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Abstract

This thesis examines the relationship between place and identity; it is concerned with the process of attachment to place and how this process is linked to identity. The study is longitudinal in design and uses both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The context is provided by the enforced relocation of Arkwright Town, a one hundred year old North East Derbyshire mining village, to a near-by site; this research monitors the relocation process over a six year period.

This work is framed within the transactional paradigm which assumes that the process of change involves a dynamic confluence of spatial, cultural and temporal aspects and, furthermore, that individuals and groups influence and are influenced by their spatial environment in a way which cannot be described adequately in terms of a direction of causality. It adopts a social constructivist position which accepts that the participants’ ‘reality’ is shaped by the meanings they attribute to their socio-spatial environment; hence the focus of this work is on how participants to this study experienced the socio-psychological changes during and after the relocation.

The interview data were analysed using a combination of grounded theory and interpretative phenomenological analysis to identify the meanings which the relocation had for the participants; a range of theoretical concepts from both social and environmental psychology were then used to interpret participants’ experiences. The findings included participants’ accounts of the degree to which their previous behaviour patterns were disrupted and the meanings which those disruptions held for them. They pointed to interruptions of friendship patterns, to changes in previous privacy regulation mechanisms, and highlighted the degree to which participants’ previous socio-spatial schemata had become redundant after the relocation. It is suggested that the reduced visual access in New Arkwright not only diminished a sense of connectedness to others but also restricted an information flow which had been part of the functioning of the community.

Participants’ quotations were also used within the framework of Breakwell’s (1986) Identity Process Theory to investigate the degree to which the participants’ identity processes were affected by the changes in the spatial environment, and especially whether the spatial change threatened or enhanced the four principles of identity described in Breakwell’s theory: self esteem, distinctiveness of the self, self efficacy and continuity of the self. Evidence was found for the important role place has in maintaining and enhancing the four principles of identity and that place is, therefore, an important link to identity. The data show that the relative salience of each identity principle can change over time during a
situation of major change and in addition, a marked change from collective to individual functioning was identified.

Moreover, participants’ accounts suggested that there are five important factors which, when present, facilitate the development of an emotional bond with place. These are here termed aspects of place attachment; they emerged during the pre-relocation interviews and provide a useful extension of Fuhrer & Kaiser’s (1992) work on attachment to home. Further support for these aspects was found during the post-relocation period both in the qualitative and quantitative data. They comprise a sense of security; a sense of autonomy; the desire and ability to engage in appropriation; an optimal level of internal and external stimulation; and place congruence.

Thus this thesis uses existing theory to understand better the effect of the relocation on the villagers; it helps develop the link between environmental and social psychological theory through its investigation of how place can be an integral part of identity, and it extends current theory on place attachment through the concept of the five aspects of attachment to place.
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Chapter One

An Introduction

1.1 The focus of the study

Issues of place attachment, identity, personal control over changes to life space, disacquisition of possessions and changes to perceptions of the future have a significant bearing on a person’s response to a changed environment, even when a move has all the outward signs of economic improvement. To date, however, our understanding of how these factors relate to each other and to place attachment is rather limited. This thesis is a longitudinal study, conducted over a six year period, of the enforced relocation of the residents of a traditional Derbyshire coal mining village to a modern village built specifically for the community.

The first aim of this study is to describe the socio-psychological and behavioural effects of a changed spatial environment on an existing community. This includes an examination of any changed socio-spatial patterns, including consideration of any additional influences and restrictions on these patterns experienced by the participants to this study. The lack of reference, in social psychology, to the physical place in which groups exist suggests that cultural norms should be relatively independent of the physical environment or, at least, dependent only on people’s construals of that physical environment. This study is an opportunity to examine whether this relative neglect of the physical environment within social psychological theory is justified. Festinger, et al.’s (1950) work is an exception in that it indicates that spatial arrangements are important as new communities are forming. There is, however, rarely an opportunity to study the socio-psychological impacts of the relocation of a community with well established friendship patterns into a spatially different environment. This thesis describes such a study.

Twigger-Ross & Uzzell (1996) argue that places are important sources of identity elements since places embody social symbols and are invested with social meanings and importance. Breakwell (1996) states that places “become elements of identity, subject to the pressure to maintain self esteem, self efficacy, continuity and distinctiveness” (p. 9). The second aim of this work is, therefore, to explore the meaning over time which the adjustments to their new environment held for the participants and to discover how these meanings influence identity, to establish empirically whether the principles of identity become differentially salient over time and whether the relocation involved any changes to identity content and/or evaluations.
The third aim of this research is to examine participants’ place attachment in old and New Arkwright and to focus on those aspects of their transactions with their home environment which relate to the processes of detaching from the old environment and developing an attachment to the new. The Arkwright relocation provides the opportunity for a field experiment in which facilitators and inhibitors to the formation of place attachment can be identified. Underlying the research work on place attachment is the belief that place attachment, as defined in Chapter 2, is a positive experience, encouraging both stability and growth at an individual and/or community level, providing a person-environment relationship which is conducive to physical and psychological well-being.

1.2 The transactional paradigm within Environmental Psychology

The possible relationship between the physical environment and the social and psychological realm can be characterized in three ways. The first, known as ‘environmental determinism’, is that the physical environment causes changes to individuals and communities at the social and psychological level. The converse of this view is that the physical environment has no effect on people at either the individual or collective level, but rather that any behavioural change which occurs in a particular environment is solely due to psychological and social processes that are independent of that environment, and that these themselves bring about changes to the physical environment. The third view, taken here, is the transactional paradigm which argues that the process of change involves a dynamic confluence of spatial, cultural and temporal aspects (Altman & Rogoff, 1987).

William James recognized in 1890 that “Mental facts cannot be properly studied apart from the physical environment of which they take cognizance.” (James, 1890, quoted by M. Knight, 1950, p. 65), yet Barker’s work in the 1960s was criticized for doing so. Transactionalism has taken James’ dictum a step further.

The transactional paradigm (also termed ‘holistic’ (Craik, 1973) or ‘contextual’ (Stokols, 1987)) was considered appropriate for this work since it locates the psychological and social levels of analysis within the entire context of space, culture and time. Proshansky states “there is no physical setting that is not also a social and cultural setting” (1976, p. 308) and Saegert & Winkel (1990) suggest that research needs to be contextualised if any progress is to be made in unravelling the complexities of human behaviour. This is a fundamental departure from traditional paradigms in psychology which view these complexities as problematic. Transactionalists, however, “embrace these limits as an accurate reflection of the complexity of human behaviour” (Altman & Rogoff, 1987, p. 513). Individual and collective relationships are not only treated as isolated units but gain their identity through and are defined by their dynamic relations to spatial, cultural, and temporal aspects. In this study, the focus is on the relationship between aspects, i.e. between emotional attachment to place and identity within a temporal framework in order to define the process of change.
The Arkwright study specifically illustrates the importance of including the physical context in any complete analysis of psychological and social processes. Thus, the study examines the social and psychological changes which accompany, are influenced by and themselves influence the changes in the villagers’ physical environment.

1.3 The structure of the thesis

Chapter 2 reviews the research literature which addresses the relationship between person and place and place identity. In particular, it focuses on research which recognizes this as a dynamic relationship. It highlights the inconsistent use of current terminology, i.e. place identity, place attachment, and place identification and points to the lack of work on the process of attachment. This chapter attempts to bring some order to a complicated and sometimes contradictory and multidisciplinary discourse on ‘place’ and to the diversity of both qualitative and quantitative research methods adopted. Chapter 2 concludes with the definitions of ‘place’ and ‘place attachment’ which are used in this thesis.

It was decided that the best integrative model of the individual as a psychological being to guide this research is Breakwell’s (1986; 1992) Identity Process Theory (IPT) as it allows for the incorporation of place into identity. Chapter 3 briefly outlines IPT and reviews some of the literature based on IPT to examine how ‘place’ has been treated heretofore within IPT theory and research. Thus Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 provide the theoretical framework which underpins this research. Chapter 3 concludes with an outline of the main research aims and research questions.

Chapter 4 relates some aspects of Arkwright’s history, from its foundation in 1897 until its demolition in November 1996, which may have had a bearing on participants’ reactions to the relocation, thereby contextualising the findings reported in this work. This chapter then describes the physical characteristics of the new village to facilitate an understanding of the ways in which it differs from old Arkwright. The socio-spatial background presented in this chapter must be taken into account if a deeper understanding of the experience of the participants is to be achieved.

Chapter 5 suggests that the epistemological position of the researcher is central to the framework within which this study is undertaken and explains why a ‘weak’ social constructivist position has been adopted for this work. This approach accepts that the ‘reality’ experienced by the participants is being shaped by the meanings participants attribute to their socio-cultural and physical environment but it claims that this does not prevent the achievement of an agreed-upon description of their reality - that is, that truth is not wholly relativist. This chapter also describes the researcher’s ideology, in the belief that this should be explicit in any account of social science research; and it then discusses the main methodologies used for this work.
The epistemology discussed in Chapter 5 determined the basic design of the study: a longitudinal approach involving in-depth interviews as well as survey questionnaires. The details of these methods are presented in Chapter 6. The longitudinal design adopted monitored the process of place attachment (and detachment) from three years before the relocation to two years post relocation. Demographic details, interview time tables and details of interview schedules and questionnaires are presented and the analytical procedure is described. Additional issues which affected the data collection and analysis are discussed.

The following four chapters present the empirical findings; Chapters 7, 8 and 9 report and discuss the findings from the interviews and Chapter 10 presents the quantitative results. Overall, Chapter 7 is concerned with the disruption to participants’ behaviour in and understanding of their environment, including the disruption of familiar routines and patterns of behaviour, of familiar surroundings, and of familiar expectations about other people’s behaviour. It describes how the community spirit had begun to decline after the sale of the old Arkwright houses to tenants in the 1970s and how with the demolition of old Arkwright the community lost the place-related mnemonics (Milligan, 1998) of their “shared history of living and working in one place over a long period of time” (Bulmer, 1975, pp. 88-89). Thus this study includes accounts of the degree to which participants’ previous behaviour patterns were disrupted and the meanings which those disruptions held for them. It is suggested that the reduced visual access in the new village not only diminished a sense of connectedness to others but also restricted an information flow which had been part of the functioning of the community. This change highlights the crucial importance of the physical environment in understanding cultural/behavioural change and the dynamic relationship between person, group and place.

The main issue addressed in Chapter 8 is the degree to which the participants’ identity processes were affected by changes in the spatial environment. More specifically, it questions whether the spatial change involved in the relocation threatened or enhanced the four principles of identity and whether it made these principles differentially salient over time. The evidence presented in this chapter suggests that place is an integral part of identity and plays an important role in maintaining and/or enhancing the four principles of identity.

Chapter 9 proposes that there are five ‘aspects’ of place attachment which appear to play an important role in creating and maintaining attachment to place. These aspects emerged as important during the in-depth interviews at T2 and T3 and further support for them was found at T4 and T5. They are: a sense of security; a sense of autonomy; the desire and ability to engage in appropriation; an optimal level of internal and external stimulation; and perceived congruence with place. A link with the Identity Process Theory was made in that these aspects also guide and motivate behaviour, cognitions and evaluations in order to achieve a positive identity.
Although the emphasis of this study has been on the phenomenological aspects of participants’ perception of the relocation, Chapter 10 examines the quantitative data which was included to obtain numerical support from the wider sample. This provided good support for the findings from the interview data on a number of issues; for example, the psychological sense of community clearly declined over time; it was found that place contributes to self evaluation in ways which correspond to the four principles of identity; and there was good support for the five aspects of place attachment. The survey data did not, however, indicate a change over time in attachment to place and the possible reasons for this are discussed.

Chapter 11 summarizes the empirical findings and discusses some methodological limitations of this work. It also offers suggestions for policy implications and for further work, both in further analyses of the data and for future empirical work arising from the theoretical advances made in this thesis.

The relocation of Arkwright has provided a rare and exciting opportunity for a social scientist to study a community undergoing a major change in its environment. It is hoped that the work described here may be of use in any future projects involving the enforced relocation of a community, to help ensure that the experience is a constructive and positive one for the residents involved. It is also hoped that the theoretical developments of this work will have a wider application in the future study of place and identity.

Chapter Two

Place Attachment and Place Identity Literature

2.1 Introduction

This research focuses on the ways in which a new place becomes a meaningful part of people’s lives. It is concerned with the cognitive, affective and behavioural processes which contribute to a person’s attachment with a place. There has been much research attempting to understand the relationship between person and place. The most relevant parts of this work are reviewed in this chapter. It will be shown that:

1. The relationship between place and person has now been recognized as a dynamic relationship, whereas earlier work conceptualized the relationship as deterministic.

2. Researchers have tried to capture this relationship by using concepts such as place identity, place identification and place attachment. As will be seen, however, definitions of these concepts are
inconsistent, the three concepts are often used interchangeably or there is a failure to distinguish between different aspects of the person-place relationship.

3. The majority of these studies examine the outcome rather than the process.

This body of research is characterized by its multi-disciplinary nature and multi-methodological approach which results in richness but, at the same time, presents difficulties in integrating the findings. This chapter attempts to bring some order to a complicated and sometimes contradictory, conceptual and multidisciplinary discourse on ‘place’ and to the diversity of both qualitative and quantitative research methods adopted. The sequence of the following sections on place, place identity, place attachment, time and place, nested place attachment and place identity, place transitions and transformations is equivalent to an approximate order of concern evident in a chronology of place discourse in the academic literature on the subject.

2.2 The concept of place

The concept ‘place’ is not new. ‘Place’ or ‘topos’, according to Aristotle, is the dimension in people’s relationship with the physical environment, conjuring up a feeling of belonging (van der Ven, 1978; Sime, 1986). This concept has received increasing attention in the last few decades, in keeping with its temporal connotations as a link between an individual and collective past, present and future. The first sections of this review consider the nature of place in a psychologically relevant multidisciplinary context. It is worth noting that the widespread interest in the subject carries with it the advantages and disadvantages of any concept which crosses disciplinary lines. What the concept of place gains in breadth by such multidisciplinary interest, it risks losing in depth. If it holds a different meaning to different disciplines and sub-disciplines then it is weakened as something which can be operationally defined or articulated in a consistent way in research terms, or serve as a reliable arbiter and frame of reference in design and planning disputes and decisions. Place is indeed an important but often an elusive concept.

Rapoport has been arguing increasingly, since at least 1985, that the concept of ‘place’ itself is ‘inherently vague’ (e.g. Rapoport, 1997) and has questioned why researchers do not use more precise words such as space, setting, milieu, street, plaza, dwelling, landscape, neighbourhood, city, or country. He argues that because of its growing popularity ‘place’ has been used indiscriminately and is either left undefined or defined illogically. He points out, however, that the widespread interest in ‘place’ and the continued use of the term, despite these obvious flaws, suggests that the concept must be important. Rapoport (1997) explains that the term was introduced because theorists wanted to express an additional component, namely “people’s affective, psychological, social, cultural, behavioural or meaning relationships with these environments” (p. 14). Rapoport states that this in itself causes confusion and is
of no benefit to environment-behaviour-studies. Agnew (1989), however, argues that the concept of place has been devalued, especially in sociology, often being confused with the term ‘community’ and, unlike Rapoport, calls for the ‘rehabilitation’ of ‘place’ in social science. This author supports Agnew’s view and considers ‘place’ to be a useful term, provided that it is clearly defined and then used consistently within that definition. Henceforth in this thesis, ‘place’ is defined as a geographical space which has acquired meaning through a person’s interaction with the space.

Historically, only in the latter part of the 20th century did place begin to capture the imagination of more than a few psychologists. Heidegger (1946) and Tuan (1977), for example, would argue that place is an expression of the most profound psychological condition, each person’s existence at a particular point in time and space yet, to date, much of the psychology of place has not been expressed through design, writing or research by psychologists. In addition to Environmental Psychology, sub-disciplines such as Social Psychology and Developmental Psychology are potentially important to a consideration of place. These sub-disciplines infuse the word with their own frames of reference. Depending on the discipline or sub-discipline, a place is deemed to be essentially physical, social, cognitive, behavioural, cultural, temporal and/or spiritual. For further recent discussion of the interdisciplinary and sub-disciplinary context of Environmental Psychology, relevant to considerations of place, see Sime (1999a) and Sommer (2000).

The attention directed to place has in general preceded and partially overlapped with subsequent attention to place identity and place attachment in more recent research. Research to date has largely addressed place attachment and identity as static conditions. This thesis is concerned with place attachment and identity as relatively enduring people-environment conditions, transitions and processes, although importantly these are seen as dynamic and therefore always in flux. It is now appropriate to consider the distinction between the terms place and space.

### 2.3 Place versus Space

The concept of place is described in the research literature as encapsulating ‘something’ which defines people’s existence, what it is to be ‘somewhere’ in time and space and the nature of what that somewhere is. Place is described as more than a set of geographic co-ordinates representing a person’s position in time and space. Thus the importance of place lies in the domain of feelings about the environment and its meaning.

In the first instance ‘place’ is a word, idea or frame of reference, which began its recent life in the realm of architectural design and planning discourse. Hence the adoption of expressions such as the ‘sense’ or ‘spirit’ of particular physical settings and contemporary concern that places are being lost. The term place has been used, implicitly if not explicitly, in the 1960s-1970s in critiques of the architecture of
large-scale urban mass housing and rehousing schemes (e.g. high-rise blocks). Consistent with the Modern Movement, geometric blocks began to replace rows of low-rise houses after the Second World War. This was an international phenomenon and was facilitated by a combination of political and economic needs, technological advances (e.g. high rise lifts (Hall, 1982a)) and new architectural styles created by the architectural and planning professions to meet the perceived needs. Criticisms of this style of building have concentrated on the assumed failure of certain designs to function psychologically and socially as ‘places’ whilst paying little attention to the processes employed in rehousing the residents. Rehousing large numbers of people inevitably involves the potential break up of communities and social networks. Some might consider this to be the primary characteristic of a loss of place (e.g. Fried, 1963). Others consider the essence of a place and its preservation to lie in the features of a design and their historic connotations as links to the past (Alexander, et al., 1977; Norberg-Schulz, 1980).

Sime (1986) reviewed the very different ways in which the word ‘place’ was used in architectural theorizing (e.g. Norberg-Schulz, 1980; Alexander et al., 1977; Alexander, 1979) humanistic geography (e.g. Relph, 1976) and psychology (e.g. Canter, 1977) up to the mid 1980s. His paper referred to the growing interdisciplinary debate in the 1970s and 1980s concerning the apparent loss of an abiding sense of place in urban architecture, a general unease about technological innovations in design and the destruction of existing landscapes and historic places. One characteristic of the discourse has been the primary emphasis by architectural ‘theorists’ on the physical features (e.g. place patterns in Alexander et al., 1977) which constitute a place, or engender feelings of place, the ‘spirit’ or ‘sense’ of place or the ‘quality without a name’ (Alexander, 1979). In view of the almost complete lack of reference to specific features of physical environments by psychologists discussing place (including environmental psychologists), it is important to point out that it is the physical referents of place and place patterns which are of most concern to the design, planning and architectural professions. Sime (1986) makes an important distinction between ‘a space’ and ‘a place’ and asks to what degree ‘a place’ can be created in design independently of the users; does a space only become a place by virtue of it also being used, appropriated and/or experienced individually or collectively, in some manner?

Whilst Sime (1986) argues that any design or research of place needs to include attention to the physical environment, he also argues that an important aspect of somewhere becoming or being a place for its inhabitants is their potential involvement in the process of design and appropriation of spaces. It should also be noted that the phenomenological literature uses terms such as ‘dwelling’ as a state of being and ‘being-in-the-world’, but does not necessarily limit the word place to a fixed personal centre or home from which people regularly journey and return. The ‘journeying’ is an important feature of a phenomenology of place (e.g. Eliade, 1959; Seamon, 1979; Dovey, 1985). A place might also be what Tuan (1977) calls ‘a pause in time’, a feeling one might have briefly in one’s own garden as much as on a mountain top, a place travelled to and from, perhaps in the sense of nearby or distant nature and the
restorative’ nature of certain environments and settings (Hartig & Evans, 1993; Kaplan, 1995; Korpela & Hartig, 1996).

It is worth comparing the definitions of place used by Relph (1976) and Canter (1977). Relph (1976, p. 61): “The identity of a place is comprised of three interrelated components, each irreducible to the other - physical features or appearance, observable activities and functions and meanings or symbols”. In a later definition Relph (1985) directs attention to the intrinsic physical and social features of a locale and the sensitivities of building users, which were not made clear in his 1976 definition: “A place is a whole phenomenon, consisting of the three intertwined elements of a specific landscape with both built and natural elements, a pattern of social activities that should be adapted to the advantages or virtues of a particular location and a set of personal and shared meanings”.

Canter (1977) also talks about three components, which are, however, qualitatively quite different: “It follows that we have not fully identified the place until we know (a) what the behaviour is associated with, or it is anticipated will be housed in, a given locus (b) what the physical parameters of that setting are, and (c) the descriptions, or conception which people hold of that behaviour in that physical environment” (p. 158-159).

Relph (1978), reviewing Canter’s book, is particularly critical of the idea that by measuring behaviour, the physical environment and conceptions of a locale, one necessarily establishes what a place is (the nexus of Canter’s 3 sets of measurements). Relph, in an essentially phenomenological review of ‘placelessness’, whilst full of insights, does not present research findings as such. Canter concentrates primarily on conceptions (e.g. rating scale measures of environmental cognitions), with very limited reference to patterns of action and the physical environment. Most clearly missing from Canter’s model of place is any reference to meaning developed through engaging with space or any reference to autobiographic and collective historic bonds which, for many writers, encapsulate the essence of ‘place’.

The phenomenological approach which has preceded much of the current research of place by psychologists would consider it anathema to ‘measure’ place, rather than to adopt a qualitative approach to its study and understanding (e.g. Seamon & Mugerauer, 1985). There are many authors who view place as a phenomenon more akin to the realms of poetry and philosophy (e.g. Bachelard, 1969) than numeric measurements (i.e. place identity and attachment rating scales). Hence, it has been difficult to reconcile phenomenological and positivistic perspectives. The first has been criticised for not addressing the question of place empirically (e.g. Relph, 1976; 1985) and the second has been criticised for relying on measurements which make a place indistinguishable from a space (e.g. Canter, 1977). It is, however, important to remember that both perspectives are of value since, by addressing different research questions, they will widen the field of enquiry. In addition theoretical propositions which
emerge from qualitative data can be tested on a larger sample so that both perspectives bring useful insights to the debate.

Prior to the mid-1980s, the academic literature on place was concerned primarily with neighbourhood transformations taking place in cities, the replacement of one set of residential buildings by another, with limited community participation in the design and planning decisions. This is evident in conference themes of the Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA), International Association for People-Environment Studies (IAPS) and People and Physical Environment Research (PAPER) associations at the time (e.g. ‘Environmental Change/Social Change’, EDRA 16, New York, 1985, (Franck, 1985); ‘Place and Placemaking’, PAPER 85, Melbourne, 1985, (Dovey, et al., 1985); ‘Environments in Transition’, IAPS 9, Haifa, 1986, (Sime, 1986)).

Despite the emphasis on the architecture, planning and politics of environmental transformations at that time, there were few research studies by social scientists on the subject of place. This split between design and social science imperatives in relation to the subject of place has, if anything, widened further since that time. This thesis is addressing that gap rather than attempting to prescribe how New Arkwright as a place should have been developed. Instead, this thesis explores what happens when a space, which a community had transformed into a place, undergoes radical change and ceases to exist.

The concept of place identity provides the links between architectural space and the topics of social science and so it is to the place-related aspects of identity that this review now turns.

2.4 Place Identity
This section is primarily concerned with a somewhat different, although related, strand of theorizing relating to ‘place identity’ which has contributed to, and coincided with, the emergence of the concept of place identity in environmental psychology and, at least implicitly, in related areas of urban sociology. Three papers by Proshansky and colleagues merit particular consideration: Proshansky (1978); Proshansky, Fabian & Kaminoff (1983); and Proshansky & Fabian (1987).

These three papers touch upon aspects of place which have received increasing attention in the psychological, sociological and anthropological literature on place. However, although their work introduces place identity as a physical environment referent for the more well-known and widely used term self identity, they actually make little reference to the physical environment. In this sense their approach to place identity provides more emphasis on identity than on ‘place’.

In the first paper Proshansky (1978) considers the nature of self identity in the city (urban identity). The city is considered to be a differentiated but unified structure. The paper draws in part on an area of
research in the early 1970s which was beginning to imply that the stresses, strains, overstimulation or imputed cognitive ‘overload’ of city life (e.g. Milgram, 1970) contribute to a decrease in social responsibility towards others (e.g. helping behaviour on the street). By inference it might be assumed that the apparent anonymity of city life is synonymous with loss of individual identity and community. Proshansky was more concerned with understanding urban identity than starting with the preconception that cities are inherently good or bad.

Proshansky (1978) defines place identity as “those dimensions of self that define the individual’s personal identity in relation to the physical environment by means of a complex pattern of conscious and unconscious ideas, beliefs, preferences, feelings, values, goals, and behavioral tendencies and skills relevant to this environment” (p. 155). He goes on to state, “If, as already suggested, both physical settings and people change, then it is clear that the place identity of the individual is a changing as well as enduring structure, which is also true of course of the person’s self-identity” (p. 159). This suggests a developmental model of self-identity and place identity as a cognitive substructure of self-identity. This is even more explicitly addressed in Proshansky, et al. (1983).

The 1983 paper is generally regarded as an important marker in the development of a psychologically oriented place identity literature. Proshansky, et al. (1983) express the need to view person-place relationships as a dynamic process in a changing social and physical environment. They define place-identity as: “To begin with, it is a substructure of the self-identity of a person consisting of, broadly conceived, cognitions about the physical world in which the individual lives. These cognitions represent memories, ideas, feelings, attitudes, values, preferences, meanings, and conceptions of behavior and experience which relate to the variety and complexity of physical settings that define the day-to-day existence of every human being. At the core of such physical environment-related cognitions is the environmental past of the person; a past consisting of places, spaces, and their properties which have served instrumentally in the satisfaction of the person’s biological, psychological, social and cultural needs” (p. 59).

In a further paper in 1987, Proshansky and Fabian recommend that psychology should consider the role of social and physical settings in child development processes: “place identity is conceived of as a substructure of the person’s self-identity” (p. 22). Proshansky and Fabian ask “in what ways does the child derive meaning, purpose, form and structure from the kinds of physical settings that he or she grows up in?” (p. 21). They consider the development of place identity broadly in terms of three settings: the home, neighbourhood and school, thereby hinting at places which developmentally contribute to a child’s evolving place related self-and social definition.
Proshansky and Fabian acknowledge that “relationships between the child and other people and objects indirectly serve to define who the child is” (p. 22). Interestingly, whilst including a section towards the end of the paper called ‘Place identity and place belongingness’, they consider their concept of place identity to be “broader than place belongingness and similar emotional attachment theories” (p. 36). Affective responses to a place and a related sense of belongingness are deemed to be sub-components of the evolving cognitions which constitute place identity. The home setting is considered to be important to the development of the child’s self-identity, but “it does not constitute the only significant physical-world experience” (p. 37).

Proshansky & Fabian (1987) state at the outset that their purpose “is to understand the relationship between the child’s increasing knowledge and mastery of its physical environment and the emergence of its place identity” (p. 26). Later they state that “self-identity ... depends on a growing separation from the places and people upon whom one first relied” (p. 38). This suggests not so much that self- and place identity are formed through an essential, initial emotional bond (place attachment) to the home or even the neighbourhood and school, but that there is a world of places beyond which will contribute to each person’s evolving place identity. The terms places, spaces and settings are used interchangeably without clear definition and differentiation in all three papers.

The 1987 paper seems to suggest that a child’s place identity develops in a formative fashion through various, unspecified experiences of home, neighbourhood and school. There is, however, no indication of which ‘qualities’, or specific features of settings and/or corresponding cognitive processes, might contribute to somewhere becoming or being a ‘place’ for someone. Specific features of the physical environment are not articulated. The physical environment referred to is apparently synonymous with the generic category labels, home, school, neighbourhood. Whilst emphasizing development, the process by which people form a place identity, why and under what circumstances, is not clear. The paper ends with the rhetorical question ‘how to describe urban identity’ and the recommendation that this merits further research. Together with the Proshansky (1978) paper this suggests that place identity is not restricted to the home, neighbourhood and school, but evolves with experience of other identity domains.

Proshansky, et al. (1983) do not provide any empirical data to verify their place-identity theory and, to date, it has proved difficult to turn their arguments into a clear research agenda (e.g. operational measures of place). Whilst the paper points to different scales or types of place, their relative contribution and relationships in terms of a core or diffused place identity remains unclear and is only just beginning to be researched. In acknowledging their contribution, Krupat (1983) suggests that the Proshansky, et al. (1983) paper asks “far more questions than it has answered” (p. 344). It is
nevertheless generally acknowledged that this series of theoretical papers by Proshansky and colleagues has advanced thinking on the generic and specific contexts in which identity is formed.

Another expression used in the later research literature on place identity is place identification. This seems to suggest a process of forming an ‘identity’ by identifying with a setting. The expressions place identity and place identification are often used interchangeably without the meaning of or the distinction between the two expressions being defined or articulated (e.g. Cuba, et al., 1993). These terms need to be carefully defined and distinguished from each other to be of use when trying to understand their relationship with place.

Graumann (1983) addresses this need by describing three processes or modes of identification which lead to the person’s identity: ‘identifying the environment’; ‘being identified’; and ‘identifying with one’s environment’. It is the latter which is of interest here. For Graumann ‘identifying with’ means modelling oneself on someone else. He states that this model does not need to be real but that it symbolizes what the person is trying to achieve. It is this symbolic function which is important because it also allows places and ‘things’ to become objects of identification. Graumann explains how even minor everyday objects (including shabby toys or threadbare sweaters) may symbolize persons and that it is through this symbolic function that we identify with these objects. This identification with the object results in the objects being cared for and guarded against damage or loss. Graumann (1983, p. 314) concludes that “ultimately, there is no social identity which is not also place-related (Proshansky, 1978) and thing-related (Graumann, 1974)”.

Turning to the concept of identity, Graumann (1983) proposes that identification with others (or place or objects) “is usually an antecedent to one’s self-conception, which is the ongoing construction of one’s self-identity ... “(p. 315). He explains that as persons are both subjects and objects of identification processes, they are multiple beings. He warns that the ascriptions defining a person may not be fully compatible and this will lead to persons feeling insecure and awkward about their identity. “The unity of a person is not a natural given, but has to be attained psychologically (by identification) and maintained (as identity) in a continuous and often conflictive process of socialization” (p. 315). This indicates that ‘identification’ refers primarily to acquisition (“the process is one of concept and object appropriation” (Graumann, 1983, p. 314), whereas the term ‘identity’ (as in ‘urban identity’ or ‘urban related identity’) characterizes a condition (Lalli, 1992), or rather its maintenance. It must be understood that identity in this view is not seen as static but is seen as a product, an end state rather than a process.

Initially, Graumann’s differentiation between the two terms appears helpful but it also raises the question of whether identification is always a process or whether it could also be conceptualized as an end state. Graumann also states that identification with an object involves affect, i.e. “we cherish them,
keep account of them, defend them against loss and decay” (1983, p. 314). If one accepts this, is it then possible to differentiate between identification and attachment? Since identification is also often confused with the term place attachment, this question will be further explored in Section 2.5 under the heading ‘place attachment’.

Since 1989 researchers have attempted to integrate the concept of place into an identity model (e.g. Korpela, 1989; 1992; Giuliani, 1991; Twigger, 1992; 1994; Twigger & Breakwell, 1994; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Skantze, 1997; and Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997. One of the important features of the work of these authors lies in their recognition that place is more than context, i.e. place is an integral part of the identity process. A more detailed look at the following two studies will illustrate this point. Skantze’s (1997) and Twigger’s (1994) work explain by example the change in emphasis from static to dynamic processes. Both studies acknowledge the transactional nature of person-place relationships and move the debate forward by including developmental and identity models.

The first study to be discussed here is that of Skantze (1997) who explored how the ordinary user of a built environment experiences and constructs meaning from that environment. Skantze concludes that experiences and representations of the environment are integrated in an inner dialogue and that this dialogue is composed of reflections on perceptions and experiences of the environment, which are, in turn, related to one’s own self-perception, world view and aims and intentions in life. She argues that the environment is not a “neutral or functional frame or something the inhabitants adapt to” (p. 5), instead the person’s perception and experiences of that environment give meaning to the self and shape the identity of the person. She concludes that the achieved balance results in a sense of belonging, whereas imbalance results in estrangement.

Skantze compared four age groups of residents of a purpose built suburb of Stockholm (children aged 10-12; adolescents aged 17-19; parents of infants; and pensioners). She used individual in-depth interviews, focus groups, essays written by the children and went on walking tours with residents around the ten-year old suburb. She found that the “individuals’ conception of self and their needs and wishes are integrated and developed by putting questions to the environment and interpreting answers. The reflections are instruments of the relationship between self and environment, self and world. Thus, the environment constitutes ways and possibilities for human development” (p. 5). The suburb had been built with public participation. She comments that when residents participate in the planning of new housing, communications between them and the architects and planners concern mostly practical and functional problems and that more complex and deeply felt experiences are left outside the dialogue (Colven, Skantze & Wadeskog, 1993). Speller (1988) found that at least part of this failure to communicate deeper feelings stems from participants not being aware of the more complex and deeper
issues affecting them, which only appear to become salient when the objects or places, the subject of these feelings, are no longer available.

Twigger (1994) began her study by looking at the place attachment of Docklands residents to their area. Twigger developed an attachment model providing a structure of the various attachment dimensions, which led her to search for the intrinsic meanings of attachment to place. She proposes that the important issue is one of place identification (e.g. as in Londoner, in the sense of a social category such as nationality or race, a place subsumed into social identity). Twigger concludes that for people who were attached to their local area, attachment was used in order to develop and maintain the identity principles, i.e. self esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy. She reserves the term place identity for the idea of a re-evaluated construct of identity and prefers to consider that all aspects of identity have place related implications (to a greater or lesser extent). For further discussion of the relationship between self-, social- and place identity conditions and processes, see Twigger-Ross, Bonaiuto & Breakwell (in preparation) and Chapter 3 of this thesis.

The work of both Skantze and Twigger is encouraging in the sense that they have gathered empirical data to explore the dynamics of the actual process of place attachment by asking ‘why’ and ‘how’ rather than simply measuring the outcome as many other researchers have done. Interestingly both authors, although they began by exploring place attachment, found themselves focusing on identity as the core issue.

This section has recounted how the concept of place identity developed and has explored some of the research literature investigating the dynamic relationship between identity and place. It has also drawn attention to the sometimes confused use of the terms identity and identification and the difficulty of unravelling this complex tangle of ideas and definitions.

Section 2.5 will focus on place attachment. Whilst Proshansky, Fabian & Kaminoff (1983) put the primary emphasis on place identity, others have put greater emphasis on an evolving emotional attachment which people might feel with a place or which defines for them what place is. A primary focus of this section will be on place attachment definitions in order to bring some clarity to the confusion surrounding the terminology. It will further be suggested that place attachment is dynamic and represents both a process and a product. Finally, the definition of place attachment used for this study will be presented.

