that never need be made explicit is that no-one knows anyone when the police are around, I quickly made for the other side of the office door and pretended to the police constables that I was in fact waiting for a taxi. Richard returned that night and I told him about the visit. He left the office immediately, but being a rather inept criminal he was picked up by the police not long after on CHH. Choosing to become a 'career deviant' does not necessarily mean that the chosen "career" will be a success.

In Chapter Five I discussed the subcultural norm of not going to the police but sorting out one's own affairs if one is the victim of a crime.

This was carried out to an extreme in the taxi office when attempts of violence against drivers and damage to vehicles, the suspected work of rival firms, were met with reprisal attacks from members of our firm. Similarly when Richard Shelley suspected a Ken Roberts, also of south east CHH, of "borrowing" his car he did not report it stolen but promptly went round to the Roberts' house, kicked the door in, smashed a window and had it out with him. The police were never called.

2.3 The Walker family

I have said that the Shelleys and the Williams were distantly related through the Walker family. The Walker family are an old CHH family, being housed there originally in the 1930's. Mr. Walker, now deceased, was apparently a key criminal figure not only in the CHH area but in the Sheffield 'underworld' of the time. His widow still lives on Cherry Road. One son still lives on the estate, also on Cherry Road. At his house all manner of articles may be bought. His two sons are also well known to the police and I give an example of this in an episode I relate in a later section.

The Walker men are without exception 'career' deviants.

The Walker daughters are particularly interesting. One is Mrs. Williams, another married a Shelley but is now separated from him and lives on the north west of the estate, and the third married a Rawlings. The Williams and the Shelleys have already been discussed, which leaves the fourth family who feature in this ethnographic note - the Rawlings.

2.4 The Rawlings family

The Rawlings are perhaps the most criminally active family on the estate today - perhaps most closely rivalled by their relatives, friends and neighbours - the young Walker family. Mr. Rawlings is a 'career deviant', a long term recidivist, an extremely violent, and incidentally,

unlikeable man - feared by his family, his friends and his neighbours. His wife, a former Miss Walker, has a long history of mental illness being a frequent patient at the City's mental hospital. They have seven children, all who have been in care or custody at various times in their lives. Of the five sons, at the time of the incident I am about to describe, one was in borstal, one awaiting trial was in Remand Centre custody and the third, Mark, was involved in the following incident. A fourth was away at community school and the fifth living at home under a supervision order. The incident, which I describe in detail, illustrates a number of features of life on south east CHH which I have outlined in Chapter Five.

I had driven to the garage of a friend of mine which was situated some two miles from CHH. This garage had in recent weeks been plagued by car thefts and vandalism. Only a week before Roy, who ran the business, had caught a lad actually driving in one of his cars on the road that runs between CHH and CHL. There had ensued a "Sweeney" style car chase over a distance of some four miles until Roy drove broadside into the stolen car ramming it onto the pavement and effectively bringing it to a halt. He then gave the thief a 'good going over' and reclaimed his car. On the following occasion, involving Mark Rawlings, I had parked my car outside the garage on the road. I was inside the garage talking to Roy and friends when I happened to glance outside and see two men sitting in my car. Roy and I dashed out to stop them driving off (they were trying to wire the car when we got to it). The one on the passenger side jumped out and ran for it when he saw us coming. Mark Rawlings in the driver's seat was still vainly trying to start the car and make a get-away. Roy dragged him out, knocked him down and proceeded to pull him across the road on his back to the garage. There was thick snow on the ground at the time and Mark was bleeding quite

profusely from a neck wound leaving a trail of blood in the snow from the car to the garage. Roy's friends came out and joined in the affray shouting they had had enough of car thieves and this one was to be taught a lesson. One suggested tying Mark onto the back of the car and dragging him home! At this point I intervened and suggested that Mark had been punished enough. I argued that if we let him go he would go home and tell his friends what had happened to him and that would get them all off victimising the garage. Mark, now standing, suddenly recognised me and crying like a child (he was seventeen at the time), bleeding and shivering (he wore only the thinnest tee-shirt, jeans and gym shoes), he pleaded with me to make them let him go. He promised never to come back to the garage again. He then cried to me that he was terrified of what his father would do if he found out. Mr. Rawlings, although constantly committing offences himself, would never pass over the chance of giving his sons a beating, particularly if as a result of their actions the police became involved.