### 2.5 Place attachment

Although Proshansky, et al. (1983) focus on place identity they also include affect in their definition of place identity but do not theorize on the emotional bond with place. Some authors (e.g. Giuliani, 1991;
Twigger, 1994) explore on both place identity and place attachment, to understand the link between them. These authors suggest that place identity has an emotional core, a bond to the place, such as a home and objects in the home. Just as people may form an emotional attachment to another person, it can be assumed that an attachment which people feel to their home, or set of places in the past, present or future, is an essential feature of their identity. Another question raised by the research literature is about the direction of causality. Is an emotional bond to place a precursor to or basis for place identity to evolve or is there evidence for the reverse, i.e. that a person has to firstly identify with a place before they can develop an attachment to place?

Before attempting to answer this question and before considering various definitions of place attachment, reference is made to the attachment theories which, explicitly or implicitly, suggest potential similarities between close attachments to people and places, and the sometimes heartfelt grief experienced at their loss.

Whilst Fried cites (1963) a paper by Bowlby called ‘Processes of mourning’ (Bowlby, 1961), it was not until a few years later that the first of a trilogy of books by Bowlby appeared on the subject of ‘Attachment and Loss’ (1969; 1973; 1980). Bowlby essentially emphasized the importance of forming a reciprocal emotional bond to a person, rather than a place, the parental figure serving as a secure emotional basis for a child growing up. This might be thought of as a prerequisite for the capacity to form a healthy emotional bond to a partner later in life. It is interesting that Bowlby drew on the example of children separated from a parent in institutions as a basis for his observations. Less apparent, though implicit, might have been the argument that in being institutionalised (e.g. in an orphanage) a child risks being deprived not only of an attachment figure but also of a ‘home’ and all that this implies. Distinguishing between the relative effects of deprivation and/or loss of parent (e.g. after an attachment) and/or the home (as a repository of object and person attachments) is difficult and awaits substantive research.

Giuliani (in preparation) makes the case for choosing attachment to place as an object of scientific enquiry as “the transition from intuitive awareness of the existence of affective bonds with places to a scientific knowledge of the phenomenon is still far from complete. ... we still have a long way to go to attain that level of conceptual rigor, consistency and integration with knowledge already acquired or being acquired” (p. 3). Giuliani describes how the study of affective bonds to place only emerged in the early 1990s, not because of lack of awareness but because it is fraught with problems. This is also recognized by other sub-disciplines in psychology (e.g. cognitive psychology, quoting Fitness & Strongman, 1991). Bowlby’s trilogy, its development by Ainsworth and its potential relevance to place attachment is considered by Giuliani (in preparation) as a possible theoretical framework in the absence of any precise conceptual framework in the environmental psychology research literature. She proposes
that although there are differences and similarities, what emerges is that the way in which the phenomenon is investigated and the objectives assigned to the scientific investigation are too different to be of any use. This is because the Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory focuses on the regularities of attachment behaviour, whereas the attachment to place approach emphasizes the diversity of the emotional bond (among individuals, different life stages, different groups and cultures). Giuliani concludes that whilst the Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory seeks to find persistence in different life stages and therefore conceptualize the phenomenon as static, attachment to place theorists emphasize the dynamic relationship between person and place, the modification of affective bonds throughout a person’s life span. Hence, although Fried (1963) used the Bowlby model to explain the grief experienced by those forced to relocate from the Boston West End, it seems that the theory itself is unlikely to be useful in the search for a theoretical framework.

An important milestone was reached by Altman & Low’s (1992) edited book on ‘Place Attachment’, particularly since developmental processes are empirically addressed for the first time (e.g. Chawla, 1992). In their introductory chapter Low & Altman (1992) state that “place attachment is an integrating concept that involves patterns of: attachments (affect, cognition, and practice); places that vary in scale, specificity, and tangibility; different actors (individuals, groups, and cultures); social relationships (individuals, groups and cultures); and temporal aspects (linear, cyclical)” (p. 8). They acknowledge that attachment to place has not yet reached the stage of a coherent body of research but, as Giuliani and Feldman (1993) comment in their review of the book, “the contributions collected in this volume represent a substantial basis from which to develop a more systematic theoretical formulation” (p. 269). Interestingly, however, the work on place attachment/identity was only briefly summarized (one short paragraph) in the last review of Environmental Psychology by Sundstrom, et al. (1996) and was hardly mentioned in the previous five reviews since 1973, indicating that the topic is still not thought to contribute substantially to the field.

Giuliani & Feldman (1993) are critical of the lack of consensus in defining place attachment. They found that differences involve three components, i.e. the content of the bond (affective, cognitive, and/or symbolic); whether the valence of the bond is positive or negative; and the specificity of the bond (some authors see attachment as a general concept, whilst others only consider specific affects, e.g. separating feelings of satisfaction, identity, insideness and attachment). Giuliani & Feldman are optimistic that some form of rapprochement can be achieved, together with a sound basis for place attachment as an empirical concept of use in people-environment studies, stating that “perhaps, the most important challenge for researchers in this area of inquiry is to integrate different viewpoints and approaches. To do so, we have to develop a common language which allows us to clearly identify the object of inquiry” (p. 271).
Giuliani & Feldman (1993) also suggest that the work of Altman & Low (1992) closed ‘an historic phase’ in research on people-environment relationships and that the usefulness of the attachment construct as a research tool was due for reassessment. They feel that in future, theorists and researchers should “concentrate on tightening up on the definition of place attachment while considering it in the broad framework of the multiple affective, cognitive, and behavioral relationships between people and socio-physical environment” (1993, p. 273). It is hoped that this thesis will make some contribution in this respect.

Not all the contributors to Altman & Low’s (1992) volume offer explicit ‘place attachment’ definitions. It should also be noted (as observed in relation to ‘place’ definitions in Section 2.2), that definitions are not always consistent with the content of papers. They do, however, contribute to the number and range of definitions expressed in the research literature.

In a recent essay Giuliani (in preparation) makes reference to nineteen definitions of place attachment which have been published since 1963. The main constituents of these definitions are affective bonds, identity references, affective, cognitive and behavioural components, including, for some, an emphasis on collective and/or individual attachment. A selection has been made to both demonstrate the diversity of researchers’ conceptualisations and to point to the lack of consensus amongst researchers in defining place attachment.

To begin with, there are four definitions which explicitly base place attachment on identity. Fried (1963) does not define the term place attachment but instead he coins the term ‘spatial identity’ and describes its affective aspects: “Associated with these ‘cognitive’ components, described as the sense of spatial identity and the sense of group identity, are strong affective qualities. ... they appear to fall into the realm of a feeling of security in and commitment to the external spatial and group patterns which are the tangible, visible aspects of these identity components” (p. 168).

Neither Fried nor any other theorist developed his work further at that time and it was not until the late 1970s that Proshansky began to develop his ‘place-identity’ theory. In 1983, Proshansky, Fabian & Kaminoff made a theoretical case for ‘place-identity’ but used the term ‘place-belongingness’ instead of place attachment: “Place-identity is theoretically conceived of ... as clusters of positively and negatively valenced cognitions of physical settings” (p. 74). “Place-belongingness undoubtedly occurs in those individuals whose place-identity involves positively valenced cognitions of one or some combination of these settings which far outweigh the number of negatively valenced cognitions” (p. 76). This definition suggests that place belongingness (using their term) is a result of place identity, rather than place identity resulting from place belongingness. This is an interesting point which is of relevance for this thesis and will be discussed in subsequent chapters.
Whilst Proshansky (1976; 1978; Proshansky, et al., 1983) developed the place-identity theory, Brower (1980) also focused on identity with place. His definition omits a reference to an emotional component but instead focuses on control and identity, although he uses the term place attachment as the concept to be defined: “Attachment to place refers to the feeling of possessiveness that an occupant has towards a particular territory because of its associations with self-image or social identity” (p. 192). Brower does not make it clear whether the cognitions ‘associated with self-image or social identity’ prefigure the formation of place attachment, giving rise to the feeling of possessiveness, or whether the feeling of possessiveness gives rise to the beliefs. The reader is also left in doubt as to whether these beliefs are part of place attachment or merely give rise to it. It is possible that one of the benefits of a longitudinal study is the ability to focus on this question of direction of causality, particularly where this focus is on the process of place attachment over time.

Belk (1992) also connects place attachment with identity: “To be attached to certain of our surroundings is to make them a part of our extended self. ... possessions involve the extended self only when the basis for attachment is emotional rather than simply functional” (p. 38). Belk states clearly that it is only the positive emotions which give rise to the inclusion of place into identity, in which case one can assume that for Belk the emotional bond precedes identity adaptation.

The remaining selected definitions do not explicitly address the link to identity, although for some there is an implicit reference to such a link. Relph (1976), as a humanist geographer, conceptualizes place attachment as familiarity: “In both our communal and our personal experience of places there is often a close attachment, a familiarity that is part of knowing and being known here, in this particular place. It is this attachment that constitutes our roots in places, and the familiarity that this involves is not just a detailed knowledge, but a sense of deep care and concern” (p. 37). Thus for Relph attachment is familiarity (i.e. cognitive, possibly deriving from behaviour) plus care and concern (i.e. affect, positive emotion, possibly resulting in behaviour). It is suggested that in this definition there is a link to identity, albeit implicit. Knowledge of the place can be seen as relating to the principle of efficacy, whilst the knowledge that others associate us with the place can be seen as relating to the other three principles of identity, i.e. self esteem, distinctiveness and continuity. These principles, Breakwell’s (1986; 1992) Identity Process Theory and literature pertaining to them will be reviewed in Chapter 3 since this framework has been found useful for this thesis. The link between place and the identity principles is further discussed in Chapters 8 and 9.

Relph’s definition is comprehensive in that it also includes the individual and communal levels. Gerson, Stueve & Fischer (1977), however, define place attachment simply as “individuals’ commitments to their neighborhoods and neighbors” (p. 139). For Shumaker & Taylor (1983): “... attachment may be
viewed as: a positive affective bond or association between individuals and their residential environment” (p. 233). “Attachment itself, at the individual level, is a system of interlocked attitudes and behaviors that refer to the home and the household and reflect the intimacy of strength of the individual’s tie to that locale. Thus, elements of the system include cognitions of satisfaction and expectations of stability, feelings of positive affect, greater knowledge of the locale, and behaviors that serve to maintain or enhance the location” (p. 237).

Giuliani’s (1991) definition of place attachment is reminiscent of Bowlby’s attachment theory, clearly defining attachment to place as an emotional bond: “An attachment bond with an object, and thus also with the home, may be defined as i) the state of psychological well-being experienced by the subject as a result of the mere presence, vicinity or accessibility of the object, and, conversely, ii) the state of distress set up by the absence, remoteness or inaccessibility of the object” (p. 134).

It is often easier to conceptualize something when also looking at the converse. Giuliani used this method for her definition and so does Chawla (1992): “Children are attached to a place when they show happiness at being in it and regret or distress at leaving it, and when they value it not only for the satisfaction of physical needs but for its own intrinsic qualities” (p. 64). Chawla leaves unsaid what the ‘intrinsic qualities’ are and yet it is those unarticulated components which distinguish place attachment from place identification, where the principal emphasis is on the cognitive component, a problem which was touched on in the previous section. It seems, however, that the research literature does not contain a finite answer to the distinction between place attachment and place identification and it is, therefore, proposed here that whilst an overlap is acknowledged, for this study the term place attachment is preferred as it emphasizes the emotional aspect and recognizes the ‘intrinsic qualities’ of a place.

There are two further definitions which have been of importance to this thesis. The first is by Brown & Perkins (1992): “Place attachment involves positively experienced bonds, sometimes occurring without awareness, that are developed over time from the behavioral, affective, and cognitive ties between individuals and or groups and their sociophysical environment” (p. 284).

This is the preferred definition because of its comprehensiveness and because it acknowledges the dynamic nature of place attachment and views it within the transactional paradigm. It also embraces the complexity of individual and collective relationships within spatial, cultural, and temporal aspects. Its emphasis on the three interacting components provided the structure for the place attachment scale and the interview schedules used in this study, which will be described in Chapter 6.

Milligan’s (1998) paper is too recent to have influenced the original structure of this study or the data collection periods but it has influenced some of the later qualitative data analysis. She defines place
attachment as: “the emotional link formed by an individual to a physical site that has been given meaning through interaction .... comprised of two interwoven components: the *interactional past* and *interactional potential* of a site. The first of these, *interactional past*, may be defined as the past experiences associated with a site, or in a word, ‘memories’. The degree of meaningfulness of these experiences translates into the degree of attachment to the site itself. The second component of place attachment, *interactional potential*, refers to the future experiences imagined or anticipated to be possible in a site, or ‘expectations’. An individual’s experiences within and in relation to a specific site result in a set of expectations for future interactions in the site” (p. 2). This definition emphasizes both the source of place attachment (meanings arising through interaction) and the temporal nature of its meanings, offering both memories of the past and potentialities for the future. It also moves the debate on in that it focuses on the specific type of behaviour, i.e. the degree of meaningfulness of the experiences, which Milligan sees as directly translating into place attachment.

Some of the above definitions refer tangentially to the way in which place attachment develops; for example, Brower’s (1980) definition sees place attachment as resulting from associations of the place with self-image or social identity and Milligan (1998) refers to the meaning given to a physical site through interaction. It is worthwhile, however, exploring a study which specifically addresses the processes by which place attachment is formed. This is the work of Fuhrer & Kaiser (1992) entitled “Attachment to the home place: the emotional bases”. Their work on place attachment suggests that there are three processes which create place attachment, of which two are interpersonal, i.e. the place as carrier of personal identity (the self receiving information) and the place as facilitator of social processes (others receiving information about the self) and one intrapersonal process, the place as facilitator of emotional needs.

A basic assumption of Fuhrer & Kaiser’s model is that places are used as non-verbal indicators (Rapoport, 1982; Altman & Chemers, 1980, as cited by Fuhrer & Kaiser). As places can be changed or adapted to meet personal needs, places represent the individual and, as such, aid identity formation by providing feedback to the individual. Thus places are carriers of personal identity.

In the second process, as seen by Fuhrer & Kaiser, place externalises this identity to others by facilitating information about the self to others. Recent work suggests that places (this could be home or workplace) which are not conducive to personalisation do not facilitate this process (e.g. 1986; Feldman, 1996), whereas places which can be personalised become a symbolic mirror of certain aspects of the personality of the person residing in that place (e.g. Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981) and shape the core of self identity (e.g. Rapoport, 1981; Brown, 1987; Hormuth, 1990). Bischof (1985) names this phenomenon ‘synchronic’ identity. In contrast he also describes ‘diachronic’ identity, the linking of temporally separated happenings. These are representations of individual biographical
milestones or traditions of social or cultural communities (e.g. Stokols & Shumaker, 1981), which are useful as indicators of biographical continuity. Both types of identity, synchronic and diachronic, are facilitated through place and are used to externalise self identity (e.g. Rochberg-Halton, 1986; Fuhrer & Kaiser, 1991; Giuliani, 1991).

As described in this review, many authors define place attachment as an emotional bond to place but few writers define the origin and quality of these emotions. The numerous ‘satisfaction studies’ (e.g. Fried, 1982; Stokols & Shumaker, 1981; Gerson, Stueve & Fischer, 1977) have helped little to increase knowledge of people-place relationships. Fuhrer & Kaiser, however, advanced the field by thinking of place as a facilitator of emotional needs. They used Bischof’s model of social motivation which suggests that “four emotions represent the core of social regulations: security, arousal, autonomy and libido. Thus places are experienced in terms of these emotions and represent the basis for regulating both identity and social interaction” (Fuhrer & Kaiser, 1992, p. 105).

Fuhrer and Kaiser did not apply Bischof’s model in its entirety to the concept of Place Attachment. Considering the home and its wider environment, they developed and tested a model of the third process of place attachment, the place as a facilitator of emotional needs, based on the emotions of security, autonomy and arousal. They decided not to investigate libido (they include a footnote which explains that they expected massive resistance from their respondents!). They surveyed 543 residents in two distinct neighbourhoods, in streets with 3 different traffic volumes, and found “significant relationships between social and physical qualities of the home place and to the emotional dimensions. Thus the results revealed that these emotional meanings represent the bases of attachment to the home place” (Fuhrer & Kaiser, 1992, p. 105).

Reference has been made, in the first part of this section, to the Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory. This study does, however, support Giuliani’s (in preparation) conclusion, that this theory applies to a static phenomenon, whereas person-place attachment is most usefully viewed as a dynamic relationship between person and place. The remainder of this section was concerned with discussing the various definitions of place attachment in order to extract those components which are considered crucial in describing the essence of place attachment. Brown & Perkins’ (1992) definition was found to integrate affective, cognitive and behavioural components and to address the complexity of the place attachment phenomenon and was, therefore, chosen for this study.

The next section considers the temporal aspect of place, an often neglected aspect of place attachment. Time can seem abstract and intangible, yet in terms of memory, meaning and feelings, time is arguably a significant property of place.
2.6 Time and Place

A relatively unexplored aspect of place, place identity and place attachment, is that of ‘time’. To date, this has been implicit in place theory and research, but has rarely been addressed specifically in research projects. The primary referent for time, in terms of place (identity and attachment) is probably that of the relationship between the past, present and future, between memory, experience and expectation and how this varies at different points in our lives. Main stream psychology considers aspects of spatial memory and cognition far more abstractly than is implied by the idea that a place is something which may evoke particular memories and feelings because of the experiences which a person has had there, and expects to have there in the future. This is the realm of what is remembered and what we expect of the world, more than how we remember and think (the realm of conventional psychological research on memory and cognition). Some aspects of time and place are briefly considered in this section in terms of their potential bearing on the nature of place attachment and identity.

Reference has already been made to the Proshansky, et al. (1983) conceptualisation of place identity in which a core feature of place identity cognitions is deemed to be the ‘environmental past’ of the person. Others have considered the time related aspects of people’s relationship to architecture (e.g. Lynch, 1972). It is clear that architecture can provide a symbolic collective and/or personal link to the past, present and a sense of an enduring future.

The term ‘continuity’ appears a number of times in Fried’s (1963) paper. Whilst not discussing the relationship between time and place in detail, it is clear from at least one paragraph, that Fried was aware of the significant experiential relationship between time and place revealed by enforced relocation.

“Any severe loss may represent a disruption in one’s relationship to the past, to the present, and to the future. ... It is a disruption in that sense of continuity which is ordinarily a taken-for-granted framework for functioning in a universe ...” (Fried, 1963, p. 153).

This could be thought to be similar to the disruption in ‘body-habit’ routines (Seamon, 1979; 1982) which may occur if the spaces in which this behaviour occurs are radically altered or removed. These are domains of habitual patterns of action within the home and outside it, of which people may only become fully aware when they are missed (Chapter 7). Seamon uses the term ‘life-world’ to express the phenomenology of ‘being in the world’. A feature of time is not only the recurring or cyclical nature of habitual actions, but the fact that a person’s life-world or life biography of places unfolds over time and may be characterized at various times by spatial continuity, discontinuity, transitions (e.g. leaving the parental home to live elsewhere for the first time), disruptions, gains and losses, varying in their significance.
Mead (1929), in a paper called ‘The nature of the past’, considers that the past is reconstructed in terms of the present – “the present implies a past and a future, reality is always that of a present” (1929, p. 235). Maines, et al. (1983) commenting on Mead’s paper argue that “the events that constitute the referents of the past always belong to the present” (p. 161). This constitutes the symbolically reconstructed past: “in the context of the present, the past is shaped by actors who retrospectively interpret acts that have occurred in light of acts that are occurring” (p. 169). There are, however, others who argue that the past shapes the present as can be clearly seen in the current problems in Northern Ireland. Taylor (1989) agrees with the latter perspective but also expresses the need to include the future, “In order to have a sense of who we are, we have to have a notion of how we have become, and of where we are going” (p. 47). In recent years there has been growing attention in academic literature to a sociology of the past, social memories (Zerubavel, 1996), social time and social theory of time (e.g. Adam, 1990).

Klein, et al. (1985), in seeking a paradigm which combines research and design, suggests that, “environment/human transactions are not static. We cannot hope to understand human settings if our new paradigm is atemporal and ahistorical. Therefore, we must look at how settings change over time and we must bring history into our research efforts. The present in any setting is the child of its past” (preface: p. x). This suggests that the present is ‘constructed’ out of the past, in contrast to the sociology of the past, which suggests that the past is constructed out of the present. Despite increasing references to time and place, longitudinal studies of place, place attachment and identity processes are rare in the environment-behaviour and social science research literature to date.

When considering representations of the self, Giuliani (1991) found that the temporal aspect is of twofold importance: firstly as a person’s identity changes throughout their lifetime and, secondly, in respect of a person’s time orientation. This, she found, either describes the location of a person’s identity as in the future (plans and aspirations) or as in the past (memories and reminiscences). She also found that one’s time orientation is closely tied to age, with young people generally displaying a ‘forward tilt’ and old people looking back, pointing to what one did or was. In addition, Giuliani found that a future orientation seemed to facilitate new place attachment bonds whereas a time orientation towards the past seemed to inhibit new bonds whilst reinforcing existing bonds.

Giuliani explored a third dimension within the representations of the self, which she named ‘nomadism’. She applied it to participants who show little attachment to their home, despite having spent 30 years there, because they were forced by circumstances to move frequently during their youth. She likens this phenomenon to the response of an infant whose attempts to form an attachment to the caregiver are constantly blocked. The time orientation of the self identity changes during a person’s life time but
nomadism, once formed, seems to remain stable and independent of both time and changing home
environment (Giuliani, 1991).

Werner, Altman & Oxley (1985) present a model which expresses the home as a transactional unity
comprised of three major aspects: people/psychological processes; environmental properties; and
temporal qualities. These authors also suggest that people invest places with meaning over linear and
cyclical time in terms of appropriation and identity processes, reflecting their bonding and linkage with
places.

Dovey (1985) likens home to a ‘mnemonic anchor’ which “enables us to participate between present and
past, between experience and memory” (p. 43). Objects in a person’s home and nearby or in far off
revisited places serve as a store for memories and reconstituted feelings about who one was, is and wants
to be. Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton (1981) found that personal photographs contribute to this
cache of memories. Bischof (1985) names this phenomenon ‘diachronic’ identity, the representation of
individual biographical milestones or traditions of social or cultural communities indicating biographical
continuity.

These observations touch upon issues of time and scale in terms of identity and place attachment. In
essence, people’s sense of who they are in terms of who and what they are most attached to, identify
with and can be distinguished from, varies in terms of their life-world (biographical significance) from
childhood to old age. The world of an infant is that of persons and objects primarily within the home
which can be touched, felt and seen nearby. This world expands to the wider world outside and
eventually contracts to that of nearby objects at the other end of a person’s lifespan, when the physical
capability of a person is again restricted (Sime, 1993). It is not suggested, however, that such a
generalised view will apply to all persons in that age range (Ng, et al., 1997).

Following from the research mentioned above (acknowledging that there are individual differences), the
time and place orientations of the majority of persons at different life stages can be described as follows:
childhood (present), adolescence (future), adulthood (future and past) and late adulthood (past oriented).
In these respect, a place is defined in terms of individual and collective time dimensions. A place is not
anywhere, but somewhere for a person, with all which that implies in terms of temporal modes of place
experience, attachment and identity. Places which do not physically change also offer the opportunity
for people to revisit or relive their past (even if reconstructed through the eyes of an autobiographic
present). This has not been possible for the Arkwright residents since the demolition of the old village.

One of the most vivid examples of the importance of continuity with the past for elderly people is
provided by Rowles (1983) when discussing the nature of the relationship between the elderly
inhabitants of an Appalachian community and their surroundings. He suggests that “attachment to place ... involves critical historic dimensions that give this environment a temporal depth of meaning. Autobiographical insideness embraces not only the place of the present but also a series of remembered places” (p. 303). Rowles cites the example of a drive with one of his participants, 87 year old Bertha, who revealed in her commentary “a host of places richly imbued with meaning in terms of events which transpired in them”. He writes that, “Autobiographical insideness may embrace a plethora of incident places spanning the space/time trajectory of the individual’s entire lifespan” (pp. 304-305).

Rowles suggests that relocation is a critical threat to the ‘insideness’ of elderly people stating that “few ... studies have probed the phenomenology of the alienation, loss and grief that is often the experiential essence of severance from place; the sense of separation from personal history and identity” (p. 310).

Rowles concludes with “Clearly, the task of those responsible for reducing relocation trauma is to identify and reinforce transferable components of attachment to place ... Through such a process it may be possible ... [that] the unavoidable relocation of the elderly ... no longer result[s] in the separation of the individual ... from their identity” (p. 310). Other researchers such as Rubinstein (1989), Ekström (1994) and Norris-Baker & Scheidt (1990) have indicated the characteristically close emotional, past oriented bond between elderly people and home places on different scales, such as objects, the home and the small town rural community (see next section on ‘Nested Place Attachments’).

Tuan’s suggestion that a place is ‘a pause in time’ (Tuan, 1977) conjures up the idea that a place experience is a product of mind and matter, more vivid if experienced in the ‘here and now’. Others might consider a ‘sense of place’ to ‘take place’ over a much longer period of time. Hay (1998), for example, drawing primarily on qualitative interviews of adult residents of Banks Peninsula, New Zealand, suggests, in a comparable fashion to ‘autobiographical insideness’ (Rowles, 1983), that there are sequential stages in the development of a sense of place. Hay also found that these stages are most evident amongst those who are raised in a place and spend most of their lives there. He concludes that there are three stages and names them embryonic (childhood to adolescent), commitment (early to mid adulthood) and culmination (mid adulthood to old age). Unfortunately, he does not appear to differentiate between the terms ‘sense of place’ and ‘place attachment’. In suggesting that tourists only experience a ‘superficial’ sense of place, it is evident that for him sense of place is imbued with strong insider ancestral and cultural connotations, rather than one which gives credence to the feelings a visitor might justifiably have and bring to a place experience.

Milligan (1998) highlights the importance of a social construction of place in terms of the emotional bond formed by an individual with a physical site due to either a meaningful interactional past or the future experiences perceived as likely or possible to occur. As Milligan (1998, p. 6) suggests, “without
some degree of meaning bestowed upon it, a site does not exist, and it is not a place”. Milligan’s paper will be more fully discussed in the final section of this chapter.

It has been suggested that the primary referent for time, in terms of place (identity and attachment) is that of the relationship between the past, present and future, between memory, experience and expectation. This thesis, inter alia, explores how in terms of memory, meaning and feelings, time is arguably a significant property of place, supporting the belief that place, in terms of identity and attachment, is a dynamic rather than a static phenomenon.

2.7 Nested place attachment and place identity
Low & Altman (1992) not only refer to the importance of time but also to the importance of scale. In general, researchers have tended to explore notions of place, place identity and attachment in terms of objects, houses, neighbourhoods, community, region, and nation, with limited integration of these differences in scale.

Linked with differences in environmental scale of the locus of place attachments, in the Altman and Low (1992) edited chapters, is an implicitly or explicitly expressed related theme of sub-groups of people who have the potential for strong place attachments and/or a sense of place identity. Thus, it can be seen that people have particularly strong bonds to objects and spaces within and immediately around the home at each end of their life span, both in childhood and old age corresponding with the expanding and ultimately contracting lifeworld, as referred to in the previous section. This applies most readily to small infants for whom the world is primarily the domain of nearby physically and visually graspable objects and to the immobile elderly at the end of their lives. For the latter, the home is a repository of objects and spaces meaningful in terms of their symbolic links to the past. Outside the unfolding autobiographic world of the dwelling is a geographic world explored by people to different degrees and in different ways during the course of their lives; e.g. the world outside for children, as they grow up, increases progressively in its home range (Hart, 1979; Spencer & Blades, 1993).

It would appear that the labelling of the scales of space depends on both the predominant discipline of the researchers and the degree of care used in their definitions. Psychologists tend to be more interested in representing the home, and objects within it, as a personal place; sociologists are more likely to explore social networks with neighbours as a representation of community and place attachment; whilst geographers focus on urban vs rural settlement and regional attachments. It is far from clear whether each of the spatial domains are aspects of the same phenomenon (place = object/ dwelling/ neighbourhood/ settlement/ community/ city / national attachment and identity); are interrelated; are hierarchical in terms of importance; or are different from each other.
It can be argued that it is appropriate to conceptualize the phenomenon of place attachment and identity in terms of places ‘nested’ within places, e.g. objects within the home; the home within the residential block; the block within the neighbourhood; the neighbourhood within a town, etc. As one shifts between home and elsewhere, each spatial category of attachment and identity becomes more tangible at the point of transition, e.g. leaving a room, the home, the town, the region, the country. There is then a repeating sequence of place awareness in reverse on the return leg of the journey. It should be observed that in terms of any assumed continuity of psychological scale, it is not a question of scale, but rather qualitative difference (Ittleson, *et al.*, 1974; Giuliani, 1991). The concept of ‘nested places’ resembles Bronfenbrenner’s approach to the ecology of human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) in which the ecological environment in which one lives and grows is considered to be an arrangement of structures nesting one within the other, and influencing each other.

2.7.1 *Spatial units.* Another reminder of the nested place approach to the study of place identity and attachment is Altman’s (1975) conceptualisation of territoriality in terms of the regulation of privacy and social contact. He defined three types of territory: primary, secondary and public territories. Primary territories are usually to be found in the place of residence and deemed to be the most central and enduring in terms of psychological attachment and identity. Secondary territories are often shared by others but in a private group. Public territories are open to public access and are the least important in terms of territorial personalisation. There are patterns of behaviour, such as the appropriation of a public space at a certain time of day by a group of adolescents, which represent temporal and spatial relationships between the three types of territory for particular users. Giuliani (1991) suggests that, whilst from a spatial point of view, places such as an apartment, block, neighbourhood, city, country, are “one inside the other ... they may not be so from the affective point of view. To be attached to one’s city does not necessarily imply being attached to one’s neighbourhood, or house, or apartment. Different spatial units can constitute different objects of attachment and the model of attachment may be different” (p. 139).

Bonnes, *et al.* (1990) quote the notion expressed by Russell & Ward (1982) that the environment is “a complex of immediate and distant places, psychologically arranged into a hierarchy such that each place is part of a larger place and can be subdivided into small places” (p. 654). Bonnes, *et al.* advocate a multi-place system. Thus, in an inter-place analysis of the city of Rome, they compared the relationship between a sample of residents and their neighbourhood, the city-centre and the periphery. They suggest on the basis of their study that the experience of the city consists of an integrated system of four generic places which include the home, neighbourhood, city centre and periphery. The authors found that fully integrated individuals were involved in all four places; the semi-integrated and semi-confined individuals were limited to only two places (neighbourhood and centre for the young, home and centre for the social elite and neighbourhood and home for housewives). The fully confined (old, poor, or very
young) were limited to one place (home). Whether the home is a place of supportive shelter or negative withdrawal will vary according to a range of factors such as stage in life cycle, disposable income and the emotions and identity invested in a place. Instead of assuming that people tend towards integration or confinement at different points in their lives, it is suggested that the nesting of places within places presents different choices, constraints and possibilities.

2.7.2 Possessions. There are a range of formulations and studies of people’s attachment to and identification with objects as possessions (e.g. Belk, 1992). Whilst objects and material possessions are often considered as personal and private within the home to reflect personal identity, there is also consumer research literature which suggests that objects are appropriated and used not only as an aid to self-definition, but also in terms of the construction of social identity (e.g. Ditmar, 1992).

Research by Rubinstein based on ethnographic interviewing techniques (e.g. Rubinstein, 1987; Rubinstein, 1989; Rubinstein & Parmelee, 1992) has looked at the strong relationship between elderly people and their possessions within the home environment. The way in which particular objects come to represent symbolic links with a person’s past is also evident in the work of Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton (1981). Rubinstein (1989) suggests that the personal meanings of objects varies in terms of the degree to which the objects are referents for distinctive events or properties of a person’s life (personalisation), or are an extension of the self, or are characterized by embodiment (a subjective merging or blurring of boundaries between self and object). As the capabilities of an elderly person diminish, the more their relationship to their surroundings is ‘body-centred’. It is clear that a major way in which elderly people define themselves is in terms of their immediate environment within the home and its links with the past (spaces and objects appropriated over the years). Rowles (1983) suggests that any relocation of elderly people, especially if enforced, poses a particular threat to their identity as constructed within and by the home.

2.7.3 The home. As in the research on objects and possessions within the home, the research on attachment to the home has primarily been qualitative, unlike the research on attachments to larger spatial or geographic domains. Indeed, the conceptualisation of what is a home has been strongly influenced by phenomenological lines of inquiry (Dovey, 1985) in which quantitative measures are generally considered to be inadequate. Cooper (1972) and Cooper-Marcus (1995) explore the notion that a house is an extension of its occupant, the latter work using in-depth interviews. Individuals were invited to talk to their houses and then assume the persona of the house talking back to the person, adopting Gestalt therapy interviewing techniques aimed at uncovering otherwise barely conscious feelings people have about their homes.
This work touches on the central question, not only of what a house means to people, but: “What makes a house a home?” as posed by Lawrence (1987). This is comparable to the question “What makes a space a place?” (Sime, 1988), except that Lawrence (like Després, 1991) does not restrict the notion of home to a psychological definition. In the introduction to his 1987 book, Lawrence distinguishes “the house which is a precise geometric composition of interrelated spaces ... from the home, which is that physical composition after it has been endowed with, and transformed by, psychological and social processes related to its decoration, personalization and use” (p. 7). This is similar to the idea that people invest their homes with meaning and significance over time (characterized as appropriation, attachment and identity processes by Werner, et al., 1992). The nature of these processes (and their relationships) and the degree and way in which they might need to work in reverse when a person moves home (detachment, shedding of previous home based identity) and are retained in memory or sustained in a new home (e.g. by the transfer of objects) is yet to be researched in a substantive fashion. Such research would best be conducted using longitudinal studies, which to date have been rare.

2.7.4 Neighbourhood and community. There is a large research literature on place attachment and place identity relating to neighbourhood and settlement spatial domains, particularly over the past ten years. There is an even larger research literature on aspects of neighbourhood, community and urban life, stretching back several decades, more explicitly in the domain of place attachment and place identity, depending on how place, place attachment and place identity are defined. A primary impetus behind this literature has been the issue, predominant in USA, that in a very mobile society (except perhaps for the economically disadvantaged) and with shifts in urban populations towards decentralisation and sub-urbanisation, there may have been a breakdown in the community and social networks.

A central question posed by sociologists is whether one can have ‘community without propinquity’ (Fischer, 1982). This relates to the so-called ‘decline of community thesis’ or proposition posed in relation to urban life. Predominantly place based communities might be evolving into a ‘transpatial’ society in which people’s circle of friends and acquaintances are less circumscribed by local spatial proximity. The degree to which people are spatial or transpatial in terms of who they know is likely to be influenced by a range of factors such as socio-economic status, past and current employment, lifespan biography of places and advances in technology (e.g. email). In the context of this thesis, with its emphasis on the study of a population moved from one physical settlement to another constructed nearby, the question might more directly be, the degree to which self- and community attachments and identity, are sustained or constrained by a significant change in the community's physical surroundings and the nature of the community relocation process.
Feldman (1990; 1996) has suggested that people have attachments to a type of settlement which are often sought out in terms of choice of home and are transferable from one location to another. In other words people might appear to be highly mobile in terms of a biography of moves from one geographically dispersed settlement to another, but despite ‘temporary dislocations, reunions and reorientations’ in fact often sustain their attachments with a type of settlement over time (e.g. city, suburb, small town, country/rural). It should be noted that these are generic types of settlement or social category, and the research is again less specific about particular environmental features of the settlements.

Feldman (1996) employed in-depth interviews to explore residential autobiographies and to assess the strength of attachment (based on a set of indicators of psychological bonds, e.g. embeddedness, community, at-easeness, uniqueness of place, care and concern, unity of identities, bodily orientation, appropriation of place, centeredness (for definitions see Feldman, 1996, p. 426)). Other researchers have employed a considerable variety of rating scale measures, which are variations on the theme of the question: how attached do you feel to your neighbourhood, community or city? Most of the researchers use composite measures derived from a set of sentences which are rated with a Likert type scale ranging from completely agree to completely disagree. As an example, Lalli (1992) uses the following: “I have got native feelings for Heidelberg/I see myself as a Heidelbergian/I feel really at home at Heidelberg/The town is like a part of myself”. Bonnes, et al. (1996) have a neighbourhood attachment scale, derived from 6 statements each of which are rated; these include: “Now this neighbourhood is a part of me/there are places in this neighbourhood to which I am very emotionally attached”.

Studies under the heading ‘community attachment’ include Janowitz & Kasarda (1974), Fernández & Dillman (1979), Riger & Lavrakas (1981), St. John, et al. (1986), Hummon (1992), and O’Brien, et al. (1994). The term community attachment is sometimes used synonymously with neighbourhood attachment or local attachment (as in Mesch & Manor, 1998). The term home is sometimes used to refer to dwelling, community and region (as in Cuba & Hummon, 1993). Indeed, the latter paper, whilst aspiring to draw together different scales of place referred to earlier, uses the terms place attachment, identity and identification loosely and interchangeably so that it does not clarify the issues involved. One can be forgiven for thinking that the confusions in measures used in this research area are at least as much conceptual as numerical. A number of other papers explore regional aspects of place identity with reference to place attachment and migration across the life cycle or seasonal migration (e.g. McHugh & Mings, 1996) and national identity (e.g. Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997). Other research on motives for house buying (Brown, 1980) suggests that people move home for a variety of reasons, including house, area, job and/or family. It is assumed in the literature just mentioned that the degree to which people feel attached to or identify with a previous or new home, neighbourhood, community or region, is related to stages in a person’s lifespan.
2.7.5 *Spatial factors in neighbourhood communications.* The final consideration in this section is research relating to visual access, social networks, social encounters and spatial configurations relating to communication between people within the neighbourhood. An important idea here is that of ‘opportunity structures’ (Saegert & Winkel, 1990), the constraints and possibilities offered by different housing and neighbourhood layouts.

One theory that fits within the opportunity structure paradigm is that of Archea (1973; 1977) who presents a visual access and visual exposure model of potential relevance to a comparison between different housing layouts. Whilst his model was developed, in the first instance, in relation to interior locations in buildings, it is likely to be equally applicable to relationships between neighbours. Archea focuses on behaviour which he considers to be contingent upon physical structures. Archea defines visual access as “the ability to monitor one’s immediate spatial surroundings by sight” (1977, p. 123). In his view, visual access allows persons to establish the range of possibilities for synchronisation of their behaviour with that of other members of a socio-spatial setting. If people can maintain active surveillance of their spatial environment it allows them to identify the acceptable and appropriate behaviours within a particular social setting.

Archea (1977) defines visual exposure as “the probability that one’s behavior can be monitored by sight from one’s immediate physical surroundings” (p. 124). He notes that visual exposure establishes a degree of accountability for one’s behaviour within an informal social setting and that a person’s socio-spatial exposure provides information about the person. This allows others to form enduring impressions of the person’s behavioural characteristics. Archea points out that “this relationship between visual exposure and the potential assessment of one’s behavior by others can affect normative pressures to align one’s behavior with prevailing social sanctions” (1977, p. 124).

He argues that any architectural plan or design not only offers opportunities but also places restrictions on, or moderates, what is possible in terms of patterns of behaviour and experience and that the framework outlined considers the behavioural and environmental attributes simultaneously. Archea states that “studies of environment and behavior cannot be expected to advance until we begin to attach the same degree of specificity to its architectural dimensions as we have traditionally attached to its behavioral dimensions” (p. 148). He stresses the importance of the physical environment “as the means by which the flow of behaviourally relevant information is either facilitated or inhibited” (1974, p. 135) rather than valuing it mainly for its symbolic associations. He concludes that “the physical environment presents everyone with a set of initial conditions upon which all behavior is largely contingent. As such, it confronts the behavioral scientist with an independent variable, the salience of which has been too long denied” (p. 134). He argues that the issue is not private or personal space but how one manipulates
one’s position within the given physical arrangement of one’s surroundings in order to achieve one’s objectives.

Archea (1977) also discusses the implications for privacy of his visual access and exposure model. He states that “the management of behavior and position to further one’s own interpersonal objectives hinges on the notion that the most accurate and vivid information about oneself is conveyed during moments of high visual exposure” (p. 132). To achieve a desired degree of privacy or social contact at different times the person engages in a process of selective inconspicuousness or selective conspicuousness respectively by manipulating behaviour and/or position. “Whether one wishes to withhold or to reveal information, matching one’s spatial and behavioural conspicuousness with one’s intentions is a key element of privacy regulation” (p. 134).

Whilst the visual access/exposure model is potentially relevant to the degree of contact with neighbours afforded by different types of housing (e.g. houses in rows vs houses in cul-de-sacs), other research has looked at the degree to which the spatial relationships between dwellings make different patterns of social contact more or less likely. Festinger, Schachter & Back (1950) wanted to find out how and why social groups are formed, what is the process of communication and what are the patterns of group structure. Two new housing projects for married students at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Westgate and Westgate West, were ready for occupancy, providing a number of advantages for their study. Westgate consisted of 100 single-family houses arranged in nine courts, whereas Westgate West consisted of 17 former Navy barracks divided into ten apartments per building. As most of the residents were strangers to each other, yet were a homogeneous group, Festinger, et al. were able to study the formation of social groups and the social processes in order to find answers to their questions.

Festinger, et al. decided that to study the complexity of the social life of a community they also needed diverse methodological tools, i.e. observational data, unstructured and structured interviewing, sociometry and field experimentation. Once they had integrated these various data they found that “the most striking item was the dependence of friendship formation on the mere physical arrangement of the houses. People who lived close to one another became friendly with each other, while people who lived far apart did not” (p. 10).

The authors isolated three necessary conditions conducive to friendship formation. One, friendships are likely to develop on the basis of passive contacts made walking to and from home. Passive contact is defined as a casual and unplanned meeting. If these brief meetings are frequent enough a sense of familiarity develops ranging from a nodding acquaintanceship to a speaking relationship and, given the right psychological conditions, into friendship. Two, passive contacts are determined by the physical structure of the spatial environment. Three, Festinger, et al. make a distinction between physical
distance and functional distance, where physical distance is measured distance (the closer people live together the more likely they are to meet one another) and functional distance is to do with the positional relationships of buildings, entrances, staircases and paths, all factors which determine a pattern of movement. Thus functional distance is measured by the number of passive contacts which position and design facilitate.

The authors found a high relationship between passive contacts and friendships and put forward hypotheses that “friendships and group membership will be determined in these communities by passive contacts between neighbors. The pattern and number of such contacts among particular people will depend upon physical and functional distance” (p. 58). Festinger, et al. state that almost all findings were consistent with these hypotheses. They warn that the strong relationship found in their 1950 study between spatial ecology and group formation is less likely to be the case in heterogeneous communities. Wider transpatial ties of kin in the same community (i.e. in other streets in a neighbourhood) may also evolve over time as families become established. What seems to be lacking is a clear idea of these processes of group formation or fragmentation and the role of the spatial environment in this process.

Young & Willmott (1957) found that when people moved from their terraced housing in East London to a more widely spaced housing estate their lives became ‘house-centered’ rather than ‘people-centered’, and ties to kin and therefore a wider community in the neighbourhood, disappeared. Brower (1980) adopting a territorial definition of place attachment (see Section 2.4) achieved through occupancy and the appropriation of space, poses an unresolved question in terms of the opportunities created by residential design improvements: “If new housing narrows the difference between low- and middle-income settings, will it have the effect of shifting low-income people toward a middle-income lifestyle?” (p. 206). There has been some research on the effects of different street forms on neighbouring behaviour. Mayo (1979), for example, found more neighbour contact on cul-de-sacs than on straight or curved streets, (attributing this to fewer people living in the cul-de-sacs). This finding will be of particular interest for this study as the community moved from a straight street layout to a village design with a number of cul-de-sacs and all roads curved.

In one study, Brown and Werner (1985) use Altman’s territoriality theory (that behaviours and cognitions are based on perceived ownership of physical space) as a framework for examining neighbourhood attachment. Design features of cul-de-sacs were found to contribute a greater degree of neighbourhood block attachment than through streets. Their sample consisted of one person (female head of household) per block (40 houses in cul-de-sacs and 99 houses in through streets). They suggest that “the primary territory is integral to the individual’s or family’s sense of self, whereas the secondary territory is integral to the sense of community” (p. 544). In another transactional study, Oxley, et al. (1986) also examined residents’ psychological attachment to a block using a composite set of measures.
This included attitudes reflecting a sense of community, social networks and patterns of seasonal decoration. In this case, respondents were drawn from a single cul-de-sac consisting of 31 houses. A range of social networks were found to exist within the cul-de-sac, defined in terms of space and time (the proximity of houses to each other and by comparing two seasons, summer and winter (Christmas)). The researchers found that not all of each social network’s members lived in the same sections of the street and they suggest that the cul-de-sac might be “in transition from one of a homogeneous, well connected group of neighbors to a diverse set of residents” (p. 671).

Interestingly, whilst these comparative and case studies appear to treat the domain of a community as synonymous with alternative forms of housing cluster (and suggest that cul-de-sacs are the most communal), Hanson & Hillier (1987) and Hillier (1988) argue that repeated enclosures of this kind fragment a community. Hanson and Hillier base their 1987 paper on a review of the Young and Willmott (1957) study of Bethnal Green residents moved from one spatial milieu to another and the account by Gans (1963) of street life amongst a working class community in the West End of the City of Boston. Hanson & Hillier (1987) admonish those, in keeping with present day architectural and planning conventions, who advocate the importance of spatial design in terms of a “correspondence between spatial zones and social identities” (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 251). Instead, “the idea of open, outward facing layouts, with intelligibility and integration given priority over exclusion and group territory” (Hillier, 1988, p. 64) is advocated. This would favour layouts of housing open to the street and to through ‘traffic’ of passers-by.

This is part of a long running argument between those advocating defensible space (e.g. Newman, 1972, who recommends an emphasis of territoriality with the use of physical barriers to exclude strangers) and advocates of spatial syntax (e.g. Hillier & Hanson, 1984). The latter employ measures of the degree to which a set of streets is integrated or segregated and corresponding numbers of people are to be found on the streets at different times (local residents and outsiders). According to Hillier & Hanson (1984) outsiders should be encouraged to enter and/or pass through, by integrated street configurations and permeable boundaries rather than residential enclosures. Whilst Hillier (1988) gives very little credence to the idea that territory and privacy are important psychological and social phenomena, his criticisms of what he deems to be the ‘enclosure-repetition-hierarchy’ will be seen to support the findings in this thesis.

He essentially criticises the idea of “linking groups of dwellings to identifiable and distinct external spaces in the hope that the enclosures or clusters so created would help group identification and interaction. The idea is justified spatially by invoking urban squares, courts and village greens, and socially through notions of group territory, the need for a hierarchy from public to private space, and the assumption that space can only be significant if a definite group of people are identified with it” (Hillier,
1988, p. 63). He criticises a methodology of design in which local enclosures are repeated (morphological repetition). In his view the result is a fragmented community. One of the consequences he suggests is new (in contrast to old) plans for towns which “are intelligible from the air, as plans. But if we try to move around them we quickly lose all sense of where we are. The similarity of the parts, and their predominantly localized reference points, guarantee that on the ground they lack intelligibility” (p. 67).

The concept of nested place attachment is important for this thesis because it will emerge that the participants’ attachment cannot simply be understood as either an attachment to the village and its community or as attachment to their personal dwelling. Thus, the advice of Bonnes, et al. (1990) to adopt a multi-place conceptual system has been helpful in analysing the data of this thesis. Objects and possessions have also been included in the discussions with participants on the basis of the work of Rubinstein (1987; 1989) and Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton (1981).

2.8 Place transitions and transformations

“Change and transition recur in the lives of people and are part of human development. Although for some people change is positive, for others it is difficult to accomplish without disruption and distress” (Fisher & Cooper, 1990, p. preface xi). They also state that little is known as to why change should be threatening, particularly as adapting to change is what the human race has to do in order to survive. They continue that “the human mind should have acquired, by natural selection, the facility for coping with change. It would seem counter-productive to have evolved a system geared to maintaining the present and clinging to the past. Yet it appears that responding adversely to change and transition is characteristic for many people, at least initially” (preface, p.xi).

There is little in the research literature which explores our resistance to change. Notable exceptions are the papers by Sell & Zube (1986) and Zube & Sell (1986). Zube & Sell discuss three mediating variables in the context of environmental change which affect individual and group perceptions, i.e. time, scale and location, stating that “time mediates perception of change through pace, distance and orientation” (p. 165). Change which happens too quickly can result in tension and lack of sensitivity in decision making (McCarthy & Saegert, 1979; Milgram, 1970), whereas a slower pace can facilitate continuity between past and future (Wadley & Ballock, 1980; Appleyard, 1979; Lowenthal, 1979). Perceptions of past or anticipated future events are perfected by their distance from the present (Sell & Zube, 1986). Frequently people react to their perception of future difficulties rather than actualities (Zube & Sell, 1986, quoting Brown, 1976). The scale of change affects the way in which it is perceived. Major projects are more obvious than smaller projects and more gradual residential scale changes. The location of the change and its distance from the observer has been shown to diminish awareness as the
distance increases (Brown, 1976). Zube & Sell (1986) found “very little discussion of positive change in the research literature on environmental change” (p. 166).

Zube & Sell also refer to the natural suspicion of a community towards any changes generated from outside. They suggest, however, that such suspicions can be minimised by the use of local public participation in planning the change. The way in which people learn about environmental change can affect their perception of its significance. This could be clearly seen in the Channel Tunnel Terminal study (Speller, 1988) and will be discussed more fully in Section 2.9.2 of this chapter.

In addition to the mediating variables of time, scale and location, Zube & Sell found that the most important influence to the perception of change were factors that, amongst others, included “age, sense of personal control, values and aesthetics, sense of self-identity and socio-cultural factors” (p. 167). They also suggest that to provide a framework for the analysis of socio-cultural impacts the following elements, proposed by Michelson (1970), should be assessed: “lifestyle, life cycle, social status, value orientations, and environmental pathologies (detrimentally poor housing, noise, pests, crowding)” (p. 167). They do not, however, suggest how these assessments might be usefully employed, i.e. what criteria might be used for assessing lifestyle and whether the emphasis should be on retaining the existing lifestyle or on improving it.

There are three further issues which demand a fuller discussion than has so far been provided. They are the issue of appropriation of immediate surroundings; a sense of personal control over environmental changes; and the concept of assumptive worlds and psycho-social transitions.

2.8.1 Appropriation. The concept of appropriation was introduced by Hegel and developed by Marx during the 19th century. Industrialisation had alienated workers from their product and Marx understood the need for employees to ‘appropriate’ the product by making it part of themselves. Marx thus proposed that the appropriation of an object always included the appropriation of a skill (Graumann, 1976). Marx believed that an individual can only develop within society and he suggested that individual appropriation occurs within a framework of a society’s appropriations, with society preserving and handing down appropriations from generation to generation (Graumann, 1976).

Vygotsky (1962) was the first psychologist to use the concept of appropriation and suggested that people appropriate the past of their culture and society firstly through language and secondly through action. Vygotsky proposed that action in the world is central to thinking and thus “making requires the higher level of thinking that is both awareness of physical reality and consciousness of consciousness” (p. 4). The use of language and action, of understanding through ‘making’, is explored by Robinson (1996), who states that anyone who makes things can see that the process of making not only changes the
environment and modifies what is to be the final product but also the process fundamentally alters the understanding of the object that is being made, thus ‘making’ plays a central role in understanding the environment.

Graumann (1976) explains that “the appropriative character of human activity is reflected in all modes of activity, in perception, orientation and acting. The examples of the child learning how to handle and to ‘understand’ a cup (Leontiev, 1973) or a spoon illustrate well how appropriative activity, mediated in social interaction, is sensory and motor, linguistic and conceptual.” (p. 119). In summary, Graumann states that “individual appropriation is essentially the interiorization of societally defined meanings, a process which is equivalent to the process of humanization” (p. 119). Graumann (1976, p. 124) lists what he considers to be the main modes of appropriating space from a psychological perspective: motion and locomotion (e.g. touching and grasping objects, moving through space); sensory exploration of space (seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, touching, kinesthetic experience); doing (e.g. manipulating, shaping, destroying); cognitive-linguistic mastery (e.g. mapping, modelling, naming); communicating (e.g. use of space and spatial objects as media of communication); taking possession (e.g. occupation, fencing, buying, defending); and personalisation of space (e.g. furnishing rooms, decorating, gardening).

Graumann (1988) continues to work on appropriation and concludes that “appropriation is more than acquisition, it is maintenance which, as a rule, means work, mostly of the physical kind” (p. 62). This type of appropriation was clearly expressed by a participant for the Channel Tunnel terminal study (Speller, 1988, p. 55): “I have a stream running by my house and although it is not my stream, I have dug it out rather more widely and planted the banks. I spend every spare hour on it. I have developed it into something special. It doesn’t run through my garden and it isn’t mine but I am looking after it”.

Andrews (1991) looked at participation in the housing process in Liverpool and states that “appropriation was found to occur when participants were extensively involved in setting up and managing their own co-operatives. Through such practical activity members took possession of the process that produced their housing, the product that resulted and the ongoing management of that product. By taking possession and making it their own, they changed their relationship with the physical and social environment” (p. 87). Andrews quotes Appleyard (1979) as pointing to the critical importance of citizen participation in environmental decisions since that is how people can possess and feel responsible for their environment. He also claims that this reduces alienation. In this thesis, not only is appropriation considered a positive outcome for the reasons given by Appleyard but also because, as will be seen in subsequent chapters, it is a facilitator of place attachment and its impact on identity.
2.8.2 Personal control and environmental manageability. Since Rotter’s seminal paper on ‘locus of control’ in 1966, the concept of internal vs external control has been used extensively to explain behaviour, in particular maladaptive behaviours like passivity and withdrawal. Seligman (1975) and Abramson, Seligman & Teasdale (1978) developed a model of helplessness, which suggests that withdrawal behaviour is a consequence of perceived inability to control one’s life space. Locus of control and helplessness theorists equate control with the ability to change the environment, i.e. the individual must effect a change in his environment to fit his need. Much of the supporting research has been laboratory orientated, where subjects are exposed to stressful situations which they cannot control and from which they cannot withdraw themselves physically.

Rothbaum, Weisz & Snyder (1982) argue that the uncontrollability model is too simplistic and only deals with primary control. It ignores the individual’s wish and ability to obtain a state of equilibrium through assimilation and accommodation to “fit in with the world and to flow with the current” (p. 8). Rothbaum et al. believe that “underlying attributions and behaviours [are] a powerful motivation to fit in with the environment”, whereas uncontrollability theorists highlight the absence of attempts to change the world and the absence of motivation for control (Wortman & Brehm, 1975). Rothbaum and colleagues found evidence of secondary control (predictive, illusory, vicarious and interpretive control) and argue that the “key difference between primary and secondary control is that in the former case the goal is to change the environment whereas in the latter case the goal is to fit in with the environment” (p. 9).

Closely connected to control over a situation is predictability. Baum & Valins (1977) found, for example, that members of cohesive groups felt less crowded in high density conditions because such groups provided greater predictability and therefore controllability of the environment. Winkel (1981), when looking at change, stability and control, believes that “the concept of control places too much emphasis on the person as separate from or in conflict with the environment” (p. 493). Most work neglects the “limitations on the person’s ability or desire to monitor and control the environment”. Winkel suggests that the concept of ‘environmental manageability’ is more useful when looking at the relationship between people and their physical environment. Thus a “manageable environment is one in which the residents of an area are able to organize information from their immediate socio-physical environment in such a way that they can develop a predictive system that allows them to judge whether a setting supports their goals and purposes” (p. 493).

Marris (1974, p. 6) also looks at the necessity of predictability. “We could not survive even for a day if our physical environment were not predictable.” He explains how we even impose regularity on events which are in fact not alike in order to manage. “We can assimilate new experiences by placing them in the context of a familiar predictable pattern of our former experiences. It matters not whether this
pattern suits others but it is vital to our own survival that there is such a pattern. If it is destroyed we have no way of placing any new experience in context.”

These are important points for this thesis. Predictability, personal control and environmental manageability will emerge as crucial factors in the participants’ experience of the Arkwright relocation.

2.8.3 The concept of psycho-social transitions. Major changes in state in people’s lives cause the individuals to reconsider their views of themselves and the world around them. It is the ‘life space’ (Lewin, 1935) which is likely to be the first affected and the importance of changes in the life space will depend upon the way in which it affects our assumptions. These assumptions about self and those parts of the environment with which the self interacts create our ‘assumptive world’. As Parkes (1971, p. 103) states: “The assumptive world is the only world we know and it includes everything we know or think we know. It includes our interpretation of the past and our expectations for the future, our plans and our prejudices. Any or all of these may need to change as a result of changes in the life space.”

Bowlby (1969) talked of ‘world models’, Parkes (1971) named it ‘assumptive world’, Marris (1974) used ‘structures of meaning’ and Epstein (1980) explained his ‘theory of reality’. Whilst containing similarities and differences, each of these terms describes a pattern or framework which enables us to organize our existence, relate to our environment and plan for our future. Minor changes can be assimilated and accommodated into an existing schema without the need for a drastic readjustment of assumptions but “major changes in life space which are lasting in their effects, which take place over a relatively short period of time and which affect large areas of the assumptive world cannot be readily assimilated” (Parkes, 1971, p. 103). Adaptive abilities are threatened and our assumptive world is disrupted. We experience a resistance to change. Parkes termed these changes psycho-social transitions.

The concept developed by Parkes proved useful in making partial sense of the interview data of the Channel Tunnel Terminal study (Speller, 1988) but, more importantly, it made this researcher more fully aware of the existence of different assumptive worlds and made her aware of the different problems which people with different assumptive worlds may experience. Knowledge of this concept strengthened the need to explore participants’ assumptive worlds and to be sensitive to the psycho-social transitions they may be experiencing. To conclude this section on assumptive worlds, it is worth noting that Janoff-Bulman & Timko (1985) found that respondents’ assumptive worlds may not be readily available. They state that “most individuals would be unable to report on their personal theories if asked to do so” (p. 80). An ethogenic view (such as that proposed by Marsh, et al., 1978) would suggest that assumptive worlds are only accessible when looking at actions and analysing accounts of actions, thus “using two mutually supporting and reciprocally checking ways of discovering the underlying system of
social knowledge and belief” (p. 20). The experience of a traumatic event, however, usually demands that we re-examine our assumptions. As Epstein (1979, p. 49) states: “whenever an emotion occurs, it can be assumed that a postulate of significance to an individual self-system has been indicated.” It is often only then that we become conscious of our assumptions. This understanding and the experience gained from the Channel Tunnel Terminal study permeates the approach adopted in this study of the Arkwright relocation.

2.9 Enforced relocations
Although the Arkwright community relocation was an enforced relocation, the main focus of the study was on the psychological concepts of place and place attachment and their relationship to identity. The enforced relocation provided the background and context rather than the main focus, hence this section will be relatively brief.

A review of the enforced residential relocation literature reveals that there are three main categories of studies:

1. Research carried out after natural and technological disasters, where the emphasis is upon emergency evacuation. The studies are generally post hoc and the main focus tends to be on stress and coping mechanisms, two areas which are, however, not addressed in this thesis.

2. Many studies address the enforced relocation of elderly people into institutions (e.g. Dimond, et al., 1987; Ekström, 1994) and there is also a growing body of research literature on patients being discharged from large psychiatric institutions to live amongst a more normal community. The issues addressed are generally impacts on physical and mental health, stress and coping strategies. It was decided for the Arkwright study that as the relocation stretched over 6 years it would be impossible to measure any health effects as these could equally be due to a natural biological decline.

3. The refurbishment of housing estates is an extensive research area. The main focus of these studies, however, tends to be not on the process but on the outcome, i.e. levels of satisfaction with the new environment, which, again, is not a primary concern for this thesis.

Many of the community relocation studies are carried out within sociological and urban planning disciplines (e.g. Young & Willmott, 1957; Wadley & Ballock, 1980) and do, therefore, not address the issues which are central to this work, i.e. the individual’s attachment to place and the meanings a place may hold for the individual. Reviews of a wider range of relocation studies can be found in Heller (1982) and Newman & Owen (1982). Some selected authors who did include place and place
attachment concepts have been included in the place attachment section (Section 2.5 of this chapter), e.g. Rowles, 1983 and Rubinstein, 1989, where their work was thought to be more usefully placed.

This section will, instead, concentrate on three relocation studies which have been influential for this work. These include the classical paper by Fried (1963) which was important in sensitising the researcher to the issues relevant for her MSc dissertation on the psycho-social impacts of the Channel Tunnel Terminal project (1988). The second study is that MSc dissertation which has influenced the way in which the researcher views enforced environmental change and which led directly to the Arkwright study. The third study is Milligan’s (1998) paper on the enforced (from the staff’s point of view) relocation of a coffee house on campus. Milligan’s findings contain many similarities to the Arkwright study, suggesting that there may be basic findings, when there is a loss of place, which are universal across different contexts.

2.9.1 Fried (1963). His powerful image of “Grieving for a lost home” has come to encapsulate the idea that people’s loss of a much loved home can be comparable to “a grief response showing most of the characteristics of grief and mourning for a lost person” (p. 167). Fried explored the experiences of those forced to move out of the former working class ‘slum’ residential area in the West End of Boston. Fried’s work was groundbreaking in terms of its expression of the psychological and social impact of place disruptions. Whilst the term home is often associated with a house, Fried adopted a broader notion of home and spatial identity. This included the residential area of social networks and a related sense of belongingness, characteristic of the working class community studied and subsequent fragmentation (discontinuity) of their sense of spatial and group identity.

There seemed to be little interest in the concept of person-place relationship until Fried’s study. He only briefly describes his methodology for the study, mostly in a footnote to the paper. He carried out a two-phase longitudinal study, with the post-relocation interviews at approximately two years after the relocation but he only tells the reader that the pre-move interviews were carried out “at the time the land was taken by the city” (footnote, p. 154). Fried’s analysis was based primarily on the comparison of information from these interviews with a randomly selected sample of 473 women from households in the area before their relocation and a high proportion of them (92%) were re-interviewed approximately two years after relocation. Men were also included in the study but Fried explains that “primary emphasis will be given to the results with the women since we do not have as full a range of pre-relocation information for the men” (footnote, p. 154). He barely mentions the quantitative analysis but uses some percentages to give weight to the depth of grief reactions. The value of the paper, however, lies in his insights into the issues involved, i.e. that for working class people (and he states explicitly that this would not be the case for a middle class area) home extends beyond the ‘dwelling unit’. Fried refers to an earlier paper (Fried & Gleicher, 1961) from which he quotes in support of this finding.
Fried sensitively describes the grief people experienced when being faced with the loss of their social and spatial identity and states based on Bowlby’s early work and Marris’ (1958) research on widows. He was able to demonstrate bereavement stages (disbelief, anger and depression) and found that “the greater a person’s pre-relocation commitment to the area, the more likely he is to react with marked grief” (p. 154). Fried proposed that the enforced relocation from the West End involved the fragmentation of two components essential to ‘West Enders’ identity, namely spatial identity and group identity both of which are associated with strong affective elements. He postulates that “a sense of spatial identity is fundamental to human functioning. It represents a phenomenal or ideational integration of important experiences concerning environmental arrangements and contacts in relation to the individual’s conception of his own body in space. It is based on spatial memories, spatial imagery, the spatial framework of current activity, and the implicit spatial components of ideals and aspirations” (p. 156). He also explains his findings on group identity: “External stability is also extremely important in interpersonal patterns within the working class. And dislocation and relocation ... destroys the sense of group identity of a great many individuals” (p. 157). Fried cites Erikson (1946) and the concept of ‘group identity’ originally formulated by him, and continues. “Since, most notably in the working class, effective relationships with others are dependent upon a continuing sense of common group identity, the experience of loss and disruption of these affiliations is intense and frequently irrevocable” (p. 157). Thus Fried emphasizes the importance of spatial factors in understanding the affective changes experienced by those undergoing relocation and even more centrally for this thesis, he points to the importance of the spatial environment in providing a stable framework for interpersonal patterns and group identity within working class communities.

Fried’s study has been widely cited. He is believed to be the first person to have linked identity with the physical environment and its importance for interpersonal relationships when these contain memories which are tied to a specific spatial environment and aspirations which can only be fulfilled within that environment.

At the EDRA Conference in 1995, over 30 years later, Fried reported that members of the old West End community, although widely dispersed, still meet regularly, produce their own newspaper, and are said to be still grieving for a now idealised but lost world.

Fried’s work will be seen to be particularly important for the Arkwright study which will further attempt to unravel the relationship between the physical environment and identity. He made the significant connection between the loss of place and bereavement, thus pointing to the central role which place can play in an individual’s well-being. This acknowledgement of the importance of place is one of the central aspects which prompted the research described in this thesis.
2.9.2 *Speller (1988)*. The communities principally affected by the building of the Channel Tunnel Terminal on the English side of the Channel were in Newington and Peene. These were two rural villages, built against the steeply rising North Downs, overlooking a valley containing farm land and ancient forest. The Channel Tunnel Terminal site now covers the valley and access roads to the terminal have taken up additional land. Eighteen houses, some of which had been protected by conservation laws, were demolished to accommodate the Terminal, leaving the remaining buildings close to the Terminal site. The villagers had been employed mainly in farming or associated trades.

Whilst only eighteen families had to be relocated, for the remaining villagers their surroundings had undergone a transformation from a rural to an industrial site which was no longer congruent with their identities.

The aim of the study was to explore the residents’ perception of the enforced environmental change, to establish the breadth and depth of their responses and to assess the degree to which the enforced changes resulted in positive or negative effects. It was also hoped to draw attention to the importance of broadening the scope of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) to include all aspects of the definition in Article 3 of the EEC Directive (1985/337/EEC).

It was decided to use a qualitative approach to explore the range of feelings and attitudes towards the transformation of their environment. Interviews were semi-structured to keep within the theoretical framework of place identity issues, the reduction in personal control, and psycho-social transitions and to allow participants to express their perceptions, interpretations and feelings towards the Channel Tunnel project. In all, 31 of the 64 remaining households were interviewed (excluding the pilot study) plus 10 of the 34 households which had voluntarily chosen to move away as a result of the project. The interviews were conducted over a period of 5 weeks in July/August of 1988, taped and subsequently transcribed. The analysis involved the use of memo cards (Miles & Huberman, 1984) to assist in abstraction and organisation of the interview data.

The findings were discussed under the headings of place identity, personal control and psycho-social transitions.

**Place identity.** The people of Newington and Peene had been largely unaware of the emotional importance of their environment until the transformation became a reality. Participants described a loss of continuity with their past on a spatial and social level; continuity of the future as they were both unable to project ahead because there were a number of physical changes during the construction period and because their rural identity was incongruent with the developing transformations of their environment; and discontinuity of meaningful landmarks. Participants indicated that, for example, not
being able to identify the site where their house once stood (because of levelling of the 450 acre terrain) created feelings of confusion, frustration, disorientation and it affected the belief in their own ability to retain important landmarks.

**Personal control.** The Channel Tunnel was a project to benefit the nation and had its own momentum. There was no public participation and people residing near the terminal area or even the people who were evicted from their properties were not in any way consulted. Only the more affluent members of the population could afford to move away and it can be argued that these residents had retained some personal control. The remaining residents felt ignored and their lives had become unpredictable. The participants’ accounts indicated clearly a link between lack of control and self esteem. This will be relevant for the Arkwright study since the reverse was the case in that the new village was to be designed by community architects with the involvement of the residents, hence a sense of control should have been high.

**Psycho-social transitions.** In rural areas it is inevitable that the landscape will form an integral part of the culture. The villagers had enjoyed an expansive view across the valley. The atmosphere had been peaceful. By 1988, two very different ideologies were competing for dominance in Newington and Peene. The residents’ care for the natural environment mirrored Heidegger’s (1947) appeal for guardianship, for tending and protecting rather than mastering the environment. By contrast Eurotunnel’s actions were driven by the commercial and financial considerations of the project. In addition to ideological incompatibilities, the pace and the extent of change made it impossible for residents to assimilate their new environment.

Reaction to change depends largely upon whether it is voluntary or involuntary and changes in response to one’s own plans are the most acceptable. Even if changes are enforced, acceptance is more easily achieved if plans are properly discussed in advance and if there is no obvious injustice. This is what should have been the case with the Arkwright relocation. There was a lengthy period of preparation, the community was involved in the decision making and the housing in the new village was to be of a higher standard. The outcome is discussed in Chapters 8 and 9.

**2.9.3 Milligan (1998).** This review of the place attachment literature concludes with a detailed analysis of Milligan’s (1998) paper. Although describing the effects of the relocation of a coffee house rather than a complete village, there is a high degree of relevance to the Arkwright study in her findings.

The paper is written from a symbolic interactionist’s perspective and looks at the experiences of the staff of a student coffee bar resulting from its relocation. Milligan’s theoretical perspective on the relocation of the Coffee House is similar to that underlying this thesis (the social constructivist view that it is the
meanings given to situations by the participants which determine their actions) but with one important difference. Within a symbolic interactionist perspective, the meaning given to physical locations arises out of the person-to-person interactions which are carried out there. Thus, places themselves (accepting Milligan’s point that places are socially as well as physically constructed) are merely “the stages for social interaction” (1998, p. 2). An environmental psychological approach would claim that this view has too narrow a focus. In concentrating on person-to-person interaction with the place as merely the stage, the background, it fails to take sufficient account of the nature of the location itself and the meanings derived from aspects other than person-to-person interaction. This includes one’s own behaviour and emotions in the location (that is where I play football or that is where I go when I want to be alone where nobody can find me) or even the degree to which one has changed the environment (this is the garden I have created). Moreover, it fails to highlight that these meanings are part of the person-environment concept. It is important to emphasize that these meanings are still fundamentally social in origin: for example, the idea of playing football, having a garden or even withdrawing from the world are products of a culture but these occur within a wider social context, wider than just intra-individual. It is suggested that in this respect Milligan’s focus on interaction alone is too narrow.

Milligan’s approach was to act as a ‘participant-observer’ by working in the Coffee House for four months before the move and 18 months after the move. In addition, she carried out a questionnaire survey of staff prior to the move, and in depth interviews of two to four hours each with fifteen employees of the old Coffee House, supplemented by a further ten short interviews.

Milligan’s definition of place attachment is “the emotional link formed by an individual to a physical site that has been given meaning through interaction” (1998, p. 2). She concludes from the study that place attachment has two ‘interwoven’ components: interactional past and interactional potential.

When considering interactional past, there are a number of points in Milligan’s paper which appear to be relevant to this thesis. The first is her claim that place attachment of the employees to the old Coffee House “became much more apparent after its disruption” (p. 3). It is interesting to note that Milligan links this ‘post hoc’ awareness of the value of the place to identity. She writes, “People often speak of not knowing what they have lost until it is gone, but this is exactly the feature of nostalgia which acts to create continuity in identity” and continues, “Thus, place attachment serves as an organizer for the past through categorizing the site-specific memories as continuous” (p. 11).