Roy and friends were on the point of letting Mark go but were stopped by the arrival of the police. A customer at the garage had dialled 999 during the chaotic minutes of Roy's "citizens arrest". The police would not have been called by Roy and friends, who also believed in sorting things out for themselves. Two police officers came into the garage; both obviously recognised Mark. One said, "Right, Rawlings you little bastard we've got you this time".

The other,

"Which bloody Rawlings are you anyway? There are so many of you - you're not Michael he's in borstal".

The first police officer then said,

"Well Mark's going to join him there".

The customer then pointed out that there had been two boys in the car and that one had got away. The police questioned Mark about his companion but Mark, despite now being in an apparent state of shock, refused to say who he was. The police then turned to Roy and said not to worry, they had a good idea who he would be. (A Walker boy was subsequently arrested.)

The two lads eventually got Detention Centre sentences. The police recovered forty or more cars as a result of this episode: the lads had been taking them to a car park behind a disused warehouse and using them as "dodgem" cars - none of them were in an intact state. Roy recovered three more of his cars. I have seen Mark Rawlings since this episode and there was no resentment for Roy's actions, although Mark felt that calling the police was "unfair" and that being "belted" for the offence was enough.

I have described this episode in some detail and I would say there are several aspects worth noting. Firstly, the poverty of Mark's apparel (it was a freezing day with snow on the ground). Secondly, the purpose for which the car was being stolen - entertainment rather than financial gain. Thirdly, Mark displayed some typical subcultural reactions - loyalty to his friend, distress at the thought of violence from his father and later a sense of injustice in the police being involved. Roy and his friends' decision to deal with Mark themselves is also significant when considering deviant values. The police reaction is also of interest. The officers knew the family well, they also knew where to look for the accomplice. Their attitude to Mark was harsh (no remark was made about his injuries) and uncompromising. Roy made a plea on Mark's behalf not to press charges, but the reply was that lads such as Mark were hardened criminals and only penal measures could possibly deter such lads from crime. Finally, perhaps it is interesting

that the detached, neutral participant observer intervened on the offender's behalf, both to stop the assault on him and, hopelessly as it turned out, to prevent the intervention of the police.

3. THE LINK BETWEEN POVERTY AND CRIME

These families who live on south east CHH, who I have described, the Williams, the Shelleys, the Walkers and the Rawlings, are poor families in material terms but then so are other families living in the area who are not so consistently criminal. Why then are some families more criminal than others? But perhaps more importantly it should be asked, why do these families commit crime when other poor families live out entirely respectable lives?

3.1 Differential association

Part of the answer, I believe, lies in the close interaction of those more criminal families through inter-marriage, through neighbouring and through peer group friendships - all forms of interaction brought about initially by their living in close proximity to one another. Other families in the neighbourhood can and do get drawn into some of their activities. At a Walker household, for instance, stolen goods are regularly sold to many friends and neighbours - not just to the 'criminal' core. Children in particular are at risk. While I was at the Williams' one day a neighbour called with the news that they had seen the police questioning the two younger Williams' children and some others. It was thought, as later turned out to be the case, that the children had been damaging cars. This neighbour thought "the law" were on their way to the Williams' house. Mrs. Williams was upset, the children were always getting her into trouble and now the police would be "nosing" round her house. She was "fed up with their interference". But one of the children with the Williams was Stevie Jameson, the young

son: of a couple I knew living on Cherry Road. The Jamesons were desperately trying to maintain a respectability until such time as they got their long-awaited transfer. For them this incident was a tragedy, although in fact Stevie was too young to be prosecuted. For the Jamesons the long dreaded moment had arrvied when their little boy was in trouble with the police. This had been their main fear in their dislike of CHH that their children should be drawn into the delinquent activities of other children in the neighbourhood.

John Swale of 'Dial-a-Car' might be taken as another example of a person who was drawn from childhood into the network of criminal families living on south east CHH, despite the efforts of his parents to prevent this. These associations, coupled with John's 'entrepreneurial' spirit had got him into trouble for most of his life.

3.2 Subcultural ways of life and inter-generational continuities

The people I have described here live very irregular life styles - their days appear to have no routine. They do not live by the clock. Typically the male head of household is drawing state benefit, either being totally unemployed or doing casual labour on the side. As I have suggested, typical casual labour is in the motor, scrap or building trades, all occupations offering opportunity for criminal enterprise. Typically the female head of household is weighed down by poverty and the commitments of a large family, often coupled with a drinking husband, who keeps the whole family short of money.