Secondly, she is interested in the concept of the spatial continuity of experience. “Breaks in continuity provide guidelines for breaks in defining one’s experiences and activities, allowing them to be categorized as different due to the fact that they occurred in different places” (p. 9).
According to Milligan, experiences of a place do not have to be outstanding or unusual to contribute to place attachment: “Everyday, tedious and even unpleasant experiences may play into the formation of meaningful attachments” (pp. 10-11). She quotes staff who describe the old coffee house “in deprecating terms, but with a strong sense of affection” (p. 11).

It is also interesting to note that the old Coffee House employees resented the move and it appears from Milligan’s analysis that they did not adapt to the new environment. They felt a sense of loss because the particularities of the old environment which suited them (i.e. supported and helped their interaction with other employees and with customers) had gone.

The second component of place attachment in Milligan’s model, the ‘interaction potential’ of the site, refers to people’s beliefs about the likely or possible interactions which may be carried out there. One source of these beliefs, for places that are ongoing, is the kind of interaction (activities and experiences) which has occurred in the place in the past. Milligan states that, “Locational socialization occurs ... as a continual process through which repeated interactions in a site act to establish meanings and patterns of behavior often shared by others who use the same site (p. 16)”. She describes how the move prevented employees following their “routinized patterns of activity”, and the type of interactions which they had experienced there. This disrupted their stability and she reports that whilst this lessened with time, this “sense of disruption and frustration ... never fully dissipated” (p. 17).

Milligan explores two aspects of the physical characteristics of the old and new Coffee Houses which, she says, give rise to differing interaction potentials. First, the layout of the two sites gave quite different opportunities for social contact with other staff. Secondly, the atmosphere of the two sites was different (mainly because of different decor and furnishings), giving rise to different expectations about behaviour and enjoyment of the place. These were seen as representing different values and ethos: “The atmosphere of the new Coffee House was perceived by employees as not allowing the same types of behavior that had made the old Coffee House so enjoyable. It was not a place in which they wanted to hang out because the same types of things could not happen in it” (p. 25).

The links between Milligan’s findings and this thesis are the theoretical concepts of identity, distinctiveness, continuity, congruence, and stimulation, in so far as they relate to the relocation of a community.

2.10 Summary

The purpose of this review was to obtain an understanding of the vast volume of theoretical and empirical work on place attachment and place identity in order to clarify the relationship between person and place. The sub-headings of place; place vs space; place identity; place attachment; time and
place; nested place attachment and place identity; place transitions and transformations; and enforced relocation gave a partly chronological, partly subject-related structure to help guide the reader through this maze. Four points need to be summarized:

Firstly, the need to use terminology more rigorously has been highlighted. Concepts have often been used interchangeably, resulting in a failure to distinguish between different aspects. Even on the occasion when concepts have been clearly defined, the definition has not always been adhered to consistently. In this study, wherever the terms place and place attachment are used, it is intended that they should be defined as follows:

**Place.** The literature discussed in Section 2.2 pointed to a definition of ‘place’, proposed by Relph (1976), as something involving three aspects: its physical features; those activities which are carried out there; and the shared and personal meanings associated with it. These components of place have been included in the definition of place for this work. Henceforth, ‘place’ is defined as a geographical space which has acquired meaning through a person’s interaction with the space, i.e. whereas space is only physical, place is seen as both physical and social. The transactional world view (discussed in Chapter 1), emphasizing the dynamic relationship between person, culture, time and place, is also fundamental to this thesis.

**Attachment to place.** For this term it has been decided to adopt Brown & Perkins’ (1992) definition, i.e. “Place attachment involves positively experienced bonds, sometimes occurring without awareness, that are developed over time from the behavioral, affective, and cognitive ties between individuals and or groups and their sociophysical environment” (p. 284). This definition is preferred to any of the others discussed because it addresses both the nature of place attachment (positively experienced bonds) and its origin (behavioural, affective and cognitive ties over time). Moreover, unlike many definitions, it acknowledges that place attachment may involve groups and their socio-physical environment, rather than isolated individuals. It is thus an explicitly social definition of place attachment.

**Place identification.** This term is often used interchangeably with place identity and place attachment. Graumann (1983) states clearly that identification is the process towards attaining identity and that ‘identification’ refers primarily to acquisition. A more difficult question to answer is ‘what then is the difference between place identification and place attachment?’ There seems to be little and the difference may simply lie in the emphasis one places on the affective or on the cognitive component. Hence, whilst an overlap between these two terms is acknowledged, for this study the term place attachment is preferred as it emphasizes the emotional aspects of place.
Secondly, the question of direction of causality emerged from the research literature review. Is an emotional bond to place a precursor to or basis for identity to evolve or is there evidence for the reverse, i.e. that a person has firstly to develop an identity facilitated by a place before an attachment to place can be developed? The work of Fuhrer & Kaiser (1992) may help. They point to three processes which they state give rise to place attachment. Two of these are interpersonal, i.e. the place as carrier of identity (the self receiving information) and the place as facilitator of social processes (others receiving information about the self) and one is intrapersonal, the place as facilitator of emotional needs. In order for the place to reflect the individual, it will often be necessary for that individual to change the place physically, to appropriate it and thus to create an emotional bond with the place although at the same time this process will give information about the self to others or, equally importantly, to the self. The important issue here is that these processes occur simultaneously. It is, therefore, proposed that the issue of the direction of causality is an inappropriate question to pose since the process of place attachment is intertwined with the identity processes and it is this complexity of their relationship which a transactional view would wish to acknowledge and focus upon.

The third point, related to the foregoing, is that a longitudinal approach is the preferred means of studying this complex and dynamic relationship between person and place, in order to understand their mutual development and influence over time.

The fourth point concerns the question of whether place attachment is a process or a product. It is clear from the research literature review that the concept can be operationalized in both ways, i.e. attachment to place can be researched as a process and as an outcome.

It was considered that the best integrative model to guide this research is Breakwell’s (1986; 1992) Identity Process Theory as it allows for the incorporation of place. This theory will be discussed in the next chapter and the theoretical framework within which this work has been carried out will be outlined. Research questions arising from this review and the literature review of the Identity Process Theory will be posed at the end of Chapter 3.

**Chapter Three**

**Identity Process Theory and place literature**

3.1 Introduction

Whilst Chapter 2 discussed the literature on place, place attachment and place identity, the majority of that literature was produced within an explicitly environmental psychological disciplinary tradition and hence, failed to address in much detail the nature of identity, an important topic of this study. This
chapter, therefore, addresses a different body of literature: that of social psychology, to find a theory which is able to provide a theoretical framework for this research. Three possibilities are considered. The first is Breakwell’s Identity Process Theory (IPT), which not only describes the nature of ‘identity’ but also looks at how people deal with threats to their identity. It seemed reasonable to assume that the relocation of Arkwright might have involved threats to the residents’ identities and Breakwell’s theory offers a strong theoretical framework within which to examine this assumption. In addition, in developing the theoretical position taken here, Tajfel’s Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Turner’s Self-Categorisation Theory (SCT) were examined since some of the environmental psychology work which was discussed in the previous chapter has been influenced by these theories (e.g. Graumann, 1974; 1983). It was decided, however, that these latter theories could not provide an adequate background to this research because SIT is a theory of intergroup relations rather than a theory of identity and both SIT and SCT were making assumptions about the identity which were not considered appropriate for this work. These are, for example, that SIT and SCT assume a distinction between the personal and social components of identity; they do not take into consideration the temporal dimensions; they only put forward ‘self esteem’ as a motivator; and they do not take into account the dynamic nature of person and place.

IPT, however, sees the identity content as including the various social identities of a person; there is no split between individual identity, social identity and human identity, as exists in SCT. Secondly, the group-related cognitive processes described by SIT, such as positively valuing dimensions which heighten ingroup-outgroup distinctiveness, can be seen as examples of the ways in which identity is maintained by means of the self-esteem principle. A third example, this time from SCT, is that identity can operate at different levels (human, personal, national identities) which is explained within IPT in terms of the hierarchical structuring of identity content and values.

Environmental Psychology has not, as yet, developed an integrative model of place and identity. Hence a theory of identity was sought which could more directly take account of the importance of change and of place. Breakwell’s theory was chosen to facilitate the formulation of research questions. This chapter briefly outlines Breakwell’s Identity Process Theory and reviews some of the literature based on IPT to examine how place has been treated within IPT theory and research.

3.2 Identity Process Theory

The previous chapter discussed the psychological importance of place. What was missing from those discussions was an explicit consideration of the nature of identity, “the subjective concept of oneself as a person” (Vignoles, Chryssoucoou & Breakwell, in press), and how place and place attachment relate to identity. What was required for this thesis was a theory of identity which both acknowledged the
role of the social world (in its widest sense, including socially constructed objects such as place) and which specifically addressed the effect on identity of changing external circumstances.

Breakwell’s Identity Process Theory is such a theory; it can provide the basis for understanding the effects on identity of the enforced relocation of Arkwright. Identity Process Theory (IPT) was developed to explain what happens when external changes threaten an individual’s identity. The basic theory, put forward by Breakwell (1986; 1988; 1992) describes how an individual’s identity is composed of two distinct but related planes or sets of dimensions, the content dimension and the evaluative dimension. Breakwell traces her derivation of these dimensions back to William James, Freud and Mead. The content dimension contains information about the individual, including behavioural, physical, psychological and life-historical aspects and, importantly, also including group membership and category identifications. The value plane of the identity structure contains the current evaluation of each of the content dimensions or items. These evaluations change over time because of changes in the individual or in the wider society. As in the more general cognitive dimensions described in Kelly’s (1955) Personal Construct Psychology, the content plane is itself structured, so that some aspects are more central than others, some are superordinate to others and vice versa, and this structure changes over time and circumstance. Thus, identity is essentially dynamic rather than fixed.

In this structure of identity, the content and value planes are ‘filled’ by two processes which Breakwell claims are universal (i.e. not culturally dependent): assimilation-accommodation and evaluation. Assimilation-accommodation is a “two-pronged process” (Breakwell, 1988, p. 193), closely related to the cognitive processes of assimilation and accommodation described by Piaget as underlying the cognitive development of children. Assimilation is the absorption of new information into the pre-existing identity structure; accommodation is adjustment of the identity structure to include the new information. Thus, unlike Piagetian assimilation and accommodation, these two are seen to operate in tandem in terms of the development of identity. Moreover, Breakwell makes it clear that these are active, motivated processes rather than a mechanical addition of facts; the dual process “operates as an editor and censor at the same time as it records events” (Breakwell, 1988, p. 193). Similarly, the continuous process of evaluation of the identity elements (the content plane) is purposive and motivated in order to achieve a positive outcome for the self. Four basic principles guide the assimilation-accommodation and evaluation processes in order to achieve the desirable outcomes.

These four motivational (or ‘desirable end-state’) principles are: distinctiveness, self-esteem, self-efficacy and continuity. If a threat to identity occurs, behaviour or cognitive processes are adjusted in order to maintain or increase the individual’s sense of distinctiveness, self-esteem, self-efficacy or continuity, as a means of dealing with the threat. It is important to emphasize that Breakwell has specifically stated that this list of identity principles is neither exhaustive nor universally (cross-
culturally) applicable (in contrast to the identity processes of assimilation-accommodation and evaluation). The principles are rather “reifications of what society regards as acceptable endstates for identity” (Breakwell, 1987, p. 107). The four principles on which she focuses include the key factors for which there is some sizeable body of evidence from within our culture. Breakwell’s (1986) earlier descriptions of the theory included only three principles, with self-efficacy being added in the 1992 paper.

Evidence for the principle of distinctiveness derives in part from studies of intergroup processes. As will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sections of this chapter (which concentrate on theories of social identity and social categorisation), intergroup comparisons often involve emphasising the distinctions between one’s own group and those of other people. Breakwell (1988) cites work by Snyder & Fromkin (1980) and Maslach (1984) which suggests that interpersonal comparisons are used in a similar way to establish personal distinctiveness. There have, however, been studies on distinctiveness outside the context of groups. For example, the positive evaluation of scarce experiences (Fromkin, 1970), the increased recollection of information which distinguishes an individual from other people (Leyens, Yzerbyt & Rogier, 1997) and the negative effect on mood of the belief that one is very similar to other people (Fromkin, 1972). The distinctiveness principle has been the subject of much questioning regarding its cultural specificity (e.g. Breakwell, 1997; Triandis, 1995). Vignoles, et al. (in press) argue, however, that distinctiveness is indeed relevant in non-Western cultural systems but that different sources of distinctiveness, position, difference and separateness, may be relevant in different cultures. Moreover, Breakwell (1987; 1993) has pointed out that there appears to be a tendency to attempt to achieve moderate rather than extreme levels of distinctiveness (e.g. Snyder & Fromkin, 1980), such that distinctiveness and evaluation have an inverted U-shaped relationship. Breakwell (1988) also points out that an individual’s identity may include, as valued aspects of self, both group distinctiveness and individual distinctiveness. Brewer (1991) suggest that this could, at least in part, explain the curvilinear relationship between distinctiveness and evaluation, where the optimal level of distinctiveness represents a balance between individual and collective distinctiveness. Another point is made by Codol (1984), i.e. that the distinctiveness must be socially recognized in order to be relevant to identity. Individuals must project a sense of distinctiveness to others, rather than simply develop and value it within themselves (Vignoles, et al., in press). Evidence from the Arkwright study reported in this thesis will, amongst other things, contribute to the ongoing discussion about the exact nature and generality of the distinctiveness principle.

Self-esteem has been recognized as a key psychological principle since the early days of psychology. William McDougall, in his 1923 “Outline of Psychology”, referred to the importance of the “self-regarding sentiment” (quoted in Thouless, 1967, p. 305). There is by now a wide range of empirical studies supporting the central role of self-esteem in identity. A number of studies have also found that
coping reactions along the lines suggested by IPT are elicited when self-esteem is threatened (e.g. Greenberg & Pyszczynski, 1985; Steele, 1988).

The principle of self-efficacy, “the wish to feel competent and in control of one’s life”, is, as Breakwell (1988, p. 194) points out, closely related to self-esteem. A number of studies have focused on the deleterious effect on self of the loss of self-efficacy, including severe depression (Seligman, 1975), whereas feelings of self-efficacy are related to feelings of well-being (Bandura, 1982). The important point is that it is the person’s subjective feelings of self-efficacy which are relevant here, rather than any objective measure. Langer (1975), for example, found that people claim self-efficacy to explain outcomes which are actually the result of chance processes. Thus, in terms of the effectiveness of dealing with threats to identity, it is an individual’s self-perception of efficacy which is important. This point has relevance in the context of the Arkwright relocation, as will be discussed in Chapter 8.

Continuity, similarly, is seen by Breakwell as relating to subjective, self-perceived continuity “across time and situation” (Breakwell, 1986, p. 24) and she distinguishes this from consistency, stating that “there can be continuity in inconsistency” (Breakwell, 1988, p. 194). Continuity involves not the complete absence of change but some connection between the past, the present and the future within identity. The Arkwright in-depth data supports this point which is addressed in Chapter 8. Absence of continuity is usually experienced negatively (Rosenberg, 1986) and Breakwell (1986) reports on people’s efforts to maintain feelings of continuity in the face of serious life events which disrupt continuity, such as unemployment or bereavement.

There are other aspects of IPT (such as a categorisation of the different types of threat and the corresponding coping mechanisms which will be employed) which are not of direct relevance to this thesis. Breakwell does, however, raise three issues which are relevant here. The first is the question of the relative salience of the four principles in controlling identity processes, suggesting that “in all probability the salience-hierarchy will be situation-specific and temporally relative” (1988, p. 195). Chapter 8 will explore the question of the relative salience of each identity principle over time during a situation of major change for the individual.

The second issue raised by Breakwell is the probable historical specificity of the identity principles (Breakwell, 1988). Although it could be argued that this study did not extend over a time period long enough for changes in the broader culture to be discernible, the relatively major change in the circumstances of the Arkwright villagers as a result of the relocation does provide an example of the potential for societal change. If changes in the identity principles are found to occur for these villagers over the duration of the relocation, this would confirm Breakwell’s view that “the principles guiding the operation of these (identity) processes must be acknowledged to be both culturally and temporally
specific. They are, after all, reifications of what society regards as acceptable endstates for identity; when society changes, they will change” (p. 196). Evidence for such a change within the Arkwright society will be discussed in Chapters 7 and 8 in the context of a move from a collective level to an individual level of operation.

Thirdly, Breakwell specifically discusses the likely identity effects of being in a new place (Breakwell, 1996), cited by Twigger-Ross, et al. (in preparation). She considers that a change of place may alter the relative importance to the individual of various aspects of their identity, particularly those aspects which were supported by the previous location. This may result in the previous location becoming either more important (if the person values the aspects of identity which the location supported) or irrelevant (Breakwell terms this ‘dislocation’, when the previous location becomes irrelevant because the related aspects of identity are no longer salient). In addition, the new place may itself act as a threat to identity, if it presents new content or causes a change in the evaluations composing the previous identity. In support of these ideas, Timotijevic (2000) reports Thoits’ (1991) claim that reactions to threats from the environment cannot be understood without taking into account how self-identity will make particular aspects of the environment differentially salient.

A number of studies have used Identity Process Theory (IPT) in a place-related context. Twigger (1994) and Twigger-Ross & Uzzell (1996) provide a review of this literature, some examples of which are repeated here. Korpela (1989) found that adolescents used place to maintain a positive sense of identity by means of the self-esteem principle. Twigger-Ross & Uzzell (1996), in their own empirical study, found that attachment to a local area was used by people to help maintain their identity, with differences between people in their degree of attachment corresponding to a difference in their reference to distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy and self-esteem when discussing the locale. Thus, both these studies point to the role of place in forming and supporting identity. This is supported by the work of Macdonald (1997) who, whilst not working strictly within an IPT framework, found that ‘localness’ related both to distinctiveness and to ‘belonging’, in terms of distinguishing those who are part of the place from those who do not belong.

Devine-Wright & Lyons (1997) looked at a particular way in which places can act to support identity, that is, through acting as a source of social meanings and memories which contribute to collective (in this case, national) identity. The idea of place as a locus of memories and meaning which is important to identity will be shown to be of particular relevance in the Arkwright context. This concept of places as the bearer of cues for continuity has been discussed by others, such as Korpela (1989, p. 251), who stated that “the continuity of self-experience is also maintained by fixing aids for memory in the environment. The place itself or the objects in the place can remind one of one’s past and offers a concrete background against which one is able to compare oneself at different times .... This creates
coherence and continuity in one’s self-conceptions”, and Rubinstein & Parmelee (1992, p. 147) who claim that “places and things are important symbols of the self, cues to memories of significant life experiences and a means of maintaining, reviewing, and extending one’s sense of self...” It should be noted that places and ‘things’ are seen by these theorists as being of equal importance in terms of bearing these cues about the self.

Twigger-Ross & Uzzell (1996) distinguish ‘place referent continuity’ from ‘place congruent continuity’. Place referent continuity occurs when the continuity of the location is used to maintain the idea of the self as having continuity, as mentioned by Korpela (1989) above, which focuses on the environment reflecting the continuity of the self to the self. Individuals see themselves as distinct from the environment, which, whilst it bears cues reminding them of their past experiences, can be left behind without any loss of self. Place congruent continuity, by contrast, occurs where individuals actively choose a place which is, or change a place so that it is, congruent with their self-image. For example, those who see themselves as ‘city people’ will choose to live in the city rather than the suburbs. In this case, the choosing of a particular environment helps maintain the individual’s sense of continuity as a particular type of person. If people find themselves in an environment which is not congruent with their identity, dissatisfaction, and possibly attempts to leave the environment, will result (Feldman, 1990; 1996). This will be one of the aspects of place attachment discussed in Chapter 9.

Twigger (1994), following Rowles (1983) and Hormuth (1990) points out one consequence of these two ways in which places can act as symbols of and support for the continuity of an individual. A person may wish to preserve this continuity by remaining in their current place, or they may wish to either change their current environment or go somewhere new in order to establish a discontinuity and a new self. The Arkwright study provides an interesting context for examining this concept, since the villagers were experiencing a new start in terms of their physical environment but not necessarily in terms of their social environment.

The above studies tend to focus on the way in which place or possessions are involved in identity through the principle of continuity, self-esteem and, to a lesser extent, distinctiveness. The role of place regarding the principle of self-efficacy has been less well-explored, although Brown (1982) claims that possessions can provide a sense of mastery. Winkel (1981, p. 493) defines a “manageable environment” as being one which allows its residents to develop a predictive system for judging whether the environment “supports their goals and purposes”. Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton (1981) emphasize the importance of possessions which strengthen self concept, increase self confidence, reinforce the sense of control over the environment and facilitate the communication of identity.
Thus, IPT can be seen as taking into account the physical and social environment, since ‘place’ can contribute to the maintenance of the principles of distinctiveness, self-esteem, self-efficacy and continuity. Not all of these principles have, however, been equally well-explored in empirical studies relating to place. Moreover, IPT, as an identity theory, does not address the exact relationship between identity and place, nor how the effect of place on identity might be mediated through ‘place identity’, a concept discussed in Chapter 2 (although it must be acknowledged that some of the studies discussed earlier (e.g. Twigger, 1994) do explicitly address this issue). The relationship between place attachment and identity will be explored further in this thesis.

To complete this review of identity literature, it should be mentioned that a number of theorists and empirical studies point to the importance of ‘place’ in the development of identity (e.g. Despres, 1991 for a selected review). Graumann (1976), for example, discusses how action in relation to an environment can lead to appropriation of that place and how through such action, the self is developed. Chawla (1992), within a psycho-analytical framework, looks at the importance of place for identity within the context of child development. Milligan (1998) takes a symbolic interactionist perspective when she explores the aspect of congruence between person and place; yet, for those studies which do not follow an explicit theory of identity, the nature of identity and the role of place in it, is not always clear.

Although Breakwell’s IPT is the principal theory underlying the analysis of the Arkwright data described in this thesis, empirical work using SIT and SCT should also be mentioned.

3.3 Empirical work using SIT and SCT

Neither SIT nor SCT explicitly address the non-group-related environment in which the group is operating. It must, however, be pointed out that, although the theories themselves fail to acknowledge the more general non-group-related environment, the literature reveals some work which has used, or at least, suggested the use of SIT or SCT in a context which does take account of the wider environment. For example, Brown (1986) suggested that SIT could be used to explore people’s environmental perception and actions.

One such study is that of Bonaiuto, Breakwell & Cano (1996), which examined identity as it relates to place at different levels, from local to national identity, in the context of an environmental threat, beach pollution. The question was whether people’s reaction to this environmental threat would be explicable in terms of the cognitive processes discussed in SIT and SCT operating through people’s local and/or national identity. In particular, would the search for positive ingroup distinctiveness through various perceptual biases and comparisons be evident at the level of local and national identity? One key outgroup in this study is the set of international bodies responsible for monitoring pollution and,
therefore, for identifying the threat and labelling a particular beach as polluted. The hypothesis was that the stronger the person’s identity at a particular level of place, the less the person will perceive the beaches at that level of place to be polluted. Thus those with strong local identity will see local beaches as relatively unpolluted, and those with strong national identity will see national beaches as relatively unpolluted. The results were generally in keeping with the hypothesis. Bonaiuto, et al. found evidence of ‘social creativity’ strategies being used by these individuals to maintain their positive self-image. More generally, the study supported the hypotheses that social identity can include various levels of place-related identity (an important issue in this thesis, see Section 2.6 on nested place attachment), and that these aspects of identity are subject to the same cognitive processes as specifically group-related social identity.

Twigger-Ross, et al. (in preparation) has, however, questioned the degree to which identification with place is similar to identification with a group. Twigger & Breakwell (1994) found inconsistent results between the responses to a questionnaire about a hypothetical local environmental threat and the actual action taken by people when threatened with a real change to the local environment. The questionnaire study supported the parallel, already drawn, between the processes involved in social and in place-related identities. Those more attached to the local area were more likely to advocate action to prevent the threat (a local industry dumping ground) and thus, maintained their self-esteem as it related to their identification with the locale. In reaction to a (genuine) proposed new chemical plant, however, Twigger & Breakwell found no relationship between taking action against the development and local attachment. Twigger-Ross, et al. (in preparation) suggest this might be due to people failing to perceive the chemical plant as a threat but it is equally plausible that the failure of the real-world situation to support the predictions of SIT/SCT is due to other factors including the possibility, raised by Twigger-Ross, et al., that identification with place is in some subtle way(s) different to identification with a group, and that this was hidden in the hypothetical example. The whole question of how people respond to a threat to their environment is of considerable relevance to the subject of this thesis.

3.4 Summary

Three aspects of the empirical and theoretical work on identity described in this chapter are particularly important for this thesis. The first is the concept, from Breakwell’s Identity Process Theory, of identity as a structure involving both particular contents and the evaluations of those contents, which is developed (through the processes of assimilation-accommodation and evaluation) in keeping with, and guided by, four motivational principles of distinctiveness, self-esteem, self-efficacy and continuity.

The second is the concept that ‘place’ can contribute to identity through the identity processes. The nature of this contribution and the role of place attachment and identity are important theoretical issues which have yet to be satisfactorily resolved.
The third important aspect of the identity literature is the concept that social identity can include various levels of place-related identity, ranging from the nation/country to the home (as was explored in the work of Bonaiuto, et al., 1996). This can be seen as providing a potential link with the concept of nested place attachment.

3.5 The aims of this research
For this study, place is defined as a geographical space which has acquired meaning through a person’s interaction with the space, and place attachment is seen as an emotional bond to place. Moreover, place and person are seen as inextricably entwined in a dynamic and mutually influencing relationship. In order to understand this relationship more fully, specific attention is paid to the processes of attachment to place and its relationship with identity processes.

Issues of place attachment, place identification, personal control over changes to life space, disacquisition of possessions and changes to perceptions of the future have a significant bearing on a person’s response to a changed environment, even when a move has all the outward signs of economic improvement. To date, however, our understanding of how these factors relate to each other and to place attachment is rather limited. The aims of this work are threefold.

The first aim is to describe the socio-psychological and behavioural effects of the change of the spatial environment on an existing community, bearing in mind the point, discussed in Chapter 2, that the influence of place on person is neither one-way nor deterministic. The discussion of this aim will include an examination of any changed socio-spatial patterns (including consideration of any additional influences and restrictions on these patterns) experienced by the participants to this study. Festinger, et al.’s (1950) work indicates that spatial arrangements are important as new communities are forming but the likely socio-psychological impacts of relocating a community with well established friendship patterns into a spatially different environment have rarely been studied. The lack of reference, in social psychology, to the physical place in which groups exist suggests that cultural norms should be relatively independent of the physical environment or, at least, dependant only on people’s construals of that physical environment. This too, it seems, was the ‘commonsense’ view of the decision makers (British Coal and the North East Derbyshire District Council) in their decision to relocate the community as a whole, without any explicit consideration as to whether an alternative spatial layout of the new village would affect the social structure of that community.

The first research question is in three parts:
Question 1 (i)  What changes in the spatial layout of New Arkwright proved to be of importance in terms of their socio-psychological and behavioural impact on the participants?

Question 1 (ii)  What changes in behaviour patterns related to the relocation of Arkwright Town were reported as important by the residents and how did they evaluate them?

Question 1 (iii)  How can these changes in behaviour patterns be evaluated within a socio-psychological framework?

Questions 1 (i), 1 (ii) and 1 (iii) are addressed in Chapter 7. In addition, Question 1 (iii) is addressed in Chapter 10.

The second aim of this work is to explore the meaning which these adjustments to their new environment held for the participants over time and how these meanings influence identity. It has been argued that places are important sources of identity elements (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Breakwell, 1996; Bonaiuto, et al., 1996; Twigger-Ross, et al., in preparation) because places embody social symbols and are invested with social meanings and importance. Moreover, “[places] become elements of identity, subject to the pressure to maintain self esteem, self efficacy, continuity and distinctiveness” (Breakwell, 1996, p. 9). Thus, the second aim is to establish empirically whether the principles of identity became differentially salient over time and whether the relocation involved any changes to identity content and/or evaluations.

The second research question concerns the degree to which the participants’ identity processes were affected by changes in the spatial environment; more specifically:

Question 2 (i)  Does place contribute to self-evaluation in four different ways which correspond to the four principles of identity?

Question 2 (ii)  Was the spatial change associated with any change in salience of the principles of identity over the course of the relocation?

Question 2 (iii)  Did spatial change affect participants’ evaluation of particular elements of their previous identity structure?

Question 2 (i) is addressed in Chapter 10. Questions 2 (ii) and 2 (iii) are addressed in Chapter 8. Chapter 10 will also examine Question 2 (ii) but focusing only on the post-relocation period.
The third aim is to examine residents’ place attachment in old and New Arkwright and to isolate aspects of the person-place transactions which may have affected their ability to detach from the old environment and attach to the new environment. The Arkwright relocation provides a field experiment in which to identify facilitators and inhibitors to the formation of place attachment. Places can be nurturing (sense of safety, sense of belonging) and challenging (skill development, expanding physical and psychological limits). Underlying the research work on place attachment is the belief that place attachment, as defined in Chapter 2, is a positive experience, encouraging both stability and growth at an individual and/or community level, providing a restorative environment conducive to physical and psychological well-being. It is also proposed that a sense of belonging decreases alienation and that attachment to place increases a sense of responsibility towards the place, thereby potentially reducing neglect and/or vandalism.

The third research question is:

Question 3 (i) What is the nature of place attachment and, in the Arkwright context, what factors encouraged or inhibited its formation and maintenance?

Question 3 (ii) What is the relationship between place attachment and identity?

These research questions are addressed in Chapters 9 and 10.

This chapter, together with Chapter 2, provides the theoretical framework which underpins this research. The reasons underlying the choice of Identity Process Theory have been given and the areas in need of further theoretical and empirical work have been described. Chapter 4 will describe some aspects of Arkwright’s history which may have had a bearing on participants’ reactions to the relocation, thereby contextualising the findings reported in this work.

**Chapter Four**

**The Historical Context of Arkwright Town**

**4.1 Introduction**

This chapter recounts relevant episodes from the history of Arkwright Town and its community from its foundation in 1897 until its demolition in November 1996, including the process of relocation of the villagers to the new site. This relocation process provides the background to this thesis. The physical characteristics of the new village are then described in detail so that the ways in which it differs from old Arkwright are clear and the socio-spatial and psychological processes involved in the relocation, which are examined in detail in subsequent chapters of this thesis, are contextualised.
4.2 Relevant episodes from the history of Arkwright Town

The economic and political aspects of coal mining history shaped the social fabric of the Arkwright community. The aim of this section is to recount briefly the major events in the complex history of the coal mining industry in the 20th Century and to highlight those factors which influenced the Arkwright community. A knowledge of their history, for instance, helps to explain the initial low level of involvement in the planning of the village and the high level of mistrust exhibited throughout the relocation process, which will be discussed further in Chapter 9. There are few published sources available concerning Arkwright Town itself, but much of the following information about Arkwright is retold with the kind permission of Godfrey Downs-Rose1 (1993; 1995; 1997). One of the key factors amongst mining communities, which will be evident from this account of the history of Arkwright, is the long-term bitterness and resentment felt by miners towards the owners or managers of the industry. This factor must be taken into consideration when trying to understand the reaction of some members of the Arkwright community to the relocation process.

Arkwright Town was built between 1897 and 1902 by the Staveley Coal and Iron Company to house miners employed in its local collieries. It was named after the Arkwright family of nearby Sutton Hall and was called “Town” to reflect the expansionist ambitions of Richard Arkwright, who is seen as one of the founders

Illustration 4.1: Aerial view of Arkwright Town in 1990 (photo courtesy of Eddie Anthony)

1 Godfrey Downs-Rose was born in Staffordshire in 1922 and, 2 years later, moved with his parents to Arkwright Town, where he spent his developing and early working years. His father was a miner and after a short spell of working on a local farm he, too, entered mining. He worked in the Arkwright Colliery from 1940 until he received a scholarship to enter University in 1952, continuing pit work as a surface worker on Saturdays and during holidays. After receiving his degree from Nottingham University in Sociology, Psychology and Philosophy in 1955 he continued to work for the National Coal Board in management until 1966. After further qualifications he entered the teaching profession and taught Industrial History and Industrial Archaeology. In 1972 he founded a summer school in Industrial Archaeology leading to the formation of a Trust to finance a small museum at Wanlockhead in Scotland, of which he became the honorary adviser and curator. He retired to the Arkwright area in 1989 and became involved in the “Back to the Future” history project in old Arkwright.
of the Industrial Revolution. The Arkwright family were also responsible for the construction of a loop line, linking the Lancashire, Derbyshire and East Coast Railway to the great Central Railway as part of their unrealised dream of a railway network linking the East and West coasts for the transport of their coal. It is reported that originally part of the village was occupied by railway construction workers (mostly Irish) on a short term basis whilst this loop line was built (Coppin, 1993). Soon, however, Arkwright Town became a focus for migrant miners and their families as older and less profitable coal pits were closed in Staffordshire, Yorkshire, Northumberland and Durham, and miners were forced to move to Derbyshire in search of work in the coal mines there (Downs-Rose, 1995).

The original plans for Arkwright Town involved the construction of 229 houses in 7 rows but in fact, only 5 rows were completed with a total of 160 houses. The terraced houses were built in blocks of 10 to 16 houses and were numbered from 1 to 160 as there were no street names. The front doors of the houses opened directly from the front room onto the pavement of the street and there was a gap of about 25 metres between the backs of the rows of houses. The village also included a school for 282 children and 140 infants (admitting additional pupils from nearby villages), a school house for the headmaster, three shops, the Station Hotel, a Methodist Chapel and a Miners’ Welfare Institute. Six more shops were added later. Land across the A632 was rented for garden allotments with spare ground for a football and recreation field. Other recreation land and a small swing-park were provided beside the Chesterfield to Lincoln railway. When the loop line was built to join the two main railway lines, this completed the encirclement of the village (see map below), including the miners’ allotments and
the children’s recreation ground. As Downs-Rose (1995) remarked: “It served to emphasise the isolation of the small mining community, sharply marking out the boundaries of its immediate physical, emotional and social sense of place” (p. 14).

The government’s ‘rationalisation’ of the mining industry following the 1914/18 war resulted in the closure of many small pits and added to the number of itinerant miners and their families. The miners’ lockout/strikes of 1921 and 1926 added to the suffering of the mining community. The 1921 lockout/strike resulted in the Government granting a subsidy to the coal industry which allowed the owners to reduce the price of coal and increase sales. “In Derbyshire coal prices fell from £1.75 per ton to 86p per ton” (Downs-Rose, 1995, p. 21) resulting in reduced wages and longer hours for the miners. “With the Government poised for a conflict, the coal owners locked-out the miners on 30 April 1926. The miners were told that they would only be signed on again provided they accepted longer hours and pay reductions. The miners refused” (Downs-Rose, 1995, p. 25).

During the 1920s, a combination of the world-wide recession and the 1926 General Strike, in which the coal miners were leading players, caused the Derbyshire coal mines to be put onto short-time working which lasted until the middle of the next decade. Downs-Rose (1993) states that “in 1927, the average miner worked only three and a half shifts per week, for which he was paid 53p per day” (p. 47). He found reference to the poverty experienced in Arkwright in a report by one of His Majesty’s Inspectors of Schools, written in February 1928: “the school is situated in a mining village in which the effects of the coal strike and subsequent trade depression have been felt and there is still much suffering. ... “ (Downs-Rose, 1993, p. 47).
The poverty was accompanied by overcrowding. Downs-Rose (1993) reports that in 1930, 67 of the 160 houses were in multiple occupation; in many cases this involved married children living with their parents or in-laws. This situation continued until the 1950s and 1960s, when the Council and National Coal Board (NCB) undertook the construction of new estates in five nearby villages (Calow, Brimington, Bolsover, Hasland and Hady Hill).