Children are typically loved but not cared for - they are from a very young age treated as adults. They are left to their own devices. There is no one to get them to school in the morning, to get their lunch for them - witness the queues of children at the chip shop at this hour

of day - to entertain them in their leisure hours or while they are not attending school, to sit with them at night to ensure regular bed times and good sleep patterns. These children bring themselves up and it often falls to the girls to bring their siblings up from a very early age. The parents are either immersed in their own miseries, like Mrs. Rawlings, or in their own leisure, like Mrs. Williams. The husbands anyway are not expected to take much interest in the children. In this type of community this is still regarded as "not men's work".

Leisure time for both male and female adults centre around the pub, the working men's club, the book-makers, the bingo hall and the dog track - all entertainments demanding money for participation. It is easier to live in law abiding poverty if there is no felt need to spend survival money on entertainment. But these expensive types of entertainment are central to the subcultural way of life found on south east CHH. Many families are plainly bad managers with money. Thus in one household the electricity had been disconnected for non-payment of bills and so the doors had been taken down and floor boards taken up and the wood used for a fire to generate some heat, to boil a kettle on and to make toast. Consequently only one downstairs room was habitable. In this one room the family lived and slept. The effect of electricity cut off is to further irregularise people's lives. The children are very prone to delinquency in such an environment. Not only do they have the pattern of dad "fixing the electric meter" to "get by", or mum "buying a carpet from someone in the pub", as suggested on page 344 of this thesis, they also have many unsupervised hours in which to entertain themselves.

Responses and solutions to poverty, modes of living, patterns of entertainment, I would argue, are learnt in the family and in the neighbourhood. They are learnt from parents, from older siblings, from

peers. The irregular lifestyles - in the literal sense of lacking routine - the lack of regular mealtimes, the absence of getting up and going to bed routines, the unsupervised nature of children's lives, the lack of basic caring in the home, and the influence of other such children in the neighbourhood, makes it extremely difficult for children from such families to escape the cycle of poverty, or even to adopt 'respectable' solutions to poverty in their own adult lives. These are the children who are poor school attenders, who get no educational encouragement at home, who are indeed often kept at home by their parents to look after the house and siblings, and who end up in dead end jobs or unemployed. These are the children who from a young age have experienced the attentions of social control agents, for whom police intervention in their lives, while resented, is considered quite normal. These are the children who lack social education as well as academic, who often become very young parents unable to cope themselves with the strains of adult relationships and parenting. As young adults they cannot earn the resources to support a family adequately, they have families of their own before they have their own homes and eventually they accept tenancies on estates such as CHH, either through desire to stay near the extended family or through the need for quick housing. As children they have learnt their parents' solutions to poverty and for the need for money to enjoy as well as to survive, they are therefore more than likely to adopt these solutions for themselves in adult life. In this way enclaves of disadvantage such as south east CHH are perpetuated over successive generations. (6)

3.3 Escape routes

There are escape routes for the children brought up in such areas as CHH. Education and occupation are one, although I am bound to say that

I found no children on south east CHH who had climbed the social ladder by these means. This is not surprising considering the lack of interest in education and the irregularity of lifestyles characteristic of the subculture. The route exists, then, but for children coming from such families as I have described it is so strewn with obstacles as to make it virtually impassable. Another possible escape route is marriage. I know of two adult people who were born into the 'criminal' families of south east CHH who have escaped by this means. Because they are in my experience exceptional I feel they deserve a little detail.

Eddy Baker I have already quoted in Chapter Four as saying he came from a problem family who lived on CHH. The Bakers are, in fact, distantly related to the Shelleys. Eddy's sister Kathy still lives on south east CHH in her parents tenancy; both parents are now dead. She has never married and is in fact somewhat mentally retarded. Eddy's brother, John, married a Rawlings (Mr. Rawlings' sister), they have eight children all who have been in care at one time or another while their parents have been in prison. This family were evicted from their tenancy on Apple Avenue for rent arrears and were subsequently rehoused in a Council owned terraced house in one of the city's clearance areas. Eddy is very scornful of John and his family. Eddy himself made a disastrous first marriage to a girl from one of the 'criminal' families on south east CHH. Eventually she left Eddy - with three children. Later the children were taken into care. Eddy met and married Susan, the only daughter of a very respectable couple who ran a grocery shop. They bought Eddy and Susan a house and a business away from CHH. Eddy and Susan now have a child of their own and are very happily married. Their lifestyle may be rather "irregular" but they are certainly very "respectable"

Eddy has not been in any trouble with the police, in fact he is now very scornful of 'problem' families and the 'criminal element' generally. Eddy then has 'escaped'.

June Robins has also 'escaped'. A woman, now in her forties, she was also born and brought up on south east CHH. Her family still live on this part of the estate and make their own contribution to the offender rate. June married a fairly successful businessman - a garage owner - and they live a life of relative affluence in a detached house in a very middle class area of the city. June's only deviance is her sexual promiscuity, widely known among friends and relatives. It is perhaps interesting to note that of her three adult sons the oldest is divorced at twenty two, living with a married woman and ~~has~~ two children on an estate north of CHH. Her second son at nineteen can neither read nor write, is married with a young child and lives on CHH. Her third son at seventeen has a criminal record. Her children, then, are hardly typical of others in the social milieu into which June married. Their adult lives are, in fact, taking on the pattern more associated with the social milieu of CHH.

4. SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS ON CHH

In this appendix I have attempted to describe in more detail some of the families and their individual members who I consider contribute heavily to the offender rate of CHH. I have tried to describe the ways of life that prompt the criminal solution to poverty, that encourage delinquency in children and that ensure the continuance of this deviant subculture in this little socio-spatial enclave over successive generations. At the same time, escape, while difficult is not impossible. I would not subscribe to the view that people are entirely prisoner of their socio-cultural heritage. Some who stay on south east CHH and continue to

commit offences actively choose to do so.

Mr. Adams, who has not featured in this account so far (not coming from a 'criminal' family), has the money to buy a house elsewhere. He has a small business that would enable him to live quite well without crime. He told me he liked where he lived - he had always lived there. His family and friends all lived nearby. He liked his neighbours. Moreover he liked his lifestyle. He didn't want a routinised life and have to conform to conventional living patterns. Above all he liked "the odd job" (crime), it was the spice of his life - it provided not only extra money but more importantly "a bit of excitement". Mr. Adams was a 'career deviant'.

Others with less definite views subscribe to the subcultural way of life because it is what they know and they are not unhappy continuing with it. One of the Shelley family, an 'opportunist deviant' called Keith, said to me :

"It's hard at times - you get nicked - you think 'I'll go straight after this'. You don't .... something else comes up, the chance of making a bit on the side. It's not a bad life - we make out."

Some like June Robins dislike the life and escape. (June is reluctant to discuss her family of origin.) Others like Jane Williams attempt an escape with no plan to guide them. Areas like south east CHH have their subcultural prisoners who are not aware of being locked in. The prognosis for the Rawlings' boys is poor but they do not even think in terms of alternatives. 'Opportunist deviants' now, they may well become 'career deviants' in their adult lives.

5. THE CONTRAST WITH CHL

On CHL, a low offender rate estate, there are obviously some people who commit crimes. I met some of these CHL offenders, particularly

through my work with 'Dial-a-Car'. The difference between these deviants and those on CHH is both numerical and qualitative.

Firstly, numerically, there seemed to me to be far fewer criminal deviants on CHL than on CHH. The official statistics show such a difference and this was my own experience. I met far fewer of these people on CHL, despite spending an equal amount of time on this estate as on CHH.

Secondly, those that I met on CHL did not have the criminal network surrounding them that I found usual on CHH. Not one of these CHL offenders came from a 'criminal family', comparable with the ones I have described as living on CHH. Nor did they have the criminal network of friends that was apparent among people on CHH. Again the individuals themselves did not have the consistently criminal involvement of the many offenders I met on CHH. Rather, those on CHL were of the 'opportunist deviant' type who were 'occasionally tempted'.

I have stated elsewhere in the thesis that the social class composition of both estates is comparable - residents being mainly of the lower socio-economic class. On CHH poverty was most apparent in the households of subcultural members whose lives were unroutinised and irregular by conventional standards. CHL also had its poor families, but where people live conventional lives poverty is less visually apparent. The criminal deviants I met on CHL did not come from the overtly deviant homes that were commonplace on CHH. Rather, the criminal deviants of CHL were deviants in terms of their own home background, as well as in terms of their violation of the law.