Coal mining was a troubled industry throughout the period leading up to the Second World War, as expressed by Downs-Rose: “two decades of internecine fighting among inefficient coal owners, of successive Governments trapped in the economics of free-market dogmas and the suffering and privations caused to their families were absorbed into the demonology of mining communities and not forgotten” (1995, p. 29). It was during this period, in 1938, that the mine at Arkwright was sunk by the Arkwright Colliery Company, which had been formed to develop a small short-term drift mine but, in the event, became a long-term feature of the village, producing high quality coal for 50 years.

In 1947 the coal mining industry was nationalised and Arkwright Town passed into the ownership of NCB. This was celebrated by both miners and their unions as a development capable of delivering a planned energy policy and enhanced security for Britain’s 980 pits and 718,400 employees (Waddington & Parry, 1995). Unfortunately, those anticipations were not fulfilled. At that time, as Downs-Rose (1993) recalls, the Arkwright housing stock was in a poor state of repair but it was only after the village was featured on 6th January 1961 in ‘The Derbyshire Times’ as ‘a shameful settlement despite its proud industrial name’ that refurbishment was carried out by NCB. Indoor bathrooms and toilets were provided, the old ‘service blocks’ in the backyards were demolished and pantries were converted for coal storage. The area between the rear of the houses was grassed for communal use and was maintained by NCB every two weeks during the summer months. At the same time, twelve houses were demolished to make way for new garage blocks, the roads were named and the houses renumbered. The local Council built eight additional bungalows after the Second World War and added a further 10 properties (4 townhouses and 6 semi-detached bungalows) during the 1960s. In 1977, NCB “wished to cease to be a major landlord” (Coppin, 1993) and sold houses to those sitting tenants who wished to buy. The remaining houses were sold to a property company which acted as landlord to the tenants. It was at that time that the new owners gradually fenced in the small grassed area to create their own individual back garden and displayed ‘private’ notices. This expressed need for privacy will be further discussed in Chapter 7.

Illustration 4.3: The marking of private space
Between 1946 and 1966, the shortage of coal led to the establishment of twelve opencast sites around Arkwright Town, in addition to the deep mine (Downs-Rose, 1993, p. 50). At the same time a national programme of deep mine closures was already underway. Waddington & Parry (1995, p. 9) refer to Hall (1981) who talks of the “great bitterness caused by the off-hand and arbitrary way in which closure decisions were made and executed – invariably without any negotiation” (p. 9). Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, coal miners shared in the increasing affluence of the working class but towards the end of this period, coal was being increasingly challenged as the dominant energy source by nuclear power, oil and gas. Mine closures continued and confrontation between the unions and the government, with national strikes in 1972, 1974 and 1981. On 1 March 1984 “all mineworkers in North Derbyshire received a bullish letter from Ken Moses, the NCB Area Director, headed ‘Our Recession is over: Five years without pit closures’. ... On 6 March 1984 NCB announced the closure of five collieries ... without going through the agreed closure procedures” (Downs-Rose, 1995, pp. 151-152). This is one of many experiences which led to the deep-seated mistrust towards BCO’s promises (see Chapter 9). On 11 March the NUM declared the 1984 strike ‘official’, which continued until 5 March 1985 and ended without a formal settlement (Waddington, et al., 1991). This strike was particularly bitter and prolonged, resulting in the creation of a breakaway mining union (Union of Democratic Mineworkers (UDM)). This began in the Nottinghamshire area but was later joined by other strike breakers, leaving the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) weakened and demoralised. Waddington & Parry (1995) report that “Parker and Surrey used leaked Cabinet minutes and ministerial memoirs (cf. Lawson, 1992) as proof that, prior to 1988, the Conservative Government’s commitment to the nuclear power industry was motivated less by objective economic arguments than a political objective to undermine the power of the NUM” (pp. 13-14).
Even before the strike, in 1982, NCB had decided on a gradual closure of the Arkwright seams. After the 1984/85 strike, the run-down of the Arkwright pit began in earnest and in February 1988 British Coal (BC), formerly NCB, closed the Arkwright colliery. By that time, the majority of the Arkwright miners had accepted early retirement or redundancy payment. The few remaining working miners were re-employed at other pits in North East Derbyshire, all of which have since been closed. The potential for collective action had all but vanished. As Beynon et al. (1991) report, the Modified Colliery Review Procedure (MCRP), whereby both BC and the Trade Unions set out the cases for and against pit closure, has not saved one mine because BC has never accepted the outcome as binding. “British Coal steadfastly refuses to accept that it has any moral obligation to consider the social consequences of closing a mine for a single community or entire mining area” (pp. 87-90).

Downs-Rose (1993) describes two main consequences of the 1984/5 strike: “First, mining communities became divided and the traditional unity of purpose and common action of the men was lost forever. Second, it gave rise to Women’s Support Groups. For the first time in the history of coal mining in Britain, miners’ wives and daughters took on a new, truly feminist role. ...”(p. 49). One example was Norma Dolby, the wife of an Arkwright miner, who, with the support of other miners’ wives, made public speeches throughout England and even travelled to Germany to raise money for the miners and their families. This was in stark contrast to her previous role as a miner’s wife and helped alleviate the poverty and hardship within the community during the year long strike. Her moving accounts of that time were published in 1987 in the form of “Norma Dolby’s Diary: An Account of the Great Miners’ Strike”.

It is appropriate here to give consideration to some points made by Downs-Rose as to the nature and quality of a mining village’s sense of community. In his introduction to an audio-taped collection of “Tales from old Arkwright” he suggests the following: “Working in the pit isolated miners from other folk, which carried over into all male social activities. It was different because the technical nature of the work could only be superficially discussed with other people. Mining speech had a vocabulary which was foreign to most people. It was different because the work demanded exceptional regard for other men’s safety and yours in turn depended on theirs. It was different because the village of old Arkwright was built one hundred years ago in isolation from any large town. It’s original folk were mining families recruited from older mining communities in Nottinghamshire, Staffordshire, Yorkshire, etc. They brought with them different dialects which, over the years, blurred into a local dialect and pronunciation. It was this way of speaking which lent itself to miners speaking to miners of things of common interest, which was known as ‘crack’. It lent itself to the telling of tales in the pit and spilled over into the club, the pub and the allotment shed. Some would say that with the local deep mines closed and the old village demolished the community has lost its distinctive culture and language” (Downs-Rose, 1997). As he explains, “the work demanded exceptional regard for other men’s safety’
and this responsibility for others spilled over above ground to the men’s families creating the received view of the ‘close-knit mining communities’. Downs-Rose foresaw that “the new Arkwright community will lack the cohering influence of the shared work ethic of mining and, if only for that reason, will differ from the one in which its older members grew up” (1995, p. 196).

With the closure of the Arkwright colliery the water drainage pumps were stopped and the access drifts were sealed (Downs-Rose, 1993). Nine months later, methane gas was found to be escaping from the underground workings and infiltrating the houses in the upper half of the village. On the night of 9 November 1988, the alert was raised and 110 people were evacuated and housed elsewhere for 15 days. Although British Coal denied any legal responsibility for the methane emergency, they installed a gas pumping plant to vent the methane on the site of the closed colliery. North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC) placed methane meters in some houses to check for future leakage. In the Autumn of 1989, an exposed coal seam near the village ignited and burned for 4 weeks, causing fears of an underground methane explosion. After considering several options, British Coal Opencast (BCO) proposed the construction of a new village, at the cost of £15 million, on the site of the allotments and recreation area but within the original village confines of the loop line. In exchange for this offer, BCO requested planning consent to opencast 1000 acres of surrounding land over a period of 10 years to extract four million tonnes of coal. It was estimated that the value of the coal produced would be worth approximately £160 million at the then current market price (Dunn, 1990).

The proposals for the relocation of the village were put to a meeting of the villagers in October 1990 and accepted. It was proposed that the 177 existing dwellings would be replaced by a modern estate comprising 250 semi-detached houses and bungalows. The exact demographics of the community at this period are not available from British Coal, the community architects, the developers of the new village nor the local or district councils. However, it is known that 60 households were deemed to need some form of disability fittings, e.g. support rails, walk-in and sit down showers, etc (personal communication with a person from Social Services who assessed residents’ disability needs). By 1993, there were only 174 households occupying houses in the village (information from the Arkwright Town – Revised Draft Strategic Plan. BCO, NEDDC & DCC Section 106 Agreement) of which 102 were owner-occupied and 72 were rented (16 properties rented from NEDDC, 50 properties rented from British Coal Opencast and another 6 rented from private landlords). There were 160 houses and 14 were bungalows.

Residents expected work on the new village to start immediately or, at most, within 12 months of the October 1990 announcement. Coppin (1993) agreed that “misunderstandings regarding the programme were created in the initial Village meeting but that the current time table has been repeatedly talked about in the Architects’ presentations” (Coppin, 1993). In the event, construction of the new village did
not begin until August 1994 and the last residents were not moved until March 1996. In the meantime the mining industry had been privatised. By 1992 there were less than 20 deep coal mines in production and the Government sold all three remaining mining regions to RJB Mining for £815 million in 1994 (BBC- Panorama: 1 May 1995).

Illustration 4.4: The memorial

The old village was demolished in November 1996. The location is marked by a simple brick pillar with a metal plaque bearing the inscription “Site of the former Arkwright Town”.

For this thesis, the key issues of relevance from the foregoing description of the historical background of old Arkwright, which must be taken into account when considering participants’ responses, are:

1. Arkwright’s history, especially the historical development of the community’s mistrust of British Coal, may explain the initial low level of involvement of indigenous Arkwrightians with the design of the new village.

2. The long-term and more recent bitterness and resentment felt by the mining community towards the mining authorities must be taken into consideration when trying to understand the reactions of some miners to the relocation process.

3. Before the Great Miners’ Strike, historians and villagers speak of the traditional unity of purpose. This potential for common action ceased to exist after 1985, because it was no longer functional. This may account for the lack of cohesive action during the relocation process.
4. Further, as Downs-Rose (1997) so eloquently describes, mining speech, the villagers’ own dialect, the safety concerns during underground shifts, the geographical isolation all generated and maintained a close-knit community. Without the industry, a decline in the community spirit, albeit gradual, was inevitable.

5. As will be suggested in Chapter 7, the loss of the physical structure of old Arkwright accelerated this inevitable decline.

4.3 The relocation
This section contains details of the relocation, beginning with the official reason for the relocation, continuing with the relocation announcement, the proposed and eventual time scale, the development of the village scheme and the results of a fleeting content analysis of the presentation of the relocation proposal by BCO and NEDDC to the villagers and the following media reports. This section will conclude with details of the timetable for the relocation of the villagers.

4.3.1 Reason for the relocation. As already described, methane seepage into some of the homes in Arkwright caused an emergency evacuation of approximately half the villagers, necessitating the installation of a pumping station and causing long-term blight to the housing.

British Coal argued that it had no legal responsibility for the methane which left the problem of the blighted properties with NEDDC. Thus both parties, after almost two years of planning a solution, jointly presented the village relocation scheme.

4.3.2 The relocation announcement. On Tuesday, 16 October, 1990, a marquee was erected in a field adjoining old Arkwright and all the residents of the village attended the special meeting. At the meeting, the villagers were presented, for the first time, with plans for the relocation of the village in exchange for the granting of planning permission to BCO to opencast mine the countryside surrounding Arkwright Town. There had been no prior consultation with the villagers by BCO or NEDDC. Spokespersons for both parties described details of the package, with the NEDDC spokespersons emphasising the future danger of methane gas explosions, “it’s likely to get worse not better” (Village meeting transcript, p. 1), the generous offer by BCO to provide new houses for old, “I will be surprised if there is a lot of you that don’t want to take up an offer of the £65,000 houses as against what you have got now” (Village meeting transcript, p. 5). Later, during the question and answer session, this figure was inflated by an NEDDC spokesperson: “we might even talk about £70,000/£80,000 as by the time they build them, that’s what your houses will be worth” (Village meeting transcript, p. 20). Another emphasis was on keeping the community together as “there is a strong community here” (p. 5) and on the community’s
involvement in the decision making process, e.g. “we have on show architects’ impression of what the houses could look like but we are not here as official pompous bureaucrats to tell you what you want in this village. This is your village ... (p. 3) ...you will be given every opportunity to put your point of view forward and to have a say in the future of your village” (p. 4). In contrast, the BCO spokespersons focused on the relocation proposal as a business venture, anxious to point out that BCO were not making this offer for charitable reasons “but because we feel that this is the basis of an arrangement that will benefit British Coal and will benefit the residents of Arkwright” (Village meeting transcript, p. 6). The importance of BCO’s Public Relations was also mooted: “we want a scheme that we can point to and say, that is something that was created by British Coal” (Village meeting transcript, p. 6). The same spokesperson explained that additional houses (63-73 properties) would be built in order to sustain the school and that a Business Park was planned for the colliery site to provide employment. Another BCO spokesperson, apart from explaining details of the opencasting process, mentioned that “if the scheme goes ahead it will provide about 200 jobs” (Village meeting transcript, p. 9). It was not clear, however, whether the jobs would arise because of the planned opencasting, the building of the village or the proposed Business Park.

The meeting ended with the residents being asked to indicate by a show of hands their acceptance of this proposal. The result was “absolutely overwhelming” support for the village relocation (Village meeting transcript, p. 21).

4.3.3 Proposed and eventual time scale. The BCO spokesperson explained that in order “to make sure that we can exclude the methane and also make the contours of the land suitable for building houses” (Village meeting transcript, p. 8), the outcrop of the second St. John’s seam on the new village site needed to be removed. He continued: “by the end of year two from the mining starting the new village will be built” (Village meeting transcript, p. 9). During the question and answer session the BCO spokesperson stated that as this size of opencasting is classified as a ‘major’ project, BCO would need to supply an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and that the assessment would take almost a year to complete. He continued that planning permission should be granted by Derbyshire County Council (DCC) within 3 – 4 weeks, “it would then take approximately two years from that time to when people could move into the new houses” (Village meeting transcript, p. 14). Thus the expected time frame for the complete process was about 3 years from the time of the announcement at the village meeting. In fact the actual relocation of all the households was not completed until five and a half years after the announcement, in March 1996.

4.3.4 The village design process. Preparations moved swiftly after the residents’ acceptance of the relocation at the village meeting. Within a few days BCO and NEDDC had sent a glossy folder to every household entitled “Arkwright – The Future”. It again stressed the “once in a lifetime opportunity to
exchange your present home for a brand new one, free from any worries of methane, whilst still maintaining and indeed strengthening the community spirit of present day Arkwright. ... The new village will be equipped with every facility and amenity needed and will be designed in consultation with you, the people of Arkwright. ... From the very outset all residents will be asked to participate. ... At every stage you will be involved. This is your community. Working together will make sure we get it right. It’s your village and your future: help to build it.”

According to the document entitled Arkwright Town – Revised Draft Strategic Plan, forming part of the Section 106 Agreement between BCO, NEDDC & DCC, British Coal Opencast retained overall responsibility for the project as a whole and appointed a design team to undertake the work. The Arkwright Project Liaison Committee was established to provide a joint forum for matters relating to the redevelopment and consisted of representatives from:

- Central North Region (BCO)
- Arkwright Town (8 residents)
- North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC)
- Derbyshire County Council (DCC)
- Sutton-cum-Duckmanton Parish Council
- Team of Architects

Planning approval (outline in part and detail in part) was obtained on 5 October 1992 for the redevelopment of Arkwright Town.

By February 1993, the layout for the New Arkwright Town had been agreed. By then, the majority of the existing community had selected a preferred dwelling type (of the 6 House types, 4 Bungalow types and 1 Chalet Bungalow) and residents had been offered the opportunity to choose their neighbour for the adjoining property. The architects found, however, that it was not always possible to adjoin these different property styles, to satisfy the villagers’ preferences.

From the beginning of the project, even at the October 1990 meeting, it was emphasised that the new village would be “designed by you”, suggesting a public participation scheme. This was reiterated in the folder sent to every household. In other documents, however, and by the community architects it is described as a consultation exercise (where the public is consulted but the initial decisions and the decision making power remains with the authorities) and that is what it proved to be. Most of the important decisions had already been taken before the Arkwright community was informed, for example, that terraced properties should be replaced by semi-detached houses, that the residents should stay together, that everyone should be treated equally, irrespective of the condition of their existing
property, that the surrounding area should be opencasted and that the new village should be built on a site across the Chesterfield Road, the A623. Coppin (1993) explained that “the proposal to move from terraced houses into semi-detached properties did not come from BCO (or the Architects as they had not been appointed at this time) but from the Councillors representing the Community”. They stressed, however, that “community sessions held by the Architects (after their appointment), to draw to the Community’s attention the significance in the change in neighbour and community relationships between terraced and semi-detached housing, resulted in only one family wanting to reconsider terraced options in the design (Coppin, 1993)”.

Although the initial design decision for semi-detached properties to replace the terraced houses had been made by NEDDC, the community architects carried out a consultative programme with the residents and provided residents with a number of choices for their semi-detached individual home. Choices included the type of house from a range of 11 different styles, choice in kitchen and bathroom units, fire places, internal wall paint, etc. For the village design, the architects suggested a number of alternatives by showing slides and artist’s impressions. The villagers voted on the preferred layout and the final plan was accepted by February 1993. After the architects’ dismissal there was little consultation with the community on either home or village design.

The following was part of the response by Coppin (1993) to the first published paper (Speller & Sime, 1993) entitled “Anticipating Environmental Change: the relocation of a village and its psycho-social consequences”, on the consultative design process: “I concur with your comments that residents were not included in the initial decision making. The basic parameters of the deal were established by elected representatives [NEDDC] and BCO. ... A discussion over a period of time after the initial announcement would have been useful for the Community. This would have also been beneficial for the Architects’ involvement. ... many feel that the [involvement] of a Community Architect is a cosmetic [exercise] and that the ‘real’ decisions will be made (as originally) elsewhere. ... To achieve effective consultation you firstly have to establish the right climate, one in which people are aware of its purpose and objectives, and critically appreciate that their individual views may not prevail in the end. ... With Arkwright, the Community did not have the chance to effectively do this ... If you examine current points of complaint and concern, it comes back to this failure to prepare. [There was] almost the assumption that the Community was harmonious and naturally could cope. Few communities are in such a position but have to be educated into preparation for such a difficult process” (Coppin, 1993).

The Liaison Committee had been established and was meeting monthly to discuss design suggestions, brainstorm problems, ask questions and to give information to the various parties. The Arkwright representatives had been selected or had selected themselves to represent their street (Penrose Street and Hardwick Street had 2 representatives each). Their brief was to inform residents of the content of the
meetings and to speak for them at these meetings. There had been no training of the representatives nor were they debriefed if they encountered difficulties with other residents. Eventually they felt that their function had deteriorated to being messengers for BCO (personal communication with a member of the Liaison Committee), indeed being put into a situation of having to defend BCO’s decisions to other residents and the Liaison Committee ceased effective functioning in July 1994, before construction of the new village began.

These difficulties had been further increased when the Community Architects were dismissed by BCO in January 1994. After an initial period of mistrust the villagers had come to respect and rely on the architects, believing that they had their best interest at heart. Both parties agreed not to make the reasons for dismissal public, yet Tim Wood (September 1994, personal communication) of Faithful and Gould (Project Co-ordinators and Quantity Surveyors) explained that expensive design details on the houses were inappropriate for New Arkwright and that the village design had become an ego trip for Brock Carmichael Associates (Architects’ team) rather than a functional design for the residents of old Arkwright. Martyn Coppin, for the Architects, stated during an audio-taped interview (September, 1994): “they just did not feel that we were making as many savings as they would have liked us to make. We had kept to the original budget, then we worked towards a reduced budget and then the whole concept of a budget was thrown out and the aim was to produce the new village as cheaply as possible. ... this made our position very difficult.” It is usual for community architect teams to remain during the construction period and for a settling in period of approximately 6 months and this was the original intention for Arkwright (personal communication, Coppin, 1994). From the data which will be presented later, it is considered that the loss of the architectural team had an effect on the ability of some of the residents to settle into New Arkwright (see Chapter 9).

In 1994 the coal industry was privatised and RJB Mining agreed to honour BCO’s commitment to building the new village. The function of the Architects Team was taken over by Faithful and Gould, headed by Tim Wood, who saw his brief as co-ordination of the construction rather than concern for the residents (personal communication).

Foundation problems at the new site delayed the building work and caused adaptations of the village design. In August 1994 Wimpey were given a ‘Design and Build’ contract for the whole village. The new terms meant that the house design and position which had been agreed by the architects with the occupiers could now be changed to accommodate the ground conditions. Changes were also made to “get value for money” (Tim Wood, 1995, personal communication), effectively cutting costs for RJB Mining. In the new Faithful and Gould climate however, occupiers were neither consulted nor told about the changes and were often unaware of them until it was too late to consider any alternatives. This may have been one of the reasons why Faithful and Gould did not allow future residents to visit the
building site, although, at the time, they stated that it was for safety and insurance reasons (David Alston, BCO/RJB Mining, personal communication, 1995). However, not all the residents adhered to their ruling and once the first residents had moved in, it was impossible to keep other people out. During the summer of 1995, a steady stream of villagers crossed the A623 to check the progress the builders had made on their new home and to start the process of appropriating their new home. Not everyone took part as some people were unwilling to go against the authorities’ wishes. Once doors and windows were installed and locked, people had to rely on finding a sympathetic workman to allow them entry to the building during working hours.

4.3.5 Portrayals of the new village scheme by BCO, NEDDC and the media.

This section presents some of the portrayals of the new village scheme which were produced in the early stages of the relocation process. It also includes images and descriptions of the village from the media. It is not intended to be a comprehensive and detailed analysis of all media coverage of the project, rather it is intended to give a flavour of the types of portrayal which the villagers would encounter. It is considered important because of the influence this might have had on the residents and on their perceptions and expectations of the new village.

The three main points emphasised in the village meeting and in the glossy folder were also the main points reiterated in the newspaper coverage at that time. The NEDDC spokesperson had asked villagers not to speak to the Press after the village meeting but to leave it to them to explain the project to the Press the following day. The newspaper reports collected for this study were provided by BC (for the early reports after the relocation announcement) or collected for the researcher by the residents. A brief mention is also made of a few reports from television and radio. The material has been sorted into three time periods and content analysed to assess whether there may have been any influence on the residents by outside parties.

The first time period begins with reports of the Press Release on 17 October 1990 and continues until 3 November, 1990. Most headlines feature the methane gas threat: ‘Village with gas time-bomb to be rebuilt’ (Daily Telegraph); ‘Time-bomb pit village on move’ (Yorkshire Post); ‘Village moves across the Road! 400 flee gas peril’ (Daily Mirror); ‘Our village is moving 250 yards’ (The Sun); ‘Have a new life on us. Coal chiefs’ £15m plan to rebuild the village which is sitting on a time bomb’ (Daily Mail); ‘Pit villagers in fear of gas blast to get new homes for old. British Coal plans £15m move for families as writs loom over 1988 evacuation’ (Guardian). All the above headlines appeared on 18 October 1990. The Independent only published a photo of Arkwright Town with a brief caption on 18 October but on 3 November it published an extensive article entitled ‘You don’t get a new semi for nowt. British Coal plans to move a small Derbyshire village to dig up 1,000 acres of land for open-cast mining’. This article went beyond the quotations by the NEDDC spokespersons emphasising the dangers of staying in
old Arkwright and the benefits of exchanging old for new and reports that “some politicians are annoyed at the skilful way in which British Coal, while denying liability for the Big Leak, appears to have exploited it by playing on the fears of the little mining community. ... Mr Thomas [BCO] denies that the new village was a sweetener slipped under the tongue of an unpopular planning application. ‘Some might call it bribery’, he says. ‘We call it putting something back into the community’”.

The next time period from May 1992 until September 1993 produced articles arising from the surprise announcement of an arrangement between BCO and DCC to leave void a large area, after opencasting, to be used as a landfill site. There were also some general articles on opencast mining. It had been planned that the landfill site would be located close to the new village. Only local papers reported this and the residents signed a petition against the plan and it was dropped. On 1 October 1992, the Derbyshire Times entered a brief article on “Safety first for new village”, where the author describes the “tough safety measures” which will be built into the new homes “to ensure that villagers never have to face the risk of a methane leak” again. The Guardian, 23 October 1992, accused BCO of expanding opencast mining at the expense of deep mines and of using increasingly aggressive tactics to achieve this. In a follow-up article, David Ketteridge (BCO) is quoted as saying that the planned draconian cuts in deep mining “will not affect us at all. We want to produce more coal. The only limit on us is getting planning permissions.” On 6 September 1993, The Times resurrected the stories of October 1990 without any obvious reason. However, much of their factual data was incomplete or plainly wrong, e.g. they stated that the cost of the project would be £6m, that “there will even be a £2,000 allowance for curtains and carpets” and “The British Coal Corporation says it is moving the occupants of the hamlet’s five short terraces across the main Chesterfield road to make way for an opencast mine”. Indeed, BCO have never said that they needed to move the village to make way for an opencast mine. The Times article also goes further than any previous account in devaluing the homes in old Arkwright: “they are to swap cramped, old-fashioned houses for new semis worth anything up to three times as much. And it’s all for free.”

One article provided by a resident is not referenced or dated. From the content it would seem to have been published in 1993. The only reference is ‘The Big Feature’ and it seems to be a copy from a newspaper magazine. It is a well researched article by Amanda Volley and in it the first comparisons are made with the popular Television soap operas “Coronation Street” and “Brookside Close”. She writes: “The Chesterfield resident props himself on his garden wall, offers a bemused face to the world and scratches his head. ‘Now what I find is amazing is that people pay good money to go and visit the set of Coronation Street when they could get on a bus for a few pence and have a recce round Arkwright.’” She continues this soap opera analogy later when she says: “they are being moved out of Coronation Street and into Brookside Close with £2,500 moving costs to boot.”
The last group of media reports accompany the actual move, with some concentrating in 1994 on the delay and others on the high cost to the environment of opencast mining. The news of the village relocation was not only shown on local television but also on National television and people had heard of programmes in Australia and New Zealand.

The picture of the new village presented in the media initially reinforced the view that the relocation was necessary to avoid the methane danger. Later descriptions concentrated on the idea that the villagers were getting something for nothing and were felt by the villagers to be patronizing. This may have undermined the villagers’ self esteem and must be borne in mind when trying to interpret some of the quotations.

4.3.6 The timetable for the relocation. Originally the plan was to build the new village and for the community to move together. Once the first houses were completed, however, residents opted to relocate as soon as their property was ready. Thus the relocation of the majority of households was spread over an eight months period. There were further delays for some residents extending the total relocation period to 10 months. Some delays occurred because of owners’ dissatisfaction with their new property, some due to building problems and others due to legal difficulties concerning the deeds of properties. The project office staff had forecast a relocation date for each household but frequently the handing over of the keys for the new property was delayed and became a point of frustration. In addition Council and MHT tenants were paid the disturbance allowance (£2,500, index linked) in full before the move whereas owners received their allowance in three instalments, one third of the amount when the exchange, ‘new for old’, had been signed, one third just before the move and the final instalment after the handing in of the keys to the old house. This made it difficult for some owners to order and pay for carpets to be fitted and curtains to be made before the actual move into the new property (personal communication with project office staff).

Once the key to the old property had been handed to the project office staff, windows and doors were boarded up with black chipboard to prevent squatters or burglars entering the properties. Security guards were provided 24 hours a day to protect the remaining, but dwindling, number of residents, a stressful experience for those residents. This period was also difficult for the people who had moved to New Arkwright because the roads were only partially surfaced and very muddy until the end of 1995 when they were finally surfaced. There was no street lighting in Hardwick Drive until early 1996 and the residents around the perimeter of Penrose Crescent were affected by noise and dust pollution from the opencasting.

Illustration 4.5: Layout and location of old and New Arkwright to scale
4.4 Physical characteristics of New Arkwright Town

A chapter in the BCO/NEDDC folder entitled “Building a New Community” described the concept: “The proposed new Arkwright will be a great place to live and will be a real community in every way. A community is more than just streets and houses – it needs facilities and amenities that people can use together. The new development will have everything that people need, and more besides, and will be the envy of everyone. So the new Arkwright will have shops, a post office, a pub and a club just like it has now. The new village gives us a golden opportunity to provide additional community facilities. Our plans include a new community centre as a meeting place together with space for village activities. The new village and surrounding area will be landscaped and planted with a range of trees and decorative shrubs.”

It can be seen from the new village plan above that the area covered by New Arkwright Town is very much larger than the old village. This reflects not only the larger individual plots but also the additional 56 dwellings intended to make New Arkwright a sustainable community and the general layout.

As part of the enforced relocation BCO purchased all the properties in old Arkwright which were owned by non-resident private landlords. BCO does not own any properties in the new village. An equivalent
number of new properties (56) were donated to the Metropolitan Housing Trust (MHT). A further 56 properties were built and managed by MHT (a Sheltered Housing Block with 14 terraced bungalows of flats, 12 Young Persons flats, 24 two-bed starter homes and six one-bed flats above the two planned shops), so that they are now responsible for a total of 112 properties. The 16 NECCD properties were retained by the Council and relocated. Of the privately owned properties 102 households were relocated (plus 16 vacant properties whose former occupants had sold their houses to BCO during the 5 years of preparation for the relocation. These occupants had either decided to move away or had died). Thus a total of 174 households were relocated, 88 of which had chosen one of six styles of three-bedroomed houses, 79 households had chosen one of 4 types of bungalows and 7 households had chosen the Chalet bungalow design. Tenants have gradually been found for the additional 56 properties built and managed by MHT. The 16 vacant properties have been sold to private households by BCO on the open market. The price realised for a three-bedroomed house varied between £36,000 and £40,000 in 1996. The tenant/owner profile of New Arkwright Town consists of 118 rented properties (102 MHT and 16 NEDDC) and 122 privately owned properties.

There are no straight roads in New Arkwright and only a few short sections of the curved roads are straight. Front and back gardens provide extra space for each dwelling. The contours are hilly with the village resting in a depression with much of it below the level of the A623. Old Arkwright, in contrast, stood higher than the A623, with a gentle incline towards the top end, affording extensive views of the surrounding countryside.

Illustration 4.6: Rosling Way
Not all the promised facilities have materialised and some have become operational two years or more after the relocation. Completed and operational was the Arkwright Centre, a facility for the Parish, to be controlled and maintained by the Parish Council. It provides a main hall for indoor sports events, social functions and displays, storage rooms, committee rooms, kitchen and kitchen store, small bar and offices. It also accommodates the St. John’s Ambulance Meeting Room, which had been housed in the Methodist Chapel in old Arkwright. The Arkwright Primary School (for 105 pupils and 26 nursery places) and the Miners’ Welfare Club were also completed, although it was not until 2 years later that the Parish Council could afford to staff the nursery school.

Of the six planned shop units only 2 were eventually built. One opened in November 1997 as a sub post office/grocer’s store and in 1998 a Chinese Take-away shop opened in the other unit. Two football fields (1 Junior and 1 Senior) were provided but were not ready for use until November 1997. This facility is provided by the Parish Council and Derbyshire District Council and includes a Sports pavilion affording changing accommodation for two football teams and a referee. A floodlit hard sports area to accommodate 5-a-side football or 1 tennis court, is also a Parish Council facility and has been used since the relocation, although there have been continual problems with the flood lighting. A young children’s play area was completed at the end of 1997, providing slides and a roundabout in a fenced off area. The bowling green and a small associated changing and storage facility are jointly controlled by the Miners’ Welfare Club and Parish Council but it is still not useable (June 2000) because of problems with the grass surface. The planned conservation area around the Lake and the landscaping along The Dell has not been carried out.
4.5 Summary

The Arkwright community had been created and shaped through its involvement with deep coal mining. This involved a strong sense of community amongst the villagers and a mistrust of authority and in particular (but not restricted to) British Coal. The village was relatively isolated physically and socially and thus, inward-focused (see Pattison (1999) for a discussion of this feature of mining communities). The traditions of a mono-structure industry and the working-class culture meant that the residents displayed less autonomy than would be evident in a more mixed and mobile community.

The news of the relocation in 1990, with all its promises of creating a “vibrant and active community”, was initially received enthusiastically by the residents of old Arkwright as a unique solution to their blighted homes. However, the promised community involvement was curtailed, the process was prolonged and the villagers were subjected to unfamiliar media interest which portrayed their existing culture and village in negative tones and which consistently emphasized the idea that they were getting “something for nothing”.

In addition, few of the communal facilities were in place on time. As Michael Simmons wrote in the Guardian on 17 July 1996, “... a standard of living is not necessarily a quality of life, and for a community which has no universally available community amenities, it can be hard to coalesce. It has now become clear to all concerned over the last year that a shared history does not necessarily make for a shared future.”

Illustration 4.8: Straight ahead for New Arkwright Town
Despite these potentially negative aspects of the relocation, the interview data to be presented in this thesis shows that the outcome was far from negative for many of the villagers, and in any case, was more complex than a simple ‘black and white’ analysis would suggest. The background presented in this chapter must, though, be taken into account if a deeper understanding of the experience of the participants is to be achieved.

Having placed this work in its historical and physical context, the next chapter will make explicit the epistemological position adopted and the implications for the chosen methodologies.

**Chapter Five**

**Choosing a methodology**

5.1 Introduction
This chapter describes the philosophical framework within which this study has been undertaken. In the post-modern world, the epistemological position underlying any piece of psychological research ought to be explicit since the common assumptions and universally accepted academic paradigms of the past no longer hold in the social sciences, if indeed there ever has been a single dominant paradigm in psychology. The research design, the definition of the concepts, and the type of evidence being sought are all heavily influenced by the epistemological position adopted by the researcher; it is thus important that this is made explicit. The first section, therefore, concentrates on the epistemological view on which this study is based. This is followed by two sections, describing respectively the research philosophy underlying the qualitative and quantitative work in this study. Section 5.5 then explores in
more detail the specific qualitative approaches adopted and Section 5.6 looks at other aspects of the researcher’s philosophical position, in particular, the attitude adopted toward the residents of Arkwright who participated in this study.

5.2 Epistemological position and its implications for research methodology

Smith (1990b) suggests that the epistemological position of the researcher is central to a proper understanding of a piece of research as epistemology, methodology and the research questions are inextricably entwined. Historically, academic psychology’s epistemological position is derived from the natural sciences and is based on the hypothetico-deductive model of knowing (by which causal relationships are tested), with its concomitant rules of objectivity, generalisability, replicability, reliability and various forms of validity. The usual strategy within this model is experimental manipulation and control of subsets of variables on the basis of ‘prior’ theory. Quantification is important as the testing of theories is normally carried out on large numbers of cases to eliminate individual variation; a statistical approach is, therefore, ideal for this. In this model, the emphasis is on replicable hypothesis testing. This is the traditional positivist model of science, which also considers that theories are value-free, resulting in pure knowledge and truth.

Such an approach is appropriate for certain fields within psychology, particularly physiological psychology (e.g. double-blind drug trials), yet for a number of other disciplines within psychology this approach is problematic. This is because psychology, along with other social sciences, now acknowledges the crucial importance of cognition - of individuals’ understandings of their world - in any explanation of social behaviour, and it is this idea, termed variously (social) constructionism and (social) constructivism, which will now be discussed.