FOOTNOTES

1. All the names of people described in this appendix have been changed to protect their identity.

2. All street names have also been changed.

3. Mrs. Williams had previously been caught shoplifting in this store.

4. Mrs. Williams was a Walker before marriage. The Walkers, then, were Marie's grandparents. This family is discussed in a later section.

5. "Ringing" involves transferring the registration plates from a "write-off" to a stolen car of the same make and model. Once a "write-off" is procured a search starts for a suitable car to steal.

6. As I have already suggested (page 258), descriptions of the lifestyle of 'rough' or 'problem' families tend to read like catalogues of human chaos, disaster and misery. In fact, most of the people described in this appendix would not consider their lives chaotic, disastrous or miserable. In highlighting the deviancy of the lifestyle what is good tends to get overlooked. Financial and domestic problems may be frequent but there is much that is enviable in the easy-going attitude to life which is typical of such people. At Nick and Marie's, for example, the good humour, family loyalty and generosity of the Williams made the irregularity of the lifestyle, at first so apparent to the outsider, fade into insignificance on getting to know the family better.

PAGE

NUMBERING

AS ORIGINAL

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, N. (1923) The Hobo
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Armstrong, G. and Wilson, M. (1973) "City Politics and Deviancy Amplification" in I. Taylor and L. Taylor (eds) Politics and Deviance
Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Attenburrow, J.J., Murphy, A.R. and Simms, A.G. (1978) The problems of some large local authority estates - an exploratory study, Building Research Establishment, Watford: D.O.E.

Bagley, C. (1965) "Juvenile Delinquency in Exeter: an ecological and comparative study" Urban Studies 2 : 33-50.

Bagot, J.H. (1941) Juvenile Delinquency
London: Cape.

Baldock, P. (1971) Tenants' Voice
(unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Sheffield University).

Baldwin, J. (1972) Social Aspects of Crime in Sheffield
(unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Sheffield University).

Baldwin, J. (1974) "Problem Housing Estates - Perceptions of Tenants, City Officials and Criminologists" Social and Economic Administration 8 : 116-135.

Baldwin, J. and Bottoms, A.E. (1976) The Urban Criminal
London: Tavistock publications.

Banham, R. (1973) "The Parkhill Victory"
New Society 18 October : 154-156.

Becker, H.S. (1963) Outsiders : Studies in the Sociology of Deviance
New York: Free Press.

Blum, F.H. (1952) "Getting individuals to give information to the outsider" Journal of Social Issues 8(3) : 35-42.

Blumer, H. (1969) Symbolic Interactionism : Perspectives and Method
Englewood Cliffe, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Bottoms, A.E. (1976) "Crime in a City" New Society
8 April : 64-66.

Bottoms, A.E. (1974) Book review of "Defensible Space"
British Journal of Criminology 14 : 203-206.

Carson, W.G. and Wiles, P.C. (eds) (1976) Crime and Delinquency in Britain Vol.2.
London: Martin Robertson

Castells, M. (1966) in Pickvance, C.G. (ed) Urban Sociology
London: Methuen.

Central Housing Advisory Committee (1969) Cullingworth Report.
Council Housing Purposes, Procedures and Practices
Ministry of Housing and Local Government: H.M.S.O.

Central Housing Advisory Committee (1955) Unsatisfactory Tenants
6th Report of the Housing Management Sub-committee
Ministry of Housing and Local Government: H.M.S.O.

Cicourel, A.V. and Kitsuse, J. (1963)
The Educational Decision Makers
New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Clerk, J.P. and Wenninger, E.P. (1962) "Socio-economic class and area as correlates of illegal behaviour among juveniles"
American Sociological Review 27 : 826-834.

Cloward, R.A. and Ohlin, L.E. (1960) Delinquency and Opportunity
Chicago: Free Press.

Cohen, A.K. (1955) Delinquent Boys
Chicago: Free Press.

Collison, P. (1963) The Cutteslowe Walls
London: Faber and Faber.

Community Development Project (1974) Noble Street and Norwich Place
Newcastle: Berwell C.D.P.

Community Development Project (1975) Housing for the Poor? Housing in Southwark
London: Southwark C.D.P.

Community Development Project (1976) Whatever Happened to Council Housing?
London: C.D.P. Information and Intelligence Unit.

Community Development Project (1976) Profits against Houses
London: C.D.P. Information and Intelligence Unit.

Damer, S. (1974) "Wine Alley - the sociology of a dreadful enclosure" Sociological Review 22 : 221-248.

Damer, S. (1976) "A note on Housing Allocation" in Housing and Class in Britain : a second volume of papers presented at the Political Economy of Housing Workshop of the Conference of Socialist Economists in London.

Damer, S. and Madigan, R. (1974) "The Housing Investigator"
New Society vol.29 July No.616.

Davis, J.G. (1972) The Evangelistic Bureaucrat
London: Tavistock.

Demers, R. (1962) Park Hill Survey
(unpublished report for the City of Sheffield Housing Department).

Department of the Environment (1972) The estate outside the dwelling : reactions of residents to aspects of housing layout
London: D.O.E. Housing Development Directorate.

Department of the Environment (1975) Social effects of living off the ground. Occasional paper No.1.
London: D.O.E. Housing Development Directorate.

Department of the Environment (1977) Housing Management and Design (Lambeth Inner Area Study) 1AS/1A/18
London: D.O.E. Housing Development Directorate.

Douglas, J.D. (1972) Research on Deviance
New York: Random House.

Downes, D. (1966) The Delinquent Solution
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Durant, R. (1959) Watling : a survey of social life on a new housing estate
London: P.S. King.

Ferguson, T. (1952) The Young Delinquent in his Social Setting
Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foote Whyte, W. (1949) Street Corner Society
Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Frankenburg, R. (1966) Communities in Britain
Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Gath, D. (1973) "Child Guidance and Delinquency in a London Borough" Psychological Medicine vol.2 : 185-191.

Geer, B. (1964) "First Days in the Field" Phillip E. Hammond (ed) Sociologists at Work
New York: Basic Books.

Gill, O. (1974) "Housing Policy and Neighbourhood Decline" Social Work Today Vol.5 No.18.

Gill, O. (1977) Luke Street : housing policy, conflict and the creation of the delinquent area
London: Macmillan.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1968) The Discovery of Grounded Theory : Strategies for Qualitative Research
London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Glueck, S. and Glueck, E. (1959) Predicting Delinquency and Crime
Harvard: University Press.

Goffman, E. (1959) The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life
New York: Anchor Books.

Gold, R.L. (1958) "Roles in Sociological Field Observations"
Social Forces 36 : 217-223.

Gray, F. (1976) "The Management of Local Authority Housing" in
Housing and Class in Britain, a second volume of papers
presented at the Political Economy of Housing Workshop of
the Conference of Socialist Economists , London.

Haddon, R.F. (1970) "A Minority in a Welfare State Society :
Locations of West Indians in the London Housing Market"
The New Atlantis 1(2) : 80-133.

Hartley, L.P (1957) The Hireling
London: Hamish Hamilton.

Harvey, D. (1973) Social Justice and the City
London: Edward Arnold.

Hedges, A., Blaber, A. and Mostyn, B. (1980) Community Planning
Project. Cunningham Road Improvement Scheme. Final Report
London: Social and Community Planning Research.

Hoath, D. (1980) in McGurk, P., Bucknell, B. and Hoath, D.
Housing Act 1980
London: Brown, Knight and Truscott (Holdings) Ltd.

Hodges, M.W. and Smith, C.S. (1954) "The Sheffield Estate" in
G.D. Mitchell et al Neighbourhood and Community
Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Hole, V. (1959) "Social Effects of Planned Rehousing"
Town Planning Review 25 : 161-173.

Hunter, J. (1978) "Defensible Space in Practice"
The Architects Journal 11 October : 675-677.

Hughes, V. (1959) A History of the Growth and Location of the
Corporation Housing Schemes in Sheffield
Sheffield: Housing Department publication.

Irwin, J. (1972) "Participant Observation of Criminals" in
J.D. Douglas (ed) Research on Deviance
New York: Random House.

Jefferson, T. (ed) (1975) Working Papers in Cultural Studies
Birmingham: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies,
University of Birmingham.

Jennings, H. (1962) Societies in the Making
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Jephcott, P. (1971) Homes in High Flats
Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.

Jephcott, P. and Carter, M.P. (1954) The Social Background of Delinquency (University of Nottingham unpublished manuscript).