5.2.1 Social Constructivism. Social constructivism holds that human beings construct their own reality, and that people’s perception of the world is an active process to which they bring to bear their own, and their community’s, pre-existing understandings of reality. Whilst this is by no means the only paradigm within both social and environmental psychology, it is an important and widespread view. Social constructivism, as derived from Berger & Luckmann’s (1967) thesis on the social construction of reality, is seen as applying equally to the people whom we as psychologists study and to ourselves as scientists, trying to make sense of the world. This has two important implications. First, the phenomenon being studied, since it is a product of both individual and social processes, is likely to be complex, multi-faceted and may contain contradictions and inconsistencies. Second, there are no theory-free observations, the data we collect is inevitably selected and coloured by our existing and developing theories, in a manner akin to Piaget’s descriptions of assimilation and accommodation. As Stratton (1997, p. 119) points out, “the idea that ‘reality’ can be discovered is abandoned. .... in research and in the rest of life, we are about creating meanings, not discovering facts”. Truth is an elusive concept in
this view since meanings “do not merely reflect the world as it exists, but are produced or constructed by persons and within cultural, social and historical relationships” (Henwood & Nicolson, 1995, p. 109).

This research adopts a constructivist position in that it sees the ‘reality’ experienced by the participants as being shaped by the meanings they attribute to their social, physical and cultural environment. Social constructivism is, though, a reflexive theory, as already discussed, in that it must apply also to the researcher and her interpretation of the data. A strong social constructivist approach leads to relativism and the conclusion that no one interpretation has priority, or a closer claim to ‘truth’, than another. This author adopts the weak constructivist position, however, which claims that there are criteria for judging between some competing accounts of a situation, and that rigour, careful attention to the material and repeated self-questioning by the researcher will lead to conclusions which are not only plausible and theoretically useful but whose veracity can be supported by others.

Thus, adopting a social constructivist perspective, this study is about how the individual participants experienced the relocation, i.e. what meanings and understandings did they develop to explain what was happening to them. This is akin to Verstehen and the hermeneutics approach of Heidegger (Skodol Wilson & Hutchinson, 1991). It has also some similarities to the social anthropological approach of ethnography, but crucially, the objective here is not to build a complete description of the culture of Arkwright (in order to help us understand cultures in general) but rather, to use participants’ experiences (as construed by them) to help answer theoretical questions about environmental psychological concepts such as place attachment.

The quantitative approach, so valuable for testing hypotheses within the hypothetico-deductive model, is of limited use here. Rating scales on pre-determined categories impose the researcher’s construal of the world on the individuals being studied, rather than letting them speak for themselves. Even content analysis, where the number of occurrences of particular words, phrases or ideas is counted, is much more useful for testing hypotheses than for developing theories about how people understand their world, although it can be used for more exploratory studies if the researcher is careful to avoid imposing pre-specified categories on the data. With an increasing focus on meaning, researchers tend to concentrate more on what is said and how an issue is expressed. This has led to an increase in the use of qualitative data, focusing on what people say or write about themselves and their situation. In parallel with this increasing emphasis on the word has been the development of a number of ‘qualitative methods’ which help the researcher use and interpret qualitative data.

Qualitative methods are thought to meet a number of reservations about the uncritical use of quantification in the social sciences, e.g. the problem of inappropriately fixing meanings when these are variable and renegotiable in relation to their context of use; the neglect of the uniqueness and
particularity of human experience; and the possibility of forcing internally structured subjectivities into externally imposed, so called, objective systems of meaning (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992). Stiles argues that “numbers offer precision in scientific communication and efficiency of aggregation and manipulation (e.g. standard indices of central tendency and dispersion, statistical procedures), but their characterization of persons’ experiences is usually far more impoverished than are their words” (1993, p. 595). Further, variation in meaning and human experience is multidimensional and much is lost when it is simplified into a few dimensions on a rating scale. Stiles points out that we may have reliable variation within simplified narrowly defined scales but “they overlook most of the richness of language and of experience, and they can deceive us by pretending the psychological world is much simpler than it is” (p. 596). Additionally, qualitative methods acknowledge the essential diversity of the field of study whereas quantitative approaches aim to reduce this diversity: “Number is the means by which the many become the summarized few, ... which may well obscure many relevant features of data” (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992, pp. 99-100). Certain statistical packages (e.g. LISREL and MDS) do aim to deal with complexity but still reduce this rather than, as in the qualitative paradigm, actually focussing on it and recognising its interpretative value. It must not be inferred from this that qualitative methods produce findings which have no generalisability and which cannot be transferred to other contexts; what it is stating, rather, is that the understandings derived from qualitative approaches of necessity include the whole context and usually acknowledge the complexity of the situation in a way which is not the case with many quantitative approaches, i.e. they produce more “open-ended” outcomes in contrast to the more closed, “yes/no” outcomes of many (but not all) quantitative techniques.

Qualitative methods have been used in social science research for some time but only in recent years has there been a growing interest in their use in psychology (see Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992; 1994; 1995a; Rennie, et al., 1988; Opie, 1992). There now seems to be a clear conviction within the field of psychology that qualitative research holds promise and is able to add value to the field in terms of theory development. This is particularly so when research is context-specific, as in the case of this study, the enforced relocation of Arkwright.

It does not follow, however, that quantitative and qualitative approaches are incompatible. For example, Henwood & Pidgeon (1992) warn against viewing quantitative and qualitative paradigms as ‘incommensurable’, as it “would deny the possibility of strengthening research through the use of a principled mixture of methods” (p. 100). They wish to avoid a repetition of the “inconclusive and divisive debates of the 1970s, obscuring the radical and exciting implications that are explicitly raised by considering qualitative methods (in the broadest sense) in relation to the scientific process and the generation of knowledge” (p. 101). Indeed, Stratton (1997, p. 119) sees a continuum between research concluding that “a certain phenomenon exists” and research claiming that “a certain population has a certain probability of a certain characteristic”, both of which he sees as qualitative approaches, since
they are based on what is initially qualitative data.

This research has adopted what it is hoped is the “principled mixture of methods” advocated by Henwood & Pidgeon (1992). Although the major approach of the thesis is, for the reasons discussed above, on qualitative analysis of interview data, quantitative data and analysis have also been used, as described further in Section 5.4 below.

However, the main focus of the research has been on using qualitative methodologies, and it is, therefore, appropriate to begin by defining ‘qualitative research’; then to describe evolving good practice; and finally to explain the choice of the qualitative approach for this work.

5.3 Defining qualitative research

Qualitative research is most frequently based on using words as the data to be studied, but the nature of the research is disparate. It has been found difficult to give a clear, single definition of qualitative research (see especially Burgess, 1984; Bryman, 1988; Hammersley, 1992b; Silverman, 1993) as it does not “represent a unified set of techniques or philosophies and indeed has grown out of a wide range of intellectual and disciplinary traditions” (Mason, 1996, p. 3). Examples of qualitative research abound within phenomenology, ethnomethodology, symbolic interactionism, Verstehen (intersubjective meaning) and post-modernism, but these involve a variety of different approaches to research.

Additionally, within these philosophical positions are many diverse methods, e.g. discourse analysis (e.g. Potter & Wetherell, 1987), content analysis (e.g. Krippendorf, 1980), protocol analysis (e.g. Ericsson & Simon, 1980), ethogenics (e.g. Harre & Secord, 1972), grounded theory (e.g. Glaser & Strauss, 1967), narrative analysis (e.g. Riessman, 1993) and Heideggerian hermeneutics (e.g. Packer & Addison, 1989). This is not by any means a comprehensive list but is meant to indicate the range of philosophical directions and methodological strategies. It is this broad range which adds to the richness of qualitative research.

A common way of attempting to define qualitative research is for writers to point to essential differences between quantitative and qualitative methodologies, rather than to offer a clear definition. One frequently quoted difference is that quantitative researchers state the theory and the hypotheses in advance, with the emphasis on the outcome, i.e. do findings confirm or not confirm the researcher’s hypotheses – i.e. the hypothetico-deductive model is usually dominant. In qualitative research, however, the focus is on the process which is discovery orientated (e.g. Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978; Glaser, 1992). The “inquirer’s role moves from that of a manipulator and controller of circumstance to that of a facilitator and co-participant in the inquiry process” (Lincoln, 1992, p. 381). Although both qualitative and quantitative approaches share a common concern with theory as the goal of research, the relationship between theory and the research process differs. Researchers using qualitative methods are
unlikely to be testing for predetermined outcomes and, importantly, during the processes of data collection and analysis, goals may change as theory emerges. Thus the process is directed by an emerging theory.

The choice between the qualitative and quantitative approaches will depend not only on the underlying epistemology of the researcher but more pragmatically, on whether the research question involves factors which can be operationalized into measurable variables and any change in these tested statistically, or is focussing on an earlier stage of the scientific process – the development of understanding and theory about as yet little-understood phenomena. Few scientists would disagree today that the question must be “which methodological approach is most suited to the research question, or problem at hand” (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1995, p. 115), being aware of and acknowledging the inherent weaknesses and strengths of each (see e.g. Bryman, 1988; Hammersley, 1989; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Silverman, 1993). The study of Arkwright clearly needed primarily a qualitative approach since the factors being investigated stemmed from the participants’ perceptions of the enforced relocation and the meanings they held for them.

In recent publications, the debate within social sciences (including psychology) centres not around whether qualitative methods are acceptable as scientific contribution but focuses on overcoming some inherent weaknesses in qualitative research (see e.g. Richardson, 1996) and on establishing which criteria are appropriate to evaluate quality and rigour of reported qualitative investigations (e.g. Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Lincoln, 1992; Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). The next section will describe what has become a gradually evolving code of good practice.

5.3.1 Evolving good practice in qualitative research. Researchers working within a positivistic tradition (e.g. Morgan, 1998) criticize qualitative research by arguing that the canons of quantitative research are absent. Many workers, however, now feel that merely applying traditional criteria such as reliability, validity, internal consistency and generalisability “risks undermining the very benefits that [the qualitative] approach brings” (Pidgeon & Henwood, 1997, p. 268). Qualitative researchers now argue for different means of assessing the quality of a piece of work, using the criteria of constructivism rather than positivism (see e.g. Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992; 1994; 1995a; Stiles, 1993; Banister, et al., 1994). This is not to say that a positivist approach does not consider the context in which the research is carried out but the status given to the participant is different and this is why positivist criteria are not necessarily appropriate to judge qualitative research. The following are some indications of why traditional criteria may not be useful within the qualitative field.

Qualitative researchers’ main tool is the use of words but as people in different cultural and social contexts use different words to express their experiences and as experiences look different from different
perspectives, there is a need for empathy on the researcher’s part in order to understand the meaning, purposes and significances which the participant attaches to a particular situation. Explanations of feelings and experiences contain their own frame of reference and need to *connect* with the listener’s frame of reference. This will become evident in the context of the Arkwright study.

In qualitative research events are reported within a given context and the essence of the context is part of the whole. In addition, “the meaning of people’s experience and actions is cumulative; in any interview or conversation an exchange contains the meanings of what has already been said” (Paget, 1983, p. 79). This is an issue, particularly with longitudinal research, since the process of getting to know participants includes remembering what has been said before and building on that knowledge. In order to ‘understand’ a person’s viewpoint it is necessary to build a relationship. Understanding is generated through relationships which has important methodological implications when empathic knowledge bridges the gap in the spoken account.

Thus, the analysis of qualitative research calls for different quality control to that applicable to quantitative or more positivistic approaches. Possible criteria are discussed under the headings of generalisability, objectivity, reliability and validity, reflexivity and fit.

### 5.3.1.1 Generalisability

Lincoln & Guba (1985) suggest that the term transferability of findings should replace generalisability, since sampling decisions have not been made on statistical grounds. Findings may be applicable to a contextually similar study, which “places a special onus on the qualitative researcher to report fully on the contextual features of a study ...” (Pidgeon & Henwood, 1997, p. 271).

Patton (1990) also addresses this issue and suggests that ‘extrapolation’ is a better term as it is problem orientated, whereas generalisability is based on statistical and probabilistic calculations. Mason (1996) distinguishes between empirical and theoretical generalisation, where the former is based on statistical grounds and thus is not applicable, whereas theoretical generalisation fits with the concepts of transferability and extrapolations. Again Mason stresses the importance of making each step overt, linking the claim of theoretical generalisability to all other elements of the research design and practice.

Findings relating to the experience of Arkwright villagers undergoing the enforced relocation may well be transferable to similar situations e.g. the recent discovery by ICI that toxic gas, hexachloro-1,3-butadiene (HCBD) from their waste dump near Weston, Cheshire was seeping into houses (Guardian, 11 February, 2000) or for other enforced relocations, e.g. the ongoing process of refurbishment by Councils and Housing Associations across England, although as Lincoln & Guba (1985) point out, the different contexts must be taken into account.
5.3.1.2 Objectivity. The strength of quantitative methodologies is said to be in their objectivity, yet Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) and Woolgar (1988) demonstrated that there is non-objective and socially constructed scientific discourse even within the natural sciences. Moreover, not only does scientific discourse involve some subjectivity, but the instruments themselves – the definition, design and evaluation of scales and other measures – involve selectivity and choice, which may be influenced by the researcher’s personal frame of reference. As already stated, from the perspective of constructivism, there is no theory-free observation. Patton (1990) states that while numbers convey a sense of precision and accuracy, they often belie the validity of the measurements that yielded them: “numbers do not protect against bias, they merely disguise it” (p. 480).

Stiles suggests that the criterion of ‘objectivity’ should be replaced with the concept of ‘permeability’, “the capacity of theories or interpretations or understandings to be changed by encounters with observations” (1993, p. 602). Good practice in qualitative research demands that these issues are addressed and acknowledged rather than hidden. In qualitative research the aim is “to enhance permeability and to help readers assess the degree to which the observations have permeated the investigator’s understanding” (p. 602), thus evidencing that researchers are not bound by their own frame of reference. In this study, the relatively large sample size ensured that the researcher would almost inevitably be presented with counter-examples to any over-rigid theories which might have been forming.

5.3.1.3 Reliability and validity. Stiles (1993) argues that, in qualitative research, the criterion of trustworthiness should replace reliability and validity. Trustworthiness of observations or data replaces reliability (procedural trustworthiness) and trustworthiness of interpretations or conclusions replaces validity. Similarly, Lincoln & Guba (1985) suggest that long-term contact with the participants will act as a test of validity in qualitative research. Mason (1996) makes a similar point. She agrees that qualitative researchers must be concerned with reliability and validity but in a different way. She states that research should demonstrate to others that data generation and analysis have been “not only appropriate to the research questions, but also thorough, careful, honest and accurate” (p. 146). She suggests that the researcher should provide evidence (e.g. tapes) including an explanation of why it is that the audience should believe it to be reliable and accurate. Smith (1990b) provides a summary checklist of validation techniques for qualitative work, these are prolonged engagement with participants; convergence of different pieces of evidence; internal coherence and presence of pattern; chain of evidence; participant validation and independent audit. This study involved a ten year engagement with participants (which is still ongoing). The qualitative analysis is ‘triangulated’ with quantitative analyses where possible (see Section 5.4), and qualitative data categories are only reported if they contained quotations from at least two participants. Internal coherence and independent audit were provided by reviews of the chapters presenting the data and interpretation by at least one colleague.
and the PhD supervisors. Participant validation proved not to be possible because of the constraints of time, the volume of data and the theoretical nature of the points being raised.

Mason (1996) stresses the importance of having permanent records (audio/videotapes) which are open to verification by other researchers. It is this emphasis on openness which is found throughout the qualitative paradigm and which is so fundamental. For this study, the transcripts of all the interviews are available for verification (however, see Section 5.6.3 on ‘confidentiality’) as are all the audio-tapes for Times 1 to 4 and about 50% of the Time 5 interviews (tapes of the remaining 50% had been reused after transcription was complete).

5.3.1.4 Reflexivity. Constructivism acknowledges the interdependent nature in the social process of research and one way in which work may be evaluated is by the extent to which the worker reflects on his or her reasons for the decisions made during the research process (Stevenson & Cooper, 1997). Good practice requires researchers to highlight and document their involvement (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stiles, 1993; Stevenson & Cooper, 1997) to help orientate the reader. Harding (1991) argues that this reflexivity, publicising the researcher subjectivities, gives a more complete account and, therefore, represents a move to “strong objectivity”. Stiles notes that events may be not only intentionally misrepresented but can also look different from different perspectives and words may take on different meanings. He, too, argues for new procedures which include “disclosure and explication of the investigator’s personal orientation, context, and internal processes during the investigation, along with intensive engagement with the material, iterative cycling between observation and interpretation, and grounding of the interpretations” (1993, p. 620).

Good practice provides detailed documentation of the thinking behind the research process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This can include initial concerns and how they were dealt with, intuitive feelings about the quality of the data, the thought processes that will help others to follow the steps which lead to the development of theories. Lincoln and Guba call it a ‘paper-trail’, which is open to external audit.

This chapter constitutes an important part of the researcher’s explanation of her subjectivities, philosophy and motivation for undertaking the research. Section 6.2.8.2 also describes the difficulties experienced by the researcher in working with participants from a very different background. In addition, the memos and documentation produced by the researcher and made accessible by the Nud*ist programme (as described in Chapter 6) offer an audit trail for the development of the theoretical ideas during the coding phase of this research.

5.3.1.5 The importance of fit. Categories created by the researcher which become the building blocks of analysis should describe the meaning units very closely. The importance of fit is highlighted by
Henwood & Pidgeon (1992; 1994; 1997) and was first described by Glaser and Strauss in 1967. Pidgeon & Henwood suggest that this can be achieved by writing “comprehensive definitions of key concepts summarising why phenomena have been labelled in a certain way” (1997, p. 269). Glaser (1992) stresses ‘emerging’ versus ‘forcing’ and warns of forcing meaning units into a preconceived category label, instead of allowing the label to ‘emerge’ to fit the data. Continued writing of memos explaining how the category was created will make this process explicit, both to the researcher and the public, allowing both to evaluate fit.

In this study, for example, early data and reading of the literature suggested that the concept of “environmental mastery” might prove to be of theoretical use in understanding the factors encouraging or inhibiting place attachment. Close examination of the quotes coded under this category revealed, however, that this category overlapped substantially with both “appropriation” and with “self-efficacy” and the category “environmental mastery” was therefore abandoned, to avoid ‘forcing’ the data.

5.3.1.6 The longitudinal process. A longitudinal approach is important for work on process and change as not only does the past affect the present but the past is also constructed in the present, when the individual recalls events and feelings. A retrospective study is, therefore, investigating something essentially different to one looking at people’s current understanding of their circumstances, and this reinforces the value of longitudinal studies. “Retrospective accounts, as often used in social science research, may look very convincing and have a considerable narrative coherence. They may however be very different to an account of the same process produced at the time it was occurring” (Smith, 1990b, p. 63). Yet for reasons of time and cost there is little research conducted within the qualitative approach which follows a process over time, although there are some exceptions, e.g. Smith’s study of the changing self-concept of pregnant women at four intervals (three before the birth and one after the birth). There has been little longitudinal work in psychology on whole communities undergoing change, such as the one described here. The rich data provided by repeated in-depth interviews with participants over a six-year period provides an unusual and fertile source for exploring the processes of change. The scale of this study, however, raises particular methodological challenges, as will be seen in Chapter 6.

5.4 Quantitative data
As already described, the epistemological position underlying this research is the weak form of social constructivism. This does not preclude the use of quantitative methods (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Hammersley, 1996) and they have been used here, for two major purposes. The first is to allow for the possibility of strengthening this research by providing a triangulation of methods addressing a particular question; this was used, for example, in exploring research question 1(iii) and the technique of triangulation will be discussed more fully below. The second use of the quantitative data is to test specific, focused, theoretical research questions such as 2 (i). Some research questions (e.g. 3 (ii))
involve both these uses of quantitative analysis.

Triangulation of methods is recommended to strengthen validity concerns (Morse, 1991a; Stiles, 1993). Smith (1996) explains that the term ‘triangulation’ is derived from navigation and refers to the notion of fixing an object from two independent locations in order to increase the accuracy of the siting. In social science, researchers, rather than hoping for an absolutely true reading as in navigation, would look to a strengthening of their claims or to producing a richer, fuller story.

In order to provide quantitative data for triangulation, it was decided at the outset to include various scales, including one measuring place attachment and another measuring sense of community. The variables in the initial quantitative data collection waves were all variables for which there were pre-existing theories suggesting that they might be important. At later stages of the research, further variables were added as it became clear that these were theoretically of interest (for full details see Chapter 6).

5.5 Choice of a dual qualitative approach for this study

Having outlined the philosophical position underlying this research, and the choice of both qualitative and quantitative methods, this section describes in more detail the qualitative approach taken.

This longitudinal study was initially begun and subsequently designed with the intention of employing qualitative analysis. As the literature reviews in Chapters 2 and 3 suggest, there is still considerable scope for amending current theories and for constructing new theories on the processes of attachment to place and its relationship to identity. It is for this reason that it was decided to adopt the Grounded Theory (GT) approach during interviews and between data waves, whilst Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) was used for the final analysis. The overall aim was to understand what the villagers experienced at different stages of the relocation process with the aim of developing new theoretical insights grounded in the interview data of the mining community.

The major data source chosen was in-depth interviews, ongoing conversations over a six year period (from January 1992 – January 1998), which would allow participants’ own construction of their experiences to be elicited. The following four sections will describe the Grounded Theory process and its advantages and limitations, whilst section 5.5.5 will describe the Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (Smith, 1991; 1994; 1996a; Smith, et al., 1999a).

5.5.1 Grounded Theory. The grounded theory method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Glaser, 1992) was developed by Glaser and Strauss as a method for “systematic discovery of the theory from the data of social research” (1967, p. 3) in response to a perceived crisis in
theory development in sociology (Charmaz, 1983; Rennie, et al., 1988). In their view, sociology had stagnated in deductive theorising, with researchers forcing data to fit existing theories instead of refining, transcending or discarding theories and developing new theories through their own analyses which are grounded in context specific data. Glaser (1992) attributes much of the laborious work for the analytic methodology and procedures of inductive quantitative analysis to the researchers and students in the Sociology Department and the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University in the 1950s and 1960s and his collaboration with Anselm Strauss from the University of Chicago. Thus, the now classic text “The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research” was written. To obtain a clearer picture of the principles of Grounded Theory, the following explanations set out its strategies; the criteria for a well-constructed grounded theory; advantages of grounded theory; and a discussion of criticisms and limitations.

5.5.1.1 Strategies for the Grounded Theory Method. The grounded theory method stresses discovery and theory development which demands four distinctive sets of strategies:

The first set of strategies requires that data collection and analysis proceed simultaneously. Grounded theorists shape their data collection from their analytic interpretations, which, in turn, sharpen their observations. By the same process they check emerging ideas by collecting further data. This strengthens both the quality of the data and the developing ideas.

In the second set, both the processes and products of research are shaped from the data rather than from preconceived logically deduced theoretical frameworks. Grounded theorists immerse themselves in their data by means of a coding technique called the constant comparative method. Two analytic procedures are basic to the constant comparative method of coding. During the first of these, called open coding, data is broken down into incidents. This makes possible constant comparisons of incident to incident. When concepts (the underlying meaning, uniformity and/or pattern within a set of descriptive incidents) emerge, additional incidents are compared to the concept, and thus properties of categories (a type of concept, usually used for a higher level of abstraction) are generated. The second analytic procedure focuses on these properties by continuously asking the question: “What category or property of a category does this incident indicate?” Glaser stresses that this is a neutral question. The researcher must have no preconceived ideas in order to be innovative rather than be restrained by existing theoretical frameworks. By comparing incident to incident or to concepts, the analyst looks for patterns, so that a pattern of many similar incidents can be given a conceptual name as a category, and the compared incidents can be seen as interchangeable indices for the same concept. When additional incidents simply indicate the same pattern then saturation has been reached, as “it is unnecessary to keep collecting more incidents which keep indicating the same pattern and no new properties of it” (1992, p. 40).
The third set of strategies requires grounded theorists to make systematic efforts to check and refine emerging categories but they do not accept the traditional canons of verification. Their verification lies in checking developing ideas with further specific observations or systematic comparisons between observations. Glaser (1992) clearly states that grounded theory is not verificational as its statements are probabilities intended to be modified as new data and new insights emerge.

Fourthly, in grounded theory, the analysis and interpretation is seen as a process in itself, continuously ongoing. New questions, even years later by different analysts, may add another piece to the intellectual puzzle. Grounded theorists do not aim for any final or complete interpretation (Charmaz, 1983).

Glaser (1992) clarified some issues which he felt had been misinterpreted or overlooked by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Glaser (1992) reformulates the basic methodology which underlies grounded theory analysis (as described above) and it is this latest account of Grounded Theory Analysis which has been used as a basis for devising the methodology used in this study.

Glaser states that “the requisite conceptual skills for doing grounded theory are to absorb the data as data, to be able to step back or distance oneself from it, and then to abstractly conceptualize the data” (1992, p. 11). He admits that this requires “theoretical and social sensitivity and an ability to maintain analytic distance, while at the same time drawing upon theoretical knowledge and astute powers of assimilation of data which allow concepts to emerge that patterns of data indicate” (1992, p. 12). He encouragingly states that grounded theory will bring out skills of conceptual analysis which many researchers did not know they possessed but he also states quite bluntly that should a researcher be low in conceptual ability then grounded theory is not the right tool for this person. Later, he writes that proficiency in grounded theory comes with practice and that “it is only by applying the methods in research that one gains the sufficient, delayed understandings of how they work and what they produce, and the openness and flexibility to apply them to diverse fields of substantive study” (1992, pp. 17-18).

### 5.5.2 Advantages of Grounded Theory

The literature on Grounded Theory indicates several benefits of the method over other approaches to qualitative data.

#### 5.5.2.1 Managing unstructured complexity

Faced with the task of managing unstructured qualitative data, the method of grounded theory provides a framework for the analyst to deal with the unstructured complexity of social reality and to render it manageable (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992).

#### 5.5.2.2 Appropriate theory construction

Grounded Theory is about developing theory from a particular field or problem under study. The emergent theory maintains a close link with the empirical data and thus reflects the social realities of the group studied and could, if necessary, be understood and used by
them (Turner, 1981; Bryman, 1988).

5.5.2.3 *Flexibility and accuracy.* The rigorous nature of the analysis (constant comparison, asking only neutral questions, delayed conceptual elaboration) ensures that care is taken to achieve an accurate and true reflection of the data (Turner, 1981). Concepts and categories are continually modified until saturation occurs. The process and the conceptual developments are open to scrutiny by others, ensuring accuracy and validity of the highest possible level.

5.5.2.4 *Closing theoretical gaps.* The method of Grounded Theory is a useful approach when existing theory is incomplete, non-applicable or non-existent. Its strength lies in its ability to focus on the salient issues of social reality rather than testing preconceived hypotheses.

5.5.3 *Criticisms and limitations of Grounded Theory.* Writers have also expressed some criticisms of grounded theory and pointed to its limitations.

5.5.3.1 *Cost and time.* Using Grounded Theory is time consuming and expensive. The data collection process (taped interviews, observational notes, reflexive journal of the researcher), the transcribing of the tapes, the coding process (e.g. constant comparison, coding, categorising, memoing) and the analysis demand much time during the data collection phase of a project.

5.5.3.2 *Assumptions and methods.* More seriously, the assumptions and analytic methods of grounded theory have also been criticized. Lofland & Lofland (1984) argue that grounded theorists do not give enough attention to data collection techniques and to the quality of the gathered materials. This may have been the case in 1983. Since then many more researchers have used grounded theory (see Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992; 1994; 1995; 1996; Rennie, et al., 1988; Rennie, 1994a; 1994b; Charmaz, 1983; 1990). Strauss and Glaser have gone their different ways since 1987 and have elaborated their interpretation of the theory further, clarifying details of the approach and thus, overcoming some of the earlier sources for criticism. Furthermore, Stanley and Wise (1983) criticize Glaser and Strauss for “espousing a form of inductivist positivism” (p. 152). Charmaz (1983), however, argues that “these criticisms misinterpret the aims and methods of grounded theory” (p. 109) and offers two main explanations for these misinterpretations: “first, the language of the grounded theory method relies on terms commonly used in quantitative research and, I believe, this language lags behind actual development of the method” (p. 109). Charmaz uses ‘coding’, ‘comparison groups’ and ‘theoretical sampling’ as examples, terms which are derived from deductive quantitative procedures. Charmaz’s second point is that, as Rock (1979) suggested, grounded theory as a method “depended heavily on an oral tradition implicitly transmitted to students, ... a practice learned largely through apprenticeship”. However, there are publications giving students of the approach more guidance, including Glaser (1978;
5.5.3.3 Misuse of Grounded Theory. There has also been criticism of researchers’ misuse of grounded theory. Bryman & Burgess (1994) comment that descriptions of analytical procedures given in some studies suggest that theoretical sorting is sometimes carried out much earlier than the grounded theory approach stipulates. Bryman (1988) suspects that “grounded theory is probably given lip-service to a greater degree than is appreciated” (pp. 54-55) and Richards & Richards (1991) observe that grounded theory “is widely adopted as an approving bumper sticker in qualitative studies” (p. 43) and is used “as a general indicator of the desirability of making theory from data, rather than a guide to a method for handling data” (1987 (no page number given), quoted by Bryman & Burgess, 1994, p. 220).

5.5.3.4 Limitations of researchers. Writers have expressed doubts as to whether it is indeed possible for the analyst to suspend theoretical reflection until a relatively late stage and whether conducting analysis in a theoretically neutral way is desirable (eg. Bulmer, 1979; Bryman, 1988). Glaser (1992) accuses Strauss and Corbin (1990) of forcing the theory by having preconceived hypotheses and asking direct questions instead of neutral questions, thus foreclosing the analysis. Glaser stipulates basic principles but as studies are idiographic, it would be at odds with the essence of grounded analysis to provide rigid guidelines. Hence the quality of grounded analysis is largely dependent on the experience and conceptual ability of the individual researcher so that the quality of the outcome is limited by the quality of the researcher.

5.5.4 This research and Grounded Theory. Grounded theory alone was not felt to be sufficient as the underlying methodology for this research. The difficulties were twofold. First, the philosophical position of grounded theory, in terms of its assumption that there is a theory hidden within the data, waiting to be uncovered is, as Stanley & Wise (1983) have discussed, fundamentally positivist rather than adopting the constructivist philosophy espoused by this researcher. In addition, there were practical difficulties with the method in the context of longitudinal interviews of the number and scale undertaken in this study. Having decided to use grounded theory, it was not possible to follow one of the basic tenets of grounded theory which is that data collection and analysis should proceed simultaneously because of overlapping time phases. This will be described more fully in Chapter 6. In addition, the researcher was looking for a methodology which acknowledged the duality of the perspectives involved: the phenomenological worlds of the participants and the conceptual framework of the researcher which would facilitate the process of interpretation. This two phased approach which was deemed necessary for the analysis of the interview material was found in the ‘Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis’ (Smith, 1991; 1994). Thus, as will be seen in Chapter 6, the qualitative approach will be a hybrid between pure Grounded Theory and pure Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. The following
section will provide a brief discussion of the similarities and differences between Grounded Theory and Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis.

5.5.5 *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis.* Smith found that a purely thematic analysis of transcribed interviews only partially addresses the meanings of participants and does not address the process of interpretation, which must also be carried out. Smith termed this dual aspect of analysis and interpretation ‘Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis’ (IPA). As Smith explains, “the aim of IPA is to explore the participant’s view of the world and to adopt, as far as is possible, an ‘insider’s perspective’ (Conrad, 1987) of the phenomenon under study” (1996, p. 264). The methodological details of IPA are described in Chapter 6.

Since IPA shares many features in common with GT, a full description of IPA would be somewhat repetitive; for this reason, the following sections concentrate on a comparison of IPA with GT.

5.5.5.1 *Similarities with Grounded Theory.* There is considerable overlap between GT and IPA. Both approaches are concerned with understanding what the participant thinks or believes, that is both emphasize and explore the subjective perception of an individual, hence are phenomenological. The process of the analysis of a transcript also has similarities, in that the researcher reads and re-reads the transcript several times and then focuses on themes which become apparent. Both employ a constant comparative method of coding. When concepts emerge, additional incidents are compared to the concept (as detailed in section 5.5.1.1) and the researcher looks for patterns, connections and tensions and is recommended to write memos throughout the process. Both approaches are fluid, in that ideas or categories are modified as new insights emerge and both analyses are grounded in the transcript. Both are non-prescriptive methodologies.

5.5.5.2 *Differences between GT and IPA.* There are, however, some important differences. GT demands that data collection and analysis proceed simultaneously, hence the data collection is shaped by the analytical interpretation at an early stage, which can only be possible if the researcher has no time constraints. This is not deemed necessary in IPA. Secondly, although it may be implicit in GT, IPA explicitly recognizes that there is a dynamic relationship between the researcher and the participant. Smith states that “while one attempts to get close to the participant’s personal world, one cannot do this directly or completely. Access is both dependant on, and complicated by, the researcher’s own conceptions which are required in order to make sense of that other personal world through a process of interpretative activity.” (1996, p. 264). This was immensely important for this study and Smith’s articulation and development of the IPA methodology has made a crucial contribution to this work. The main concern of the researcher was to listen carefully to the participants and to attend to themes which were important to them.
Qualitative research seeks interpretations, not just facts. Seeking interpretations creates an obligation both to support and test interpretations and to rigorously report internal processes taking place during all stages of the research process, including the researcher’s personal orientation, doubts throughout the process and how they might have been resolved. If done well, it will result in a much more open and honest, objective, reliable and valid piece of work.

5.6 The researcher’s ideology
The fundamental philosophical position of this research, that of a constructivist epistemology, has been described above. However, there are a number of other philosophical and ethical considerations which helped determine the nature of this research. These mostly relate to the researcher’s overall motivation for the study and her attitude towards the residents of Arkwright. The motivation for embarking on this work was not primarily to gain a PhD. The researcher had previously examined the psycho-social impacts on small communities affected by the Channel Tunnel Terminal project (Speller, 1988). The lack of adequate theories explaining place attachment and how it may impact on identity became apparent. To be effective (perhaps in order to influence planning laws) place related attachment and identity theories need to be better developed. The implications of this stance are that the concern for the affected community must dominate the research. These issues are discussed below.

5.6.1 Text appropriation and empowerment. Opie (1992) explored a number of issues which are seldom addressed. Her interpretation of lengthy and unstructured interviews with carers for elderly confused spouses or relatives at home, draws on feminist comment and research “in order to challenge conventional political and social knowledge about caring” (1992, p. 52). The task of constructing an analysis which adequately represents the complexity of the carers’ experiences made her conscious of “the need for further, more reflexive analysis to avoid textual appropriation of the researched; and to focus attention on difference as a means of more fully representing the complexities of the social world” (1992, p. 53). Opie defines ‘text appropriation’ as an act on researchers’ part “in the sense that they can appropriate the data to the researcher’s interest, so that other significant experiential elements which challenge or partially disrupt that interpretation may also be silenced” (1992, p. 52). She elaborates her thoughts on ‘difference’ by quoting from interview text. Briefly, her point is that for most of the interview, the carer talks about the stressful experience and it would be easy to focus only on that during the analysis but “interspersed through a number of texts are different moments which speak of love and affection and regard, which mitigate temporarily the tensions of the role, and which disrupt and qualify the subjective experience of exploitation. These moments by no means negate that reading but they indicate points of complication and of contradiction which the analysis must additionally identify and explain” (1992, p. 53).
Opie’s point of avoiding appropriation of the text and to highlight expressions of even fleeting difference is firstly a means of more fully representing the complexities of the social world and secondly a “crucial means by which a researcher may empower participants in her research” (1992, p. 53).

Although ‘good practice’ as detailed above will go some way towards avoiding appropriation of text, Opie’s focus on significant yet barely voiced moments is immensely important. These brief moments of love, affection and regard “derive their significance from the hesitation, contradictoriness and recursiveness of the spoken voice (Opie quoting Barthes, 1973) ... from the light they cast on the painful moving across the surfaces of remembrance/nonremembrance, presence/absence” (p. 55). Events, which are significant although fleeting, must be included in the analysis and not be avoided because of “ingrained valorizing of quantity” (p. 55) and the inherent complexity.

Opie identifies four alternative practices which need to be part of the final analysis in order to avoid appropriation of the researched material. These are:

1. Recognition of the limitations of the researcher’s research and knowledge. Clifford (1986) speaks of the researcher being positioned ‘at the edge of the frame’ (quoted by Opie, 1992, p. 58) “which undermines the authoritativeness of the research and introduces elements of incompleteness and contingency” (p. 58). Opie notes that this has fundamental implications for the practice of social research as it goes against the Western notions of objectivity and truth and raises questions about the authority of texts.

The long-term relationship established by the researcher with the participants has meant that misunderstandings or failures of understanding have been corrected during the ongoing interaction. The researcher was careful not to give any impression of being an authority figure. Participants would not have agreed to continue with the study if there had not been an accepted and empathic understanding between the researcher and the participants.

2. The analytic reading of the participants’ texts. Opie advocates a reading of the data, which pays “attention to the paradoxical, the contradictory, the marginal. ... it attends to what may be quantifiably insignificant but whose (remarked) presence may question a more conventional interpretation and expand theoretical understanding” (p. 59). Opie argues that this demands reflexivity from the researcher and an acceptance that the research report is limited in its representation of actuality. Adherence to the practices of IPA and GT have ensured that Opie’s recommendations have been met in this study.

3. Some principles in relation to the incorporation of quotations from the participants’ texts. Opie
argues for the inclusion of the participant’s voice but warns that principles for selection of quotations must be clearly defined. Again, adherence to the practices of IPA and GT, together with the capacities of the Nudist software, ensured that the use of quotations was guided by consistent and clearly defined principles.

4. Issues of empowerment. Opie describes how empowerment of participants can be achieved through research design and researchers’ assumptions about the purpose of the research. Research design includes issues about the style of interviewing, “where the style of interviewing is not hindered by rigid interview schedules, and where points of specific interest can be followed in detail” (1992, p. 64). This, she argues, empowers especially “the socially marginalized as it assumes that they can contribute significantly to the description and analysis of a social issue” (1992, p. 64). The open-ended style of interviewing adopted for this study ensured that participants could direct and control the content of the interviews.

There is another issue which has been prominent in work carried out by this author and colleagues (Speller, 1988; Speller & Sime, 1993; Speller, Lyons & Twigger-Ross, 1996), which is empowerment through being heard. Empathic listening, having time for and emphatically responding to the participant’s concerns, allowing the participant to explore feelings even if they, at times, do not adhere to the research question, is about empowering in addition to giving something back to the participant for their willingness to be involved in research.

Stiles points out that “people’s thoughts and intentions continually feed back to influence themselves and each other; thoughts may be caused, but they are seldom predictable” (1993, p. 597). Thoughts can also be influenced and many qualitative researchers speak of empowerment or enhancement of the researched community as a research goal (e.g. Gergen, 1982; 1985; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lather, 1986a; 1986b; Opie, 1992; Rosenwald, 1985), thus intentionally influencing the research outcome. It should be stated here that there was no intention to influence the research outcome at any stage of the Arkwright study but this did not preclude assistance and comforting when necessary.

Opie concludes that textual appropriation of the participant is inevitable but with an awareness of the effects and shortcomings and implementation of the above approach some balance can be achieved.

5.6.2 Accountability. Researchers are accountable to their participants and their research community. Previous studies carried out by this researcher made it evident that the researcher needs to think about the effect an interview might have on a participant, to note if any explorations have been in any way painful for the participant, to question whether the researcher has adequately debriefed the person and to make a note to check on the participant later that day or the following day, either in person or by
telephone. This was carried out throughout the six-year period of data collection.

5.6.3 Anonymity and Confidentiality. Researchers need to be clear about their assurances of anonymity or confidentiality and need to communicate the difference to the participants. Since qualitative work is usually supported with quotes from the interview, comments which have been made in confidence cannot be used for such quotes. In a small community it is extremely difficult to achieve anonymity due to the content of the quoted section, as participants may be recognized by others even when a fictitious name has been used. Participants in the Arkwright study demonstrated a strong degree of trust in the researcher in what they were willing to divulge. It is, therefore, considered absolutely crucial to ensure that statements cannot be attributed to particular individuals. To achieve this, not only have the names of participants been changed, but some non-essential demographic details of the participant or the person to whom they are referring may, on occasion, have been altered. Such changes have only been made where this could make no difference to the current research. When it was impossible to protect the participant in this way the quotation was either omitted or the participant has been shown the quotation within its context and asked for permission to use it. Permission has been granted in each case. Sometimes the material was considered by the researcher to be too sensitive to ask the participant for permission to reproduce it, in which case it was not included in the analysis.

5.7 Summary
For this work the epistemological position of constructivism has been adopted. This research is situated in the transactional worldview which embraces the complexity of human behaviour within the physical environment. The main methodology of this study involves qualitative data and methods, i.e. Grounded Theory and Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis but also includes a questionnaire survey to provide a triangulation of methods. The concept of qualitative research was clarified and ‘good practice’ discussed, including examples of how this study attempts to adhere to good practice. The researcher’s ideology was explained, since it is held here that this forms an important part of the context of the research which must be made explicit; this also complies with the canons of good practice in qualitative research.

The epistemology discussed in this chapter has already determined the basic design of the study: a longitudinal approach involving in depth interviews as well as survey questionnaires. The details of the methods are given in the next chapter.

Chapter Six

Methods
6.1 The research design
This study adopted a longitudinal design to monitor the process of place attachment (and detachment) from three years before the relocation to two years post relocation and to explore the relationship between place attachment and identity. Chapter 5 described the philosophical framework within which this study has been undertaken. This chapter will present details of the methodology employed, with the qualitative details followed by the quantitative details and will describe the difficulties which were encountered. As discussed in Section 5.4 of the previous chapter, although the main emphasis in this study is on the qualitative approach, questionnaire surveys were included for two purposes: to provide ‘triangulation’ of the interview data and, where appropriate, to test specific, focused, theoretical research questions. Fig. 6.1 shows the time scale of the two methods employed.

Fig. 6.1: Time line for interview and survey data collections
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6.2 The qualitative study
The qualitative approach was adopted to learn about place attachment and the meanings places represent. This section will describe the sample; the demographic variables used; the sampling procedure for the thesis; the interview time table and schedules, the choice of analytical strategy, and the analytical procedure.

6.2.1 The sample. Given the sensitive nature of the research and the position of the researcher as an outsider, the first contact was made with the relocation project officer and the community architects to explain the aims of the research. It was agreed that the researcher should be invited to the next relocation liaison committee meeting to introduce the study and to ask for their co-operation. At that meeting, committee members expressed concern as to whether it would be possible to guarantee confidentiality and others felt that as this study would be of no benefit to them it should not be supported. Nevertheless, door to door canvassing began in January 1992 and 35 residents agreed to in-depth interviews at that time (Time 1), which represented 20% of all households. Participants were interviewed in their homes with interviews ranging from 30 to 90 minutes. Interviews were audio-taped and transcribed and only interviews which were used for the final analysis are listed here.
Only 17 of the original 35 remained in the study until the last data wave, T5, in 1997, an attrition rate of 50% between T1 and T5 (this compares favourably to Scott & Alwin’s (1998) suggestion that average attrition rates would result in only 17% of the original sample remaining after five data phases). At Time 2, only 15 of the original 35 participants were available to be re-interviewed (9 had moved away, 5 were unavailable at T2 but rejoined the study later, 4 refused to give further interviews and 2 participants were too unwell to take part). Five additional participants agreed to take part and thus 20 residents were interviewed, with interviews ranging from 45 minutes to 2 hours. At T3 a further 7 participants joined the study and 1 of the original T1 participants rejoined, increasing the number to 28 participants. At T4 it was decided to carry out in-depth interviews including all of the participants of the survey sample which increased the in-depth sample to 81, with audio-taped sessions ranging from 30 minutes to 90 minutes. This was considered advisable to make sure that as many perceptions of the relocation as possible would be included in the data analysis. At T5 the number of in-depth interviews was increased to 95, with taped interviews ranging from 30 minutes to 2 hours 45 minutes (see Table 6.1).

<p>| Table 6.1: Participants whose taped interviews were included in the project database |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Recruited at Time 1</th>
<th>Recruited at Time 2</th>
<th>Recruited at Time 3</th>
<th>Recruited at Time 4</th>
<th>Recruited at Time 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total of 157 households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that this study covered the entire (willing and able) population of Arkwright, not just a sample, although it was decided to sample the data for the thesis, as discussed in Section 6.2.3. It should also be noted that each participant recruited for interviews also took part in the questionnaire study.

6.2.2 Demographic range. There was little control over the spread of demographic variables since almost anyone who could be persuaded to take part was accepted. An effort was made, however, to recruit participants so as to achieve a balance in terms of gender (e.g. only one member per household was included in the study and where there was a choice between male or female, an effort was made to balance the sample); age; number of years participants had lived in old Arkwright; whether or not participants were born in old Arkwright; whether they were tenants or owners; whether or not participants had a mining background; and whether they were mostly at home or had reason to spend part of their day outside the village. The majority of residents had worked in the coal mining industry and many had been made redundant either when the Arkwright Pit was closed in 1988 or when the other neighbouring pits were closed in 1992/3. There was, therefore, little variation in social class.

6.2.3 Sampling for the thesis. It was decided that only participants who had been part of the study for at least four of the five time intervals should provide the main qualitative material for the analysis in this
thesis as the theoretically most interesting findings would be those concerned with the process of change ranging from T1 or T2 through to T5. This criterion resulted in a final selection of 104 in-depth interviews provided by 22 participants. Table 6.2 shows a profile of the demographic variables of the 22 participants included in the main analysis for this thesis. The 22 participants also participated in the survey study, described in Section 6.3 below. The 155 interviews from participants excluded from the main analysis on the criteria described above were nevertheless transcribed and the material used to verify the emerging categories from the 104 selected interviews.

Information about the demographic variables of the whole population could not be obtained as the census data for Arkwright is part of the Sutton-cum-Duckmanton Parish and it was not possible to extract the Arkwright data. It should be noted, however, that although the whole sample was reasonably well balanced in terms of gender and dwelling ownership (see Table 6.4), the above 22 participants are less well balanced on these criteria. The sample contains 15 females and 7 males with 17 owners and 5 tenants. This latter imbalance should be borne in mind when the lack of autonomy is discussed in Chapter 9 as it may account for the many grievances reported. Many of the issues addressed concerned the building of the new properties and owners expected to have more control over the construction than they achieved. The interests of the tenants were, to a large extent, safeguarded by the Council and the Metropolitan Housing Trust, whereas owners and the standards of their houses were not included in these discussions.

6.2.4 Interview time table. The relocation scheme was announced and accepted in October 1990 and the first interviews, Time 1, took place in January 1992. The second set of interviews, Time 2, took place during the summer of 1994 as an interim measure to assess the progress made towards the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Years lived in Arkwright</th>
<th>Born in Arkwright</th>
<th>Rent/own</th>
<th>Mining-background</th>
<th>In/out of home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60s</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60s</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relocation. It was decided that Time 3 interviews should be carried out four weeks before each participant’s relocation, a period which stretched over 10 months during 1995/6. Also in 1995/96, Time 4 interviews took place six months post-move and the final interviews, Time 5, were carried out in 1997/98 at 2 years post-move (see Fig. 6.2). The timing for the last three periods was determined by theoretical and practical considerations, i.e. for Time 3 it was thought that feelings of attachment/detachment would be most salient four weeks before the move yet participants would not be too caught up in practical tasks regarding the move. Six months was considered to be long enough for people to have gained a sense of permanence since their move. Two years post-relocation was thought to allow enough time for people to evaluate their new situation and to be able to judge whether they had become attached to their new home.

**Fig. 6.2: Time phases of the qualitative study**

The Relocation of Arkwright
In-depth interviews with participants at 5 intervals

---

**6.2.5 Interview schedules.** The interviews ranged from being barely structured in the first and second time phases to being semi-structured during the later interviews (see Appendix 1). They are briefly described below.

Following a review of the place attachment and place identity literature, an interview schedule was prepared for **Time 1 (T1)** focusing on three areas. Part 1 explored the existing level of community spirit and whether a sense of community was important to the participants. Part 2 addressed place attachment issues, including attachment to home and whether people felt a bond to their home/village. Part 3 centred on relocation issues, exploring how people felt about the proposed move and which might be the most exciting/most difficult aspects for each participant.
For **Time 2** (T2) adjustments were made to the interview schedule to include issues which were salient during the T1 interviews and to reflect the progress of the new village project. Two new parts were added to the T1 schedule to include a section on public participation issues and a section on health effects.

**Time 3** (T3). At T2 it had been noted that many ideas were verbalised whilst participants were considering their replies to the statements in the survey scales (as will be explained in the later Section 6.3.6, apart from the first survey questionnaire, subsequent questionnaires were administered by the researcher), yet the richness of these comments and musings was not apparent from the survey data. It was, therefore, decided to tape-record the survey questionnaire session of 28 participants, 21 of whom had been part of the qualitative study at T1 and T2. In addition, 9 open-ended questions, concerning participants’ satisfaction with the relocation process and their perceptions of their future life in the new village, were added to the survey questionnaire for all survey participants although these were not audio-taped.

The **Time 4** (T4) schedule consisted of 21 open-ended questions, again including issues which had been important to participants at T3. In addition, the schedule was adapted to reflect post-relocation issues (e.g. satisfaction with the new home and village; possible changes in life style; future plans; feelings on the day of the move; ease or difficulty of detachment from their previous home and personal possessions; participants’ different use of their new accommodation) and to establish whether the process of personalisation of their new home had begun. This part of the questionnaire was audio-taped for each participant.

Two schedules were designed for **Time 5** (T5). First, an extended schedule of 41 questions, which was used for participants who had been part of the study for at least 3 data intervals and, secondly, a brief schedule of 12 questions for those participants who had joined the study only for the post-relocation intervals. The questions addressed people’s feelings about their new home; which issue they perceived as the biggest change; whether they would prefer still to live in old Arkwright; whether they would be proud to tell others that they live in New Arkwright; how they would describe New Arkwright to an outsider; and what did they think New Arkwright would be like in 10 years time.

**6.2.6 Choice of analytical strategy.** As was stated in Chapter 5 a hybrid of Grounded Theory (GT) and Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) was used to analyse the data. The aim of the analysis of each time phase was to explore the participants’ view of the relocation and to learn about the issues which became salient during the process of the relocation. Preliminary analyses were carried out at each stage to assist with the formulation of the research questions and instruments for the following stage, but
it cannot be claimed to have been genuine GT analysis. Although the feeding forward of ideas from the earlier interviews to the later ones was certainly an important component throughout this research and one which is derived directly from GT, the recommended procedures of GT, i.e. that data collection, data analysis and decisions to adjust the following interview schedule are “intimately linked at every step of the way” (Glaser, 1992, p. 14) could not be carried out after T2 for the following reasons. Since the relocation of the whole community extended over a period of 10 months (in part due to ground stability problems in New Arkwright which delayed the building of area C) the data collection times for T3 and T4 overlapped. As a result approximately one third of the residents were due for their T3 interview at the same time as others were due for their 6 months post-relocation interview (T4). This made it impossible to follow the recommended procedures for GT.

Another difficulty in complying with the requirements of GT was caused by the distance between Arkwright and the researcher’s home (186 miles). Visits were made for periods of 3 or 4 days to conduct interviews whilst subsequent transcribing and analysis was carried out at home. For reasons of both time and cost it was not possible to extend the period of time spent in Arkwright.

IPA is based on GT and the similarities and differences between the two forms of analysis have been described in Chapter 5. IPA does not prescribe such a tight method but leaves the practicalities to the researcher and this was one of the main reasons for switching to IPA as it still fulfilled the main criterion of “accessing meanings inherent in the participants’ experiences” (Smith, 1996a).

What follows is a brief outline of the process of analysis of the interview data, of coding and developing categories, theoretical memo writing and the sorting of memos as these illustrate the philosophy underlying both GT and IPA interview analyses.

6.2.7 Analytical procedure. To begin with, GT was used to identify values, meanings and constructs regarding participants’ experiences and to inform the next stage of data collection. The focus of the analysis was on the range of reported experiences and on comments which indicated a change in behaviour patterns or participants’ conceptualisation, interpretation and evaluation of situations rather than a numerical account of the data. The emerging themes were coded, starting with one interview and comparing additional interviews to try to understand in what way these may differ or fit the previous themes or codes. It is not claimed here that a quotation in itself is evidence for an emerging theory but that by drawing together a number of quotations into themes, a theoretical argument can be supported.

At the same time memos were written which captured links with established theories or indicated the beginning of a cluster of meanings which may represent a new insight. This process of constantly comparing, analysing and memo-writing clarified the data and highlighted areas which needed further
exploration and which were therefore included in the subsequent interview schedule in order to learn as much as possible about the participants’ values, cognitions and emotions and to access meanings inherent in participants’ accounts.

Glaser (1978; 1992) describes two sources of the concepts used for categories: socio-psychological constructs derived from theoretical literature and concepts from the data itself. Both were used during the category development stage and definitions were written and refined for each of the emerging categories, following Glaser & Strauss’ (1963) recommendations. An example of a definition derived from the theoretical literature is the category ‘perceived possible self’, which is based on Markus and Nurius’s (1986) work and thus contains quotes of participants’ self-knowledge of “what they might become, what they would like to become and what they are afraid of becoming” (p. 954). An example of a category derived from the data itself is ‘previously valued ritual’ which is defined as any account which describes handed down traditions and ritualistic behaviours with a sense of pride. The definitions for the categories used in the empirical chapters 7, 8 and 9 are given in Appendix 3.

For the final analysis across all time phases, the qualitative software NUD*IST 4 was used. NUD*IST stands for Non-numerical Unstructured Data*Indexing, Searching and Theorizing. The software provided a tool-kit for managing the data and for allowing easy access to each interview.

A total of 259 interviews were transcribed and loaded into the NUD*IST database. The text was divided into text units of lines of up to 80 characters. Chapters 7, 8 and 9 will reference text units (e.g. txt: 1-5) and give the time phase and thus it will be easy to locate the quotation within the particular interview, allowing the quotation to be seen in its wider context. As discussed in Chapter 5, being open to verification by others increases the validity of the analysis. There is a total of 181,147 text units in the database. The same procedure of coding, comparing, creating categories and memo-writing was carried out across all 5 time phases for the sample of 22 participants.

The next stage in the analysis was to print out all the collected quotations within one category and to reread participants’ responses in this concentrated form. This highlighted complexities within the category, including nuances or differences which frequently resulted in splitting the category or merging it with others. This process of searching for relationships between themes and emerging patterns also brought to the fore what Opie (1992) calls ‘multiple realities’ or inconsistencies in participants’ accounts. These often represented or were an indication of the process of adaptation to a new environment and were therefore considered an important element for inclusion in the analysis.

Glaser (1992) states that “if grounded theory works it will explain the major variations in behavior in the area with respect to the processing of the main concerns of the subjects. If it fits and works the
grounded theory has achieved relevance” (p. 15). In Chapter 7, the major variations in participants’
behavioural patterns, their relevance to the participants and the participants’ evaluations of those
changes are presented across the time phases. Chapter 7 is purely grounded in the data and had not been
envisaged before the completion of the analysis. This was not the case for Chapter 8, where the analysis
was informed by the intention to investigate the presence of the identity principles and how the spatial
change was associated with a change in the salience of participants’ distinctiveness, self esteem, self
efficacy and sense of continuity over the course of the relocation. Chapter 9 is a combination of both
approaches. Coding of interviews at T2 and T3 suggested that there are five important aspects of place
attachment which facilitate the development of an emotional bond with place. These five aspects of
place attachment were again found during the analysis of the T4 data and were therefore grounded in the
data. For the final analysis, however, the researcher was already sensitised to categorising quotations
under the headings of security, autonomy, appropriation, stimulation and congruence. Hence the initial
congr is not a local; she talked “posh” and had difficulty understanding the local accent and elements of
dialect. At T1 she knocked on the front doors, immediately indicating that she was a stranger, and asked
questions which gave evidence of a middle class culture. Nevertheless, encouraged by the friendliness
of the T1 participants who managed to put aside those differences, and through increased sensitivity and
persistence, the general reluctance to take part in the study gradually receded. Many cups of tea and
coffee later the researcher had become part of the scene.

6.2.8 Confidentiality and anonymity revisited. As confidence and mutual respect grew so the sharing
of confidential information increased. The researcher’s stance concerning these issues has already been
discussed in Chapter 5, Section 5.3. As explained earlier, the quotations used in Chapters 7, 8 and 9 have been chosen to protect participants’ confidentiality and anonymity but this effort would be rendered worthless if the normal practice of including complete transcripts of interviews in an appendix to this thesis was adhered to. Not only would it mean a breach of trust but also whereas an isolated quotation by a participant may not point to a particular person (because in many cases a number of people said the same thing), a number of incidences would provide all the necessary links to identify the person even if all the names had been changed. Hence, in order to preserve anonymity transcribed interviews will not be included in the final bound copy of this thesis.

6.2.8.4 Knowledge not transcribed. This is an issue of particular relevance to longitudinal research and has important methodological implications. The process of getting to know a participant includes remembering what has been said before and building on that knowledge. Such empathic knowledge (Verstehen) bridges the gap in the spoken account since when there is a sense of understanding there is no need for repetition, indeed it could prove injurious to the relationship. Hence, knowledge of what had been said in previous interviews was assumed to exist. In addition, the researcher not only conversed with participants during the interviews but also talked to them on the streets, in other people’s houses and by telephone. Elderly participants were visited for purely social reasons whenever the researcher worked in the village. Much knowledge was gained in that way, although due to time constraints it was not possible to even note a fraction of it in a diary. This additional knowledge aided the researcher’s interpretation but it may be difficult to prove to an auditor when questioning an interpretation that this is what the participant meant.

6.2.8.5 The scale of the study. With hindsight there was no advantage in increasing the number of in-depth interviews at T4 and T5 for this thesis although it is hoped that the data will be used later for further analysis.

6.3 The Quantitative study
The questionnaire design was chosen to expand the interview sample since it was the most efficient method for collecting data from a larger sample. Wave 1 followed 3 months after the first interview study, whereas W2, 3 and 4 ran concurrently with T3, 4 and 5 (as illustrated in Figure 6.1).

6.3.1 The sample. Almost every household was invited to take part in the study and the way in which the sample was achieved for each wave is now described in more detail.

6.3.1.1 Recruitment for Wave 1. Questionnaires were distributed by knocking on the door of each house in order to make personal contact and to invite all members of the household aged 16 and above to take part in the study. If, after three tries at different times of the day, there was no reply, two questionnaires
were left with a note asking for their help with the study and asking them to return the questionnaires in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope. Of the 320 questionnaires distributed, 120 were eventually returned (the researcher revisited Arkwright to encourage residents to take part and some were returned by mail), representing a return rate of 37.5%. The 120 participants represented 80 households. For subsequent data waves, however, only one member per household was included, because it was noticed that husbands and wives tended to give identical or near-identical responses and it was surmised that they completed the forms together. This would obviously double the effective weighting of the responses from married couple households and it was felt that an approach which gave equal weight to each household would be preferable. This is reflected in the percentages shown in Table 6.3.

6.3.1.2 Recruitment for Wave 2. Reducing the sample to one person per household resulted in the loss of 40 participants and a further 14 did not take part in Wave 2. The time gap between W1 and the beginning of W2 was 3 years and in that period there were 4 deaths, 5 families had moved away, 3 previous participants were too unwell to take part, and 1 refused to take part again. Returning to the knocking on doors method, 38 new participants were recruited.

6.3.1.3 Recruitment for Wave 3. Although there was a gap of only 7 months between W2 and W3 for each participant, by the time W3 began the sample had been reduced from 103 to 92 (3 participants had died during that time, 2 were unavailable, 5 had moved away, 1 participant refused and 1 was too upset to be interviewed due to circumstances unrelated to this study). Time did not permit the recruitment of any new participants for W3.

6.3.1.4 Recruitment for Wave 4. An effort was made to increase the sample to more than 100 in order to increase the confidence level. Since W3 there had been a loss of 4 participants because 1 had died and 3 had moved away. Nevertheless, two of the original W1 participants were persuaded to rejoin the study and 16 new participants were recruited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.3: Participants in each wave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruited for Wave 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final number of households relocated in 1995/6 was 157 and this figure was used when calculating the percentages. For the purposes of calculating the attrition rate the number of participants recruited for W1 should be shown as 80 (households). At W4 57 of these households were still participating so that
the attrition rate was only 29%. As already discussed in the qualitative section of this Chapter, this figure is much lower than could have been expected.

As reported in Chapter 4, 56 new properties were built in New Arkwright for the Metropolitan Housing Trust. Since the study considers the process of change from the old to the new village, none of the newcomers to New Arkwright were invited to take part.

6.3.2 Demographic range. The variables have been explained in Section 6.2.2. Table 6.4 displays the number of demographic variables present at Wave 4 and their percentages.

Table 6.4: Demographic variables at W1 of the participants used in the final analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Years lived in Arkwright</th>
<th>Born in Arkwright</th>
<th>Rent/own</th>
<th>Mining-background</th>
<th>In/out of home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 44%</td>
<td>16-29: 24%</td>
<td>0-9: 32%</td>
<td>Yes 51%</td>
<td>Rent 35%</td>
<td>Yes 71%</td>
<td>In 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 56%</td>
<td>30-59: 49%</td>
<td>10-29: 28%</td>
<td>No 49%</td>
<td>Own 65%</td>
<td>No 29%</td>
<td>Out 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-83: 25%</td>
<td>30-49: 22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-82: 16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already mentioned in Section 6.2.3, information about the demographic variables of the whole population could not be obtained as the census data for Arkwright is part of the Sutton-cum-Duckmanton Parish and it was not possible to extract the Arkwright data.

6.3.3 Data waves of the quantitative study. The survey data was collected during 4 data waves rather than 5 as in the interview study. There was no data wave to correspond to Time 2 of the interview study. Wave 1 and Wave 2 data were collected pre-relocation whilst Wave 3 and Wave 4 covered the post-relocation periods. It should be noted that all references to Time (T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5) indicate interview data, whereas references to Wave (W1, W2, W3 and W4) indicate questionnaire data.

Fig. 6.3: Data waves of the quantitative study
6.3.4 The Questionnaires. The questionnaire for W1 was designed after the T1 in-depth interviews. It contained 8 scales, a section with 6 open-ended questions to elicit people’s perceptions of the relocation and a section to obtain demographic details. Only the scales which have been used in the final analysis are fully described across the 4 data waves. These are scales to assess place attachment, the psychological sense of community, the identity principles and the place attachment aspects.

6.3.4.1 The Place Attachment scale. The research literature differentiates between personal, social and behavioural place attachment and place identity, as has been discussed in Chapter 2. For this reason the place attachment scale was designed to include four sub-scales, i.e. personal attachment, social attachment, behavioural attachment and place identity. The items of the scale were largely derived from the T1 interviews and, in order to measure participants’ strength of feelings, a 5-point Likert-type scale was used ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ with a mid-point of ‘neither agree nor disagree’. The component of personal attachment consisted of 15 items, e.g. “I feel safe and secure in this house”; the social attachment component consisted of 5 items, e.g. “I wouldn’t have agreed to move if they had not moved the whole community”; the behavioural attachment component also contained 5 items, e.g. “I enjoy caring for my home”; and the place identity component consisted of 3 items, e.g. “It is important to me to think of myself as an ‘ Arkwrightian’”. Participants who agreed with this statement were asked to rate 7 statements in hierarchical order, ranging from 1 as the most important to 7 as the least important. An example is “I have lived here for a long time”. The complete list of items is not shown here but the items of the scale used in the final analysis will be presented in Chapter 10. A copy of each questionnaire is contained in Appendix 2.

The items for the place attachment scale for the W2 period remained the same but there were some changes for W3 since some of the items had become inappropriate for the 6 months post-relocation phase. For other items factor and reliability analyses indicated that they should be either moved to a different sub-scale or deleted. For example, the former item 6 of the personal attachment sub-scale was “I often dwell on memories of the past”. This was changed to “I often dwell on memories of old Arkwright” and moved to the place identity sub-scale. It is important to note that although the wording was slightly changed, the two sets of wordings were functionally equivalent and thus it was justified to carry out statistical analyses across the 4 data waves (see Chapter 10). Of the 15 items used for W1 and W2, 7 were deleted, 2 were reworded and 6 items remained unchanged.
Of the 5 social attachment items 3 were unchanged, 1 was deleted and 1 item was changed from future tense to past tense (“Moving the whole community has increased the community spirit” from “Moving the whole community will increase the community spirit”).

Of the 5 behavioural attachment items only 2 remained the same, 2 were deleted and 1 item was changed from: “I worked a lot on this house, it feels part of me” to “I am putting a lot of work into my new home, it is beginning to feel part of me”. Two new items were added: “I am enjoying the challenge of bringing my garden to life” and “Activities are more enjoyable in my new home”.

The place identity component was extended from 3 to 6 items. Of the original 3 items 1 was deleted and 1 was changed from: “It is important to me to think of myself as an Arkwrightian” to “It is important to me to still think of myself as an Arkwrightian”. One item from the personal attachment sub-scale was added, i.e. “I often dwell on memories of old Arkwright” and 4 new items were included: “I feel out of place in my new home”; “I feel the new village is me”; “I feel out of place in the new village”; and “I still feel a stranger here”.

The items across the sub-scales of the place attachment scale remained the same for W4.

6.3.4.2 The psychological sense of community scale. The T1 interviews evidenced the strong sense of community which had once existed in old Arkwright and indicated that this had undergone a change since the early 1970s (see Chapter 7). The authorities had made the assumption that it still existed and had given this as a reason to relocate the whole community. It was, therefore, appropriate to measure the perceived sense of community and to follow its progress across time. To do so Glynn’s (1981) Psychological Sense of Community scale was adapted. Glynn’s work suggests that “a sense of community is not merely an undefined feeling but may be considered a group of measureable and manipulable behaviors and attitudes” (p. 807). His study was designed to measure the actual psychological sense of community (PSC) and people’s perception of the ideal PSC in three different communities by rating items (60 items for each scale) on a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ with a mid-point of ‘not sure’. Glynn (1981) reports reliability results, using Kuder-Richardson (1939) estimates of reliability (KR-20). His results indicated that the reliability estimate of the Actual scale was .972 and the Ideal scale estimate .924. Its validity was also supported since the scale was constructed from items considered by expert judges to contribute to PSC and the scales were able to show significant differences at the .001 level of probability when distinguishing between different types of community and between the Actual and the Ideal communities.

The 60 item scale was considered too long for this study and therefore the items were reduced to 26. This was achieved by omitting statements which did not reflect life in Arkwright. The remaining items
were grouped within 3 sub-scales after Glynn, i.e. sense of belonging; sense of giving and receiving support; and taking responsibility for the functioning of the community. Glynn’s concept of including a second response column, for rating an ideal community, was also incorporated. This meant that participants rated the same item twice, firstly how they rated Arkwright now (1992) and how they would rate an Ideal Community. It was hoped to be able to measure a change in the ‘Arkwright now’ column over time, whereas the Ideal column should remain the same throughout.

No changes were made to the items of this scale across the data waves. The ‘Ideal’ column was not used in the W1 analysis because the majority of participants had omitted to fill it in. The concept of an ‘Ideal’ community had seemed too abstract to be of any use. At W3 the second column was retained to rate the items twice, firstly whilst thinking of new Arkwright and secondly whilst thinking of old Arkwright. This would allow for a comparison between perceptions of the new and old village and a comparison of how participants rated old Arkwright whilst living there and how they rated old Arkwright retrospectively. The outcome of this comparison will be discussed in Chapter 10.

6.3.4.3 The Identity Process Principle scale. This scale was specifically developed for Wave 3 to assess whether participants, either individually or as a community, experienced any threat, associated with the relocation, to their distinctiveness or uniqueness, their self esteem, their sense of continuity and to their perceived sense of efficacy and to be able to measure whether these different principles were differentially salient over time. Items were generated from the pre-move in-depth interviews. A total of 39 items were generated: i.e. 7 to assess distinctiveness, e.g. “My new home makes me feel unique”; 12 items for self esteem, e.g. “Living here in new Arkwright makes me feel fortunate”; 10 for continuity, e.g. “Moving to new Arkwright has changed my way of life”; and 10 for efficacy, e.g. “I cannot remember where I have put things”.

Due to the need to reduce the length of the questionnaire for W3 it was decided to eliminate 2 previous sections: section 3, which contained the stressful event scale and Cohen, et al.’s (1983) Perceived Stress scale and section 6, Waddington & Wykes’ (1992) Health scale. Whilst many participants exhibited stress and health concerns, these were considered to be too general and it was not thought possible to link them specifically to the relocation. In addition it became clear that the 5 year duration of the relocation was too long to be able to state that any physical deterioration was due to the relocation.

6.3.4.4 The Aspects of Place Attachment scale. For W4 all the W3 scales were continued unchanged. A new scale, containing five sub-scales, was added to measure the existence of separate ‘aspects’ of place attachment which began to emerge from the interviews at T2 and became clearer at T3 and T4. Items were generated from the interview data: security (e.g. “The new village gives me a safe feeling”), autonomy (e.g. “It is more acceptable now to be different from others”), appropriation (e.g. “I have
made changes to my home to make it feel it is mine”), stimulation (e.g. “People miss bumping into each other and having a chat”) and place congruence (e.g. “Things which are important to me are still the same”). In this new scale there were 7 items to measure sense of security; 9 items to measure autonomy; 7 items for appropriation; 8 for stimulation and 5 to measure place congruence.

Two scales, i.e. the Coping Behaviour scale and Hammond’s Estrangement scale, were used throughout the data waves but they have not been included in the analysis for this thesis and are, therefore, not described here. The same applies to the Positive and Negative Affect (PANAS) scale which was added at W4. It had been the intention to link emotional states to place attachment but it became clear during data collection that participants responded in a general way rather than specifically linking their emotions to place and, therefore, it also has not been included in the analysis.

6.3.5 Procedure. All scales were piloted on a small sample of members of Arkwright village who were not part of the study (for example, friends of participants) and some adjustments were made to the wording of the items for the final copy when wording had been misunderstood or questions appeared over-complex. The W1 questionnaire was self administered but for the following data waves, the researcher handed the appropriate response cards (e.g. some scales ranged from “1: Strongly disagree”, to “5: Strongly agree”, others from “1: very false” to “5: very true” etc.) to the participant and then read out the statements and filled in the responses. This was done in order to maximise participation (it was realised that people were willing to sit and talk to the researcher but less likely to fill in the questionnaire by themselves). The same researcher/participant relationship issues concerning the interview study applied to the survey data collection. Therefore, accountability and issues of confidentiality and anonymity are equally applicable to the survey study.