Jevons, R. and Madge, S. (1946) Housing Estates : A Study of Bristol Corporation Police and Practice between the Wars Bristol: Arrowsmith for the University of Bristol.

Jones, H. (1958) "Approaches to an Ecological Study" British Journal of Delinquency 8 : 277-293.

Kerr, M. (1958) The People of Ship Street London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kirkby, D.A. (1971) "The Inter-War Council Dwelling" Town Planning Review 42 : 250-268.

Kluckhohn, F. (1940) "The Participant Observer in Small Communities" American Journal of Sociology 46 : 331-343.

Kuper, L. (ed) (1953) Living in Towns London: Cresset Press.

Lambert, J. (1976) "Freedom and Local Authority Housing" Political Quarterly Vol.47 : 215-221.

Lambert, J., Paris, C. and Blackaby, B. (1978) Housing Policy and the State Allocation, Access and Control London: Macmillan.

Lassell, M. (1962) Wellington Road London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lemert, E.M. (1967) Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control Englewood Cliffe, N.J. : Prentice Hall.

Lewis, N. (1976) "Council housing allocation : problems of discretion and control" Public Administration Vol.54 : 147-160.

Lewis, O. (1969) The Culture of Poverty" in D.P. Moynihan (ed) On Understanding Poverty New York: Basic Books.

Le Play, F. (1879) La Méthode Sociale abrégé des ouvmers Européens Tours: A Mame et fils.

Lurie, A. (1967) Imaginary Friends Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

McCord, W. and McCord, J. (1959) Origins of Crime : a New Evaluation of the Cambridge-Somerville Study
Columbia: University Press.

Mannheim, H. (1948) Juvenile Delinquency in an English Middletown.

Matza, D. (1969) Becoming Deviant
Englewood Cliffe, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Maule, H.G. and Martin, F.M. (1956) "Social and Psychological Aspects of Rehousing" The Advancement of Science 12 : 443-453.

Mawby, R. (1977a) "Defensible Space : a Theoretical and Empirical Appraisal" Urban Studies 14 : 169-179.

Mawby, R. (1977b) "Kiosk Vandalism : a Sheffield Study"
British Journal of Criminology 17 : 30-46.

Mawby, R. (1978) "A Note on Domestic Disputes Reported to the Police"
The Howard Journal 17(3) : 160-168.

Mawby, R. (1979) "The Victimization of Juveniles"
Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 16 : 1.

Mawby, R. (1979) Policing the City
Farnborough: Saxon House.

Mayhew, P. (1979) "Defensible Space : the Current Status of a Crime Prevention Theory"
The Howard Journal Vol.18 : 150-159.

Mayhew, P., Clarke, R.V.G., Burrow, J.N., Haigh, V.M. and Winchester, S.W.C. (1979) "Crime in Public View" HORS No.49
London: H.M.S.O.

Mays, J.B. (1963) "Delinquency Areas : a Re-assessment"
British Journal of Criminology 3 : 216-230.

Mays, J.B. (1964) Growing up in the City
Liverpool: University Press.

Merrett, S. (1979) State Housing in Britain
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Merton, R.K. (1947) Selected Problems of Field Work in the Planned Community" American Sociological Review 12 : 304-312.

Miller, W.B. (1958) "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency"
Journal of Social Issues Vol.14 : 5-19.

Mills, C. Wright (1959) The Sociological Imagination
New York: Oxford University Press.

Mogey, J. (1956) Family and Neighbourhood : Two Studies in Oxford
London: Oxford University Press.

Morris, R.N. and Mogey, J. (1965) The Sociology of Housing : Studies at Berisfield
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Morris, T.P. (1957) The Criminal Area
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Morris, T.P. (1966) "Social Toleration of Crime" in H.J. Klare Changing Concepts of Crime and its Treatment
Oxford: Pergaman.

Myrdal, G. (1957) Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions
London: Methuen.

N.A.C.R.O. (1975) Housing Management and the Prevention of Crime
London: War on Want.

Newman, O. (1973) Defensible Space
London: Architectural Press.

Newman, O. (1975) "Community of Interest - Design for Community Control" in Architecture, Planning and Urban Crime (Report of N.A.C.R.O. Conference held on 6 December 1974).
London: War on Want.

Niner, P. (1975) Local Authority Housing Policy and Practice : A Case Study Approach
Birmingham: CURS Occasional Paper No.31.