At the end of each appointment, participants were asked whether they wanted to put any questions to the researcher and time was spent to answer these. Finally, participants were thanked for taking part in the study and permission was sought by the researcher to return for the next session. This was always granted.

To arrange the next appointment, participants were telephoned or contacted personally about one week in advance to arrange date and time of the next session. At W2, to fill in the questionnaire would have taken a one-hour appointment for the majority of participants but at W3 and W4 the combined interview and questionnaire sessions for each participant were rather longer. Sessions ranged from 1.5 to 3 hours during W3 and W4, with the majority taking close to 2 hours.

The raw data was entered into the SPSS database. After the W3 data collection items were recoded into a different variable (W3r) to change previous values. The value ‘1’ had been assigned to ‘strongly
agree’ which made interpretation of the data more difficult. Thus, 1 was changed to represent ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 to represent ‘strongly agree’.

This chapter has described the methods employed in both the qualitative and quantitative data collection for this study. The following chapters address the empirical findings, in Chapters 7, 8 and 9 (qualitative) and Chapter 10 (quantitative). It should be noted that these chapters both present the data and discuss it, since the data and its interpretation are intrinsically related in qualitative approaches. Chapter 7 is about the spatial change and the concomitant changes in behaviour patterns. Chapter 8 looks at the four identity principles and their existence and salience over time, whilst Chapter 9 explores the nature of place attachment. Chapter 10 presents and discusses all the quantitative data, addressing aspects of the material covered in Chapters 7, 8 and 9.

**Chapter Seven**

**The Reconstruction of Arkwright**

7.1 **Introduction**

This chapter will examine residents’ individual and collective adaptations to the new environment and describe the changes in behavioural patterns which occurred after the relocation. Although there have been a number of studies on relocations, rarely does an opportunity occur to study the many changes resulting from the relocation of an entire community to a spatially different location. Moreover, many of these studies are from a sociological perspective and fail to acknowledge sufficiently the role of the physical environment. It is argued here that, as Altman & Rogoff (1987) emphasize, the behavioural changes resulting from such a relocation cannot be understood without taking into account the physical environment as well as the social context, and that there is a dynamic relationship between person/group and place.

The Arkwright relocation raises a number of issues. This chapter sets the scene by describing the changed spatial layout of the new village and the reported and observed behavioural changes. It also prepares the ground for theorizing about these changes and their relationship with attachment to place and identity. The next chapter, Chapter 8 will focus on the relationship between place and identity and Chapter 9 will examine five aspects which have been found to be facilitators of place attachment. This chapter is solely concerned with describing the changes in behavioural patterns which occurred in response to the relocation of a former coal mining community to a more widely spaced modern estate.
The purpose of the following section (Section 7.2) is to put the effects of the relocation into context, i.e. to what extent are some of these changes associated with the relocation per se and to what extent are some changes due to the cessation of coal mining, as described in Chapter 4. The particular issue of concern is the psychological sense of community as its perceived decline was often referred to during interviews.

7.2 The chronology of the decline in the spirit of the mining community

This section will describe the historical events as construed by the participants, which led to the decline of the sense of community over the twenty years prior to the relocation. As described in more detail in Chapter 4, the hardship of coal mining engendered a closely knit community life in Arkwright over a period of almost 100 years. The miners and their families lived in rented accommodation provided by their employer and coal mining was the centre of their lives. Working underground in difficult conditions created a sense of interdependence and trust amongst the miners. As a result mining communities tended to be self dependent and isolated from the outside world. The essence of the work environment permeated into the social structure of the village. As Bulmer (1975: 88-89) expressed it: “The social ties of work, leisure, neighbourhood and friendship overlap to form close-knit and interlocking locally based collectivities of actors. The solidarity of the community is strengthened not only by these features of themselves but by a shared history of living and working in one place over a long period of time. From this pattern derives the mutual aid characteristic in adversity and through this pattern is reinforced the inward-looking focus on the locality, derived from occupational homogeneity and social and geographical isolation from the rest of society.”

Bulmer’s account matches participants’ stories of the past history of Arkwright. According to the villagers, the first recognisable decline in this psychological sense of community (Glynn, 1981) appeared in 1977, when residents were given the opportunity to buy their house from the National Coal Board (NCB). The evidence for this was contained in participants’ narratives and was also discernible in the degree of discord within the community and in the lack of collective action undertaken by the villagers during the relocation process. This decline in the sense of community can be attributed to the following key events:

7.2.1 Sale of previously rented houses. In 1977 the NCB offered tenants the right to buy their house, which was taken up by 70% of the residents. At that time, the area of grass that separated the rear of the rows of terraced houses was mown regularly by the NCB and provided a common play and relaxation area. Those people who had bought their homes gradually fenced in the small grassed area to create their own individual back garden. As Christine explained at T1: “... when the Coal Board offered houses for sale in the 70s, people who bought started to fence off their little bit of ground, that made a lot of difference to the sense of community” (txt: 12-13). At T5 Christine returned to this theme: “...
when [people] started fencing off, I didn’t like that. I never thought, I was one of the last one’s to fence off but they kept throwing rubbish [on our area], this is why we did but we never wanted to fence off. We always said that would split people up, make you different, whereas we were all one before” (txt: 419-423). Other participants recounted this event and viewed it as the first break-up of the very close community spirit which the mining village had experienced.

7.2.2 The Great Miners’ Strike. The dispute lasted for almost a year (1984-1985), having been preceded by some months of overtime ban which had already reduced the miners’ income. There was much poverty and family members of the miners did a great deal to raise funds for soup kitchens and food parcels (Dolby, 1987). Towards the end of the strike, however, some Arkwright miners joined the breakaway union, the Union of Democratic Mineworkers (UDM). As Christine stated at T1: “some people broke the strike and [the sense of community has] not been the same since” (txt: 9). The strike-breaking was seen as disloyalty to the common cause and resulted in much bitterness towards these members, contributing to the fragmentation of the community.

7.2.3 Influx of young non-miners. After 1985 there was an increase in the number of new young residents due to the low cost of property. Many members of the indigenous population felt that these were people with different standards and interests who had never known the meaning of community spirit and were not prepared to work towards achieving it.

7.2.4 The methane threat. The Arkwright colliery was closed by British Coal (BC) in May 1988. In November 1988, methane gas, which had accumulated in the disused pit workings, was found to be seeping into some of the houses. The upper half of the village had to be evacuated until the threat of an explosion evaporated. BC agreed that the methane was coming from their mine but denied responsibility for the leakage and refused to pay compensation to the residents. Initially, this episode brought the community closer together through fighting a common cause, as Penny put it at T1: “... the methane was an important issue and people joined together to fight this particular issue” (txt: 74). Later, however, a split was reported by participants which placed people into two camps: those who had suffered the anxiety of the emergency evacuation late at night and others, who were considered by the authorities not to be at risk and had to remain in their homes during the three weeks which it took to install a drainage pumping system. Christine expressed this at T1: “... the methane problem. First it got people together and then it split people into two groups, the ones that had to be evacuated and the ones that were not evacuated, each thinking they had the harder deal” (txt: 10-11). Participants reported the deepening of the rift within the community from that time.

7.2.5 The relocation announcement. In October 1990, British Coal Opencast (BCO) and North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC) called a meeting of all residents to propose the building of a new
village (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3 for more detail). Initially, residents were addressed as a group but later BCO were thought to make individual ‘deals’, which were perceived by others as favouritism and much resented. Ben talked about this in four of his five interviews, e.g. at T2: “I wrote to [BCO] about Mr. X, about him getting a double garage ... He never denied it” (txt: 187-188). This management style created an environment of ‘everyone for themselves’, greatly damaging the remaining sense of community.

7.2.6 A unifying event. There was, however, a subsequent event which helped to reinforce community cohesion. In February 1992, residents heard of the British Coal Opencast/Derbyshire County Council (BCO/DCC) proposal which would allow BCO to leave a million square metre void at the site following opencasting operations, to be used during the following 7 years as a landfill site. As the proposed site of the void was very close to the new village, the possibility of additional potential methane hazard and the increased pollution (noise, dust, fumes) from the tipping traffic angered residents and the local Councils (North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC) and Chesterfield Borough Council (CBC)). It had not been part of the original new village/opencasting agreement (Smedley, Derbyshire Times, 5 March, 1992). More than 400 Arkwright residents signed a protest petition, which was supported by the NEDDC and resulted in DCC asking BCO to withdraw the proposed landfill site (Derbyshire Times, 12 March 1992). This ‘success’ against the authorities provided a boost to the community spirit.

7.2.7 Individualisation of the relocation. The relocation to New Arkwright was spread over 10 months and took place between May 1995 and March 1996. People who had not yet moved found it difficult to identify with the problems of those who had. Equally, people who had moved were too involved in settling in to give much thought to those left behind who had to cope with living in the desolation of old Arkwright. Marjorie described the situation at T3: “… everybody’s sort of fighting their own corner and looking after number one. Everybody’s got different needs and different circumstances so people will try to fight their own battles” (txt: 28-32). Marjorie returned to this subject later in the interview: “… at the beginning we were all looking at the same problems but we’ve all got different problems at the minute … everybody is at a different stage. I mean some people aren’t moving until Christmas and they are happy to just sit here for another 4-5 months before they start thinking about it” (txt: 51-62). Thus the extended relocation period seemed to further accelerate the decline of the community spirit.

7.2.8 The dearth of communal facilities in New Arkwright. The plan for the new village included the replacement of the existing facilities and some additional leisure facilities. Not all were forthcoming and many were seriously delayed. There was, for example, no village shop until two years after the relocation. After months of negotiation, an Arkwright family remortgaged their home to buy the building designated as a shop and then opened a sub-post office/grocery store. The shop opened in November 1997.
The football pitch came into use at about the same time, providing two areas where people had an opportunity to encounter others. The bowling green is still not useable five years post-relocation. The planned landscaping of The Dell and the creation of a conservation area around the lake, with benches and picnic areas, is now unlikely to be provided by either RJB Mining or NEDDC. The new Community Lounge which had been envisaged by the architects as a reading room for all, where people could go and have a cup of coffee or tea, read the daily newspapers and chat to friends, was completed but its purpose was amended. NEDDC decided that only council tenants and sheltered accommodation residents would be entitled to use this facility. This caused much disappointment and proved divisive (this will be discussed further in Chapter 9).

Illustration 7.1: The opening announcement of the shop/post office

Illustration 7.2: The community lounge
Having traced the decline in the psychological sense of community, as perceived by the residents, the research question for this chapter is now posed.

7.3 The research question
The research question is concerned with the changed spatial environment and changed behaviour patterns of the residents. There are three parts to this question:

(i) Which changes in the spatial layout of New Arkwright proved to be of importance in terms of their socio-psychological and behavioural impact on the participants?

(ii) Which changes in behaviour patterns related to the relocation of Arkwright Town were reported as important by the participants and how were they evaluated by them?

(iii) How can these changes in behaviour patterns be evaluated within a socio-psychological framework?

7.4 The structural properties of New Arkwright
This section describes the main features of the new village which participants perceive as important changes compared to old Arkwright. In the old village layout, the terraced houses opened directly onto the pavement at the front, and there was a tarmac-covered footpath along the back of the rows, constituting a right of way between the houses and their yards which, in addition to a small garden, contained an assortment of coal-bunkers, sheds, greenhouses and washing lines.
This right of way was generally used by residents to enter the houses via the back door. Using back doors was a long-standing tradition and its use also indicated that you were an accepted member of the community as only strangers would knock on the front door. Indeed some front doors had been either permanently secured of removed and the doorway bricked up.

Illustration 7.4: The right of way along the back of a terrace
7.4.1 Curved roads and cul-de-sacs. The new village design is characterized by curved roads whereas old Arkwright comprised three straight roads of terraced housing. A number of participants talked about the impact of the difference between the two designs. People wishing to cross the road now experience restricted visibility due to the curvature of the new roads. As some participants commented: “you can’t see what’s coming”. Parents’ fear of the traffic on the curved roads has also restricted young children’s freedom to go to other houses (visiting relations and friends) or going to school by themselves. As Jackie explained at T5: “Karl is of the age now (7 years) where he wants to go to school on his own and I won’t let him. When Andy was that age, I used to let him go by himself. …. I used to stand on the doorstep and watch him to the top of the street where I knew the lollipop person would see him across” (txt: 374-376). When Hannah was asked at T5, ‘Looking back, what in your view has been the biggest change for people?’ she replied: “The biggest change for me is not seeing people. It’s not having the straight streets and the open backs … You could chat to people [in old Arkwright], over here, you don’t. I miss the straight streets. I miss being able to look down the street” (txt: 79-85). Hannah had moved to one of the cul-de-sacs and hence saw few people passing. The question of whether cul-de-sacs enhance or fragment communities was addressed in Chapter 2, Section 2.6. Hannah’s comment supports Hillier’s (1988) view that ‘enclosures within enclosures’ isolate and hence fragment a community. None of the participants living in cul-de-sacs reported an enhanced sense of community at T4 or T5.

7.4.2 The need for new socio-spatial schemata. As described previously, the new village layout consists of a labyrinth of curved roads and cul-de-sacs, replacing the three straight roads in old Arkwright. This new spatial complexity and a concomitant fear of getting lost has been a source of anxiety for the older generation, resulting in at least 3 participants not venturing out at all since the relocation. Others also described an uneasiness about finding their way around the new village. Norma at T4 expressed it thus: “I don’t feel that I want to go out and about. I want to just stop in, do you know what I mean? ... No, I just don’t feel as if I want to go and visit or anything, I just want to stop in, somehow. And it’s not the attraction of the house, you know, I just haven’t got that get up and go, somehow” (txt: 458-475).

Lee’s model of socio-spatial schemata is of relevance here. Lee (1967) argued the importance of spatial cognition to normal functioning. He stressed that to achieve control over the environment, which is essential to the minimisation of stress, one needs detailed knowledge of the local geography and the ability to navigate to avoid feelings of helplessness and being lost. Lee (1990, p. 184) made the point that unlike children, “adults may only rarely experience ‘lostness’ because they are careful to restrict themselves to known territory.” This may have been precisely why a number of people simply stayed in their new houses, thereby not only reducing their own external stimulation but adding to the ‘ghost town’ effect for others. In addition, not having a shop to go to for the first 2 years and the eventual shop
being out of reach for many, deprived people of a motive to explore their new environment. They were also thus deprived of an opportunity to appropriate their new neighbourhood.

Ben described this phenomenon well at T3: “a lot of the streets, especially round the school and the bottom end near the lake, look the same, because of the way the houses have been set out. ... You get to junctions and you look and think ‘well, where does this bit go?’ And sometimes, we’ve walked ... and ended up back where we’ve just come from. You’re thinking, well, you sort of ... stand and look and then think, ‘how do I get to the Club?’ ... A lot of old people need the confidence to do things, you know, like walk up the street, ... (in old Arkwright) they walk in a straight line to the top of the road, irrespective of which road they live in and they knew that at the top there was the Club, the shop and the pub. Like, even if they went down the wrong street, they’d always come to a ginnel (passage between houses) and down onto their home. They knew that they weren’t far from where they lived or if they did get lost, you know, they could always knock on somebody’s door and say, ‘I can’t find my way home. Can you help me?’ (txt: 497-528).

Lee (1963; 1967; 1968; 1969; 1976) developed the socio-spatial model over several years and concluded that “social space is isomorphic with physical space, and hence that social space disorientation is congruent with geographical disorientation” (1990: 184). Norma’s declaration at T4 that she had “just lost track of everybody” (txt: 603) is a clear indication of this and because she had no knowledge of the ‘whereness’ she found it too stressful to venture into the unknown. Previous socio-spatial schemata had become redundant.

When Christine explained at T5 that for the first year she had not wanted to explore the new village, she may also have been demonstrating that she had not acquired a socio-spatial schema for New Arkwright: “Hmmm, I didn’t want to walk anywhere, after I had walked to Mandy’s (a short distance), that was enough. I didn’t want to walk anywhere else” (txt: 778-779). When probed further, Christine tried to understand her feelings herself: “I just felt I shouldn’t be walking there, although it was public pathways. ... It’s funny to say that but it was as though when you were walking past other people’s houses, you didn’t know whether they’d like it or not. I don’t know, really. ... It was as though you’re trespassing. I don’t know why it was, really. As though you were, what can I say, being nosy or what” (txt: 783-789). Earlier in the interview Christine had been positive about the future: “I think we’ll see more of one another. We’ll go about the village more. The first year was very strange for us and I don’t know why but I feel now I can walk about it better than I did in the beginning. It was as though you were treading on strange ground, as though you shouldn’t be walking there. But now, if I walk up to the shop I feel alright” (txt: 769-774). The shop had only just opened and it is suggested that this had provided Christine with the necessary purpose for going out and developing the socio-spatial schema necessary for feeling at ease.
7.4.3 Increased distance between properties and facilities. The properties are now more widely spaced and the private space at the front and rear of the house has been increased, eliminating the ‘right of way’ close to the house which had existed both at the front and back of the terraces. It is no longer easy for people to ‘nip next door’, and few neighbours seem to make the extra effort. Even though front gardens are enclosed with only a token boundary fence or wall, they clearly mark private space. A participant from the wider sample described the situation at T4: “People are not sure about where they can walk. We don’t like using front doors and there is no public right of way going round the back. Even walking up to the front door is trespassing, you are on private ground so everybody stays indoors.” Alice put it this way at T5: “We no longer can pop in or out [of houses] as we used to as we were passing, now you have to go through the garden to see anybody” (txt: 423-425). Whilst the barriers at the front of the houses are merely token, at the back of the houses there is a definite physical barrier, since 4 - 6 ft high wooden fencing encloses the gardens, limiting both visual access and visual exposure (Archea, 1977). This lack of visual access is frequently referred to as a loss by residents. At T4 Enid commented on not being able to see others going about their daily tasks: “like pegging out washing, it was something happening, weren’t it, some movement” (txt: 153-157). Apart from feeling part of a cultural group, visual access provided a sense of connectedness. As another participant explained at Time 4: “I see nothing now. That’s what I miss, seeing things and people. Even at night I would hear footsteps and I would know who is going by. I know nothing now.” In addition to visual access, auditory access was an important feature of old Arkwright providing vicarious connectedness with others.

Being monitored by others was generally perceived by residents as a positive attribute. As Sadie explained T5: “… neighbours were so close and always watching out for you” (txt: 119-120). They would know when someone wasn’t feeling well because they had not put their washing out or when a bedroom light was on at a time when it would not normally be on. As might be expected, the restricted visual access in new Arkwright also inhibited contact between neighbours and friends. Norma’s case was not unusual. Although her friend lived physically further away in old Arkwright, Norma could see her house: “… you see, I used to look across and the light was on and I used to think, oh, she is in. Now I have to go right round the corner to find out if she is in [so I don’t go]”. Another participant explained that he no longer visited someone he used to call on regularly in the old village because he could not longer see that person’s back door and hence was not able to monitor other visitors coming and going. In old Arkwright he had been able to avoid contact with another visitor but now he could not tell whether anyone else was there and was not willing to take the risk of an encounter.

7.4.4 Hilly contours. Old Arkwright had been built on high ground whereas the new village was located in a depression. Participants commented on this in two ways.
Firstly it made people feel isolated, e.g. as Barbara described it at T5: “... it doesn’t upset me but we are rather cut off down here. ... you come off the main road and to all intents and purposes you have vanished! ... I mean nobody knows we’re here” (txt: 168-171). Sadie also commented on the difference in altitude: “I think it seems more isolated than the other village. I don’t know why ... maybe it’s being down in a dip. Before it didn’t seem to be isolated but it does now” (txt:56-61). Another participant remarked that she had assumed the new village would be as level as the old village: ‘to see a plan like this you just think it will be like it always was ... I don’t think anybody even mentioned [the hilly terrain]’.

The second group of comments focused on the difficulties some people experienced with walking through the village. Hannah stated at T4: “... it’s uphill and it kills me” (txt: 305). Other participants’ explained that ‘with me being short of breath, it buggers me walking from here right up to [the bus stop]. I don’t mind coming back but when I’m going up I have to stop two or three times’; or: ‘the only thing I’ve got against it is the hills. It doesn’t matter where you go you’ve got a hill to climb. ... especially when the wind is blowing, it takes your breath’. Indeed, some elderly people who used to be seen walking to the shop or the Club in old Arkwright, and who were part of the daily scene, were no longer in evidence. The implications of this change in the pattern of movement will be discussed further in Chapter 9.

### 7.5 Evidence of change in behaviour patterns

**7.5.1 Privacy.** There are a number of behavioural mechanisms which allow us to achieve the desired level of privacy, e.g. content and style of verbal responses; distance and angle of orientation from others; eye contact; rules about territory and possessions; and cultural norms through which members of a group regulate their contact (Altman, 1975). In the old village, people living in close proximity to each other had developed effective mechanisms to indicate their openness and closedness to social interaction. A walk to the shop or post office would guarantee a number of social interactions or residents would sit outside their houses, on the footpath, when they sought company.
It is suggested here that mechanisms, i.e. learned behaviours, are ‘in tune’ with a certain environment and cannot be easily transported. Newell (1998) explains that learned privacy behaviours vary widely across cultures and that these differences can lead to problems when a person relocates from one culture to another. The data from Arkwright suggests an extension to Newell’s findings in that previously learned privacy mechanisms can become inappropriate when the structural setting changes.

Marjorie, who had moved into old Arkwright 6 years before the village relocation, commented at T1 how “there are always people about” (txt: 15) and that it was the friendliness which gave her a sense of belonging. At T3 she reiterated this observation in more detail: “neighbours were right there and always talked to you. You’d go to your dustbin and you’d see people. It will be harder for people to move [into New Arkwright], it’ll not be like moving into old” (txt: 270-276). She foresaw the impending change: “I think people might get a bit more private [in the new village] because the houses are more private” (txt: 265). At T4, six months after the move, Marjorie commented: “you see hardly anybody anymore. I can’t remember when I last had a real conversation with either side (her previous neighbours who still live quite close to her). I can’t remember the last time I’ve seen Ellen, I saw Mrs. Ball for about 30 seconds the other day” (txt: 1021-1034). She surprised herself when she talked about the change within the village: “I think I do like the privacy and the quiet, because that’s what I have always been used to” (txt: 2113-2121) prior to her moving to old Arkwright. At T5 she mentioned again that she had not seen her other previous neighbours since the move, although they live only a short distance from her. Marjorie clearly regretted the loss of ease of social communication (“sometimes it can be really quiet, because we don’t see many people … and I feel a bit, I think, oh no, there is nobody
to talk to” (T5.txt: 94)) but when asked which, for her, was the best aspect of the move, she replied: “privacy, I think. … No, I do like my privacy, having my own little plot” (txt: 322).

Marjorie’s account is typical of participants who had not been brought up in old Arkwright. She has now returned to a socio-spatial environment with which she is familiar, whereas living in old Arkwright had required her to adjust to unfamiliar behavioural mechanisms.

As already described, seeking interaction in the old village was easy, it was always available but villagers needed to successfully employ privacy mechanisms to control access to the self in order to cope with the physical closeness. In the new village the reverse is the case. The spatial layout provides privacy and residents now have to actively seek social interaction. Just coming across people is quite rare, as Charles reported at T5: “there don’t seem to be people milling around the village like you used to see them in the old village” (txt: 24-25). Later in the same interview he reported a sense of isolation, particularly for older people. He commented: “the older people that I’ve spoken to, they feel isolated and perhaps, I think, they feel isolated because each property has got a front and back garden, which is basically making them feel isolated, whereas in the old village, people were walking right by the doors. It’s very quiet for them now” (txt: 205-211).

Many people reported feeling bereft because of the ‘quietness’, even inside the houses. Previously they had been used to hearing their neighbours. This quietness derives in part from the double glazing and cavity wall insulation but also from the lack of social interaction which was part of the daily life. At T5, Enid likened living in New Arkwright to “living in a morgue. I absolutely detest Sundays down here, I hate them, ... nothing stirs” (txt: 491-495). Jackie explained at T4 that “there was always company on the yard, there was always somebody here, you’d just have to shout” (txt: 451-452). When asked at T5, ‘How did you feel about the level of contact in old Arkwright?’, Jackie replied: “well, I liked it. It was like having a family, being part of the family. I feel I haven’t got the village family now, it feels like being out on a limb” (T5.txt: 623-629).

Participants also reported positive increased privacy opportunities inside the home due to the extra space. Les realised at T4 that having additional space reduced the need to go out and provided more harmonious living: “they [boys] don’t have to fall out if they don’t want to now, they can just go to their own rooms, whereas before, sharing a room, one of them had to impose his will over the other. Now they can just go their separate ways and I think that’s probably the biggest plus with moving” (txt: 552-569). Les, who was able to add to his property (owners could pay extra for an additional bedroom, a conservatory and/or a double garage), stated at T5 that he now knew why middle class people have fewer family rows: “I don’t feel I have to go for a drink to get out of the house anymore” (txt: 499).
In old Arkwright the proximity of the houses to each other and the relative absence of private space meant that neighbours could assist each other without feeling they were trespassing on private property. For example, people often took in milk or the washing for their neighbours. This no longer happens in the new village. As Jackie recalled: “they are all things because you were so close together that it was so easy to do. There is nothing like that at all now” (T4.txt: 460).

Despite having developed useful privacy mechanisms in old Arkwright, there was, nevertheless, evidence of a need for greater privacy. Hannah felt strongly about the lack of privacy in old Arkwright and reported at T3: “The one thing everybody stipulated [at the architects’ meeting], ... we all wanted our gardens private. We didn’t want kids in them if we didn’t have kids, or dogs if we didn’t have dogs, because that’s what we have now and we don’t want it” (txt: 611-615).

Two other issues were often discussed, both of which are connected with lack of privacy in old Arkwright. As Tracey described at T2: “Sometimes it gets a bit annoying when you want to do something and people come to us for tea and you think ‘I wish they’d clear off!’ Or if Mark wants to service his car and I say ‘have you done it?’ and he says ‘I haven’t started yet’ ... because he’s been over the road looking at somebody else’s problem. What you should be able to do in an hour, four hours later you are still trying to do it. So, it will be nice to have your own space” (txt: 2674-2685).

When asked at T1, ‘What are the bad points about living in this community?’ Phillip replied: “Well, in this village, it’s people prying into each other’s business the whole time. You say a word and it soon gets round, that’s the negative side to this village” (txt: 90-91). At T4 Phillip stated that this did not happen in New Arkwright as attitudes had changed: “... attitudes and how they think. I mean, a lot of people now, they don’t like knowing everybody’s business. In the old village, everybody knew each other’s business all the time ...[now] everybody wants to keep themselves to themselves” (txt: 569-577).

People who had grown up in or had adjusted well to old Arkwright’s close patterns with others functioned well there, as the desired level of contact could be achieved by simply stepping out of the back door, by walking along the terraces or by going to the shops, post office, club or pub. These behaviours provided easy visual and verbal access to others with easy opening and closing mechanisms, since when you wanted less connectedness you simply made a friendly remark and walked on or closed your window or reduced the volume of your voice. Mary at T5 explained how older people who were unable to go for walks no longer saw anybody, whereas previously “they could go on the door step and always speak to somebody. They can’t do that now because you don’t see anybody” (txt: 274-275).

### 7.5.2 Cost of living

There have also been noticeable behavioural changes arising from increases in the cost of living. The former low rents or mortgage repayments, low maintenance costs and low
community taxes left villagers with a good amount of disposable income. Many people used this to socialise in the Miners’ Welfare Club or the Pub. Since the closure of the Arkwright pit in 1988 and the surrounding deep mines in 1992/3 the majority of miners have been unemployed. The relocation provided people with a better standard of housing but did not increase their income to enable them to meet additional expenses. In a number of cases higher mortgage levels were needed to finance extensions; rents, although pegged at pre-move levels until May 2000 would then be gradually increased fourfold to the current market rate; the new houses were fitted with water meters with the resultant increased bills for families; community tax was increased due to the higher value of the properties; and the cost of looking after gardens has been significant. Thus their disposable income was reduced and several participants resented this imposed change since their preferred choice would have been to live in a smaller and older property and to be able to go out and socialise.

Economic hardship has also been created through a perceived compelling need to have everything new for the new house. Thus some people are struggling to meet hire purchase payments. In addition, people are now more aware of the need for proper maintenance. As Les explained at T5: “in the old house, when something went wrong with the house, it didn’t really matter. Now that it is a new house it is a catastrophe! The toilet seat broke the other day. Now in the old house it wouldn’t have really mattered but suddenly we’ve got to get it done. Silly little things. I might have been lackadaisical about the old house but suddenly it really matters and that is a change in culture!” (txt: 398-407).

The increased need for a private telephone has resulted in another cost of living increase for many of the residents. There had been an easily accessible public telephone box in old Arkwright but after the relocation the only public telephones were inside the Miners’ Welfare Club and the Arkwright Centre and these were only accessible during opening hours. Both these venues are situated at one end of the village which is too far to walk for many elderly people. A public telephone box was eventually erected on the other side of New Arkwright (about 2 years post-relocation) but, in the meantime, quite a few people had already decided that they needed to install their own private telephone. In addition, many people reported an increase in the number of calls made since it was now considered too far to deliver a message in person. Previously people would just drop by or shout. As Jackie explained at T5: “Eddie rang me up to tell me that Joe had gone into hospital, whereas before he would have shouted me across the road” (txt: 479-480). Norma complained that their son now used the telephone to see if his mates were in whereas before he would have gone in person. This use of the telephone instead of personal contact has not only increased costs but also reduced the number of people walking through the village and the shouting of messages, both of which were evidence of life.

Much research literature has made mention of affluent workers and their likely rise into middle class (see Lockwood, 1960; Goldthorpe & Lockwood, 1963; Goldthorpe, et al., 1967) although mostly
focusing solely on economic impacts. In the Arkwright context, however, behavioural patterns have changed not because of increased affluence but because of the spatial changes.

McRobbie (1991) describes a similar transition at a global level and quotes Mort (1989): “the old politics of civics is dead and that people now prefer to spend their free time at home and that they derive an important part of their identities from buying and consuming” (p.10). As part of the relocation deal, it was agreed in 1990 that each household would receive £2,500 (index-linked), shortly before the move, to buy carpets and curtains for their new home. This provided people with a solid starting point to buy these items. As mentioned earlier, the belief that one had to have everything new for the new house further provided a focus on material goods, a phenomenon Young and Willmott (1957) commented on when describing the relocation of East Enders to a London suburb. This new materialism had two implications: people became protective towards their new belongings and people displayed a self-consciousness about material goods. For instance, Paul, who collected football pool money every Thursday in old Arkwright was used to walking into people’s homes and was regularly asked to sit down and offered a cup of tea. When he started collecting the money in New Arkwright people no longer invited him in. He concluded that people were worried about their new carpets. An additional explanation was given by another participant, i.e. that people were very conscious of their new belongings and thought that others would be “nosing around to see how well they had done” (from a casual conversation between T4 and T5). The local terminology is ‘nebbying’ and it was explained that she made a real effort not to look into her neighbour’s garden in case her neighbour thought she was nebbying. Norma explained that she did not like to go for a walk without a purpose (e.g. going to the shop or the school) because everybody else would think she was just going around nebbying. In old Arkwright, nobody was accused of nebbying as there was no visible materialism and no reference to this word occurred in any of the interviews at Time 1, 2 or 3.

**7.5.3 Life style.** Some participants focused on a changed life style. Molly wondered at T2 “how is it that we’ve got a front room here and all of a sudden we talk about a lounge over there? We wouldn’t dream of calling this our lounge! And the hall. We’ve never had a hall. Oh (laughing), we are posh now, aren’t we!” (txt: 627-633). At T4 Molly commented on another change: “we sit down at the table for meals now. Up there (old Arkwright), Neville used to sit at the work bench and I had my meal on my knees. I like being able to sit at the table now” (txt: 896-902). Molly felt positive about this life style change but others resented being forced into a different pattern. Toni, for example, talked about becoming middleclass at T4 and evaluated it negatively: “you keep thinking that you’ve got to have your house up to scratch, you’ve got to have it looking nice and without knowing you are getting like that. … some of the houses are like show houses, … to me a house is for living in” (txt: 974-999).

**7.6 Evaluations of behavioural pattern change**
7.6.1 New values and new priorities. Since the relocation there have been signs of an ongoing reassessment of people's identity. Previously, for example, the villagers felt their community to be perceived by others as a stereotypical coal mining community and this negative image provided a sense of cohesion and strengthening of their group identity. Now this former identity has almost disappeared and in its place there are beginnings of a more autonomous expression of identity. In New Arkwright, with its spatially varied environment, the emphasis is now on achieving individual distinctiveness. This increase in overt distinctiveness is discussed more fully in the following chapter, but the way values and priorities have changed in New Arkwright also needs to be addressed under this heading.

Illustration 7.6: Individual overt distinctiveness

It is easy to find house elevations displaying colourful decorations; new PVC front doors; doors decorated with brass letter boxes and elaborate house numbers; house names; and windows decorated with transfers or replaced with stained glass. Gardens were also a means of externalising the desire and ability to function well within this new environment and to present a new identity to others. Some participants regretted this change. As a participant wistfully commented after a heavy snowfall at T5: “those posh gardens don’t look any better now [than other people’s], do they!”

Illustration 7.7: The joy in creating a garden
Breakwell’s (1986) work on Identity Process Theory does not specifically include or address the significance of place but her later work (1996) acknowledges that places are important sources of identity elements, as they embody social symbols which are invested with social meanings and significance. She suggests two sources, i.e. that places represent personal memories and these memories invest the place with personal significance; and that places are located in the socio-historical matrix of intergroup relations, reflecting and representing social memories (see also Lyons & Breakwell, 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997). The physical environment in old Arkwright was conducive to the communal type of behaviour, whereas none of those ‘markers’ or opportunities exist in the new village.

Those former opportunities included the use of allotments and the area in front of two garage blocks within old Arkwright. The allotments were an important venue for Arkwright’s male society, where they not only grew vegetables and flowers but cherished their freedom from domestic life. Sheds on the allotment were often furnished with comfortable chairs or even sofas, a heater, tea making equipment and sometimes more (Downs-Rose, 1995).

**Illustration 7.8: Gren’s allotment shed** (photo courtesy of Jenny Bull)
British Coal Opencast did offer a new area nearby to provide allotments but few people felt able to cultivate a new piece of land in addition to looking after their new front and back gardens in New Arkwright. As a result, most members of the allotment society resigned.

Another area in old Arkwright which was conducive to communal behaviour was in front of the two garage blocks which was frequently busy with men working on their own cars or helping others. Although it was mainly a male domain, others who walked through it were often involved in a lively banter. Now that everyone has their own garage, attached to their bungalow or house, people work largely individually within their own domain. Enid perceived this as a positive change at T5: “having a garage at the side of the house has changed things a lot for Jeff, especially during winter mornings. … he can shut himself in there and work. He has boarded up the ceiling and painted the floor, things like that. You gradually get there, don’t you” (txt: 663-670). This has also resulted in everyone being neatly shut away and is contributing to the lack of people’s movements and sounds throughout the village.

These examples illustrate how a behavioural shift from collective to individual functioning emerged within the community during the process of relocation and accommodation to the new environment. In old Arkwright the emphasis was on presenting a sameness, at least outwardly. Greenbaum & Greenbaum (1981) and Brown & Werner (1985) concluded from their studies that social integration is indicated and a sense of belonging to the neighbourhood is demonstrated by conforming with the style of neighbours’ properties. This seemed to be the case in old Arkwright where people apparently felt no need to externalise a distinctive identity. This homogeneity of the mining community provided a community uniqueness