Pahl, R.E. (1970) Patterns of Urban Life
London: Longman.

Pahl, R.E. (1975) Whose City?
London: Longman.

Parker, H. (1974) View from the Boys : a Sociology of Downtown Adolescents
Newton Abbot: David and Charles.

Patrick, J. (1973) A Glasgow Gang Observed
London: Methuen.

Pawley, M. (1973) The Private Future
London: Thames and Hudson.

Phillipson, C.M. (1971) "Juvenile Delinquency and the School" in V.G. Carson and P.C. Wiles (eds) Crime and Delinquency in Britain
London: Martin Robertson.

Pickvance, C.G. (1976) Urban Sociology
London: Methuen.

Pollard, S. and Holmes, C. (1976) Essays in the Economic and Social History of South Yorkshire
Sheffield: South Yorkshire County Council.

Polsky, N. (1967) Hustlers Beats and Others
Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Power, M.J. et al (1967) "Delinquent Schools?"
New Society 19 October.

Power, M.J. et al (1972) "Neighbourhood, School and Juveniles before the Courts"
British Journal of Criminology Vol.12 : 111-132.

Reiss, A.J. and Rhodes, A.L. (1961) "The Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in the Social Class Structure"
American Sociological Review 26 : 720-732.

Rex, J. and Moore, R. (1967) Race, Community and Conflict
Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations.

Rutter, M. (1973) "Why are London Children so Disturbed?"
Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine Vol.66 : 1221-1225.

Rutter, M. and Madge, N. (1976) Cycles of Disadvantage
London: Heinemann.

Schutz, A. (1944) "The Stranger : an Essay in Social Psychology"
American Journal of Sociology May : 499-507.

Schwartz, M.S. and Schwartz, C.G. (1955) "Problems in Participant Observation"
American Journal of Sociology 60 : 343-353.

Sharrow Community (J. Peaden ed.) (December 1972)
Views of Sharrow
Sheffield: Sharrow Action Group.

Sheffield City Council (1976) Report of Working Parties in High Density Developments (Sheffield: unpublished).

Shelter Report (1975) Griffith, P. : Homes Fit for Heroes
London: Shelter Publication.

Shelter Report (1974) Homeless Families in Sheffield
Sheffield: Shelter Publication.

Spencer, J. (1964) Stress and Release in an Urban Estate
London: Tavistock Publications.

Stevenson, A. et al (1968) High Living : a Study of Family Life in Flats
Melbourne: University Press.

Sturman, A. (1978) "Measuring Vandalism in a City Suburb" in R.V.G. Clarke (ed) Tackling Vandalism Home Office Research Study No.47 London: H.M.S.O.

Sutherland, E.H. and Cressey, D.R. (1970) Principles of Criminology (8th edition)
Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott

Taylor, I., Walton P. and Young, J. (1973) The New Criminology
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Taylor, I., Walton, P. and Young, J. (1975) Critical Criminology
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Trice, H.M. (1956) "Outsider's role in field study"
Sociology and Social Research 41 : 27-32.

Tucker, J. (1966) Honourable Estates
London: Gollancz.

Vidich, A.J. (1955) "Participant Observation and the Collection and Observation of Data"
American Journal of Sociology 60 : 354-360.

Ward, C. (1974) Tenants Take Over
London: Architectural Press Ltd.

West, D.J. and Farrington, D.P. (19753) Who Becomes Delinquent?
London: Heinemann.

Willis, P. (1978) Profane Culture
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wilmott, P. (1973) The Evolution of a Community
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wilson, R. (1963) Difficult Housing Estates
London: Tavistock Publications. Tavistock Pamphlet No.5.

Wilson, S. (1978) "Vandalism and Defensible Space on London Housing Estates" in R.V.G. Clarke (ed) Tackling Vandalism
Home Office Research Study No.47
London: H.M.S.O.

Wilson, S. and Burbidge, M. (1978) "An Investigation of Difficult-to-let Housing"
Housing Review July/August : 100+104.

Wright, C.H. and Lunn, J.E. (1971) "Sheffield Problem Families : a Follow-Up Study of their Sons and Daughters"
Community Medicine 126 : 301-307; 315-321.

Yablonsky, L. (1965) "Experiences with the Criminal Community" in A. Gouldner and S. Miller (eds) Applied Sociology
New York: The Free Press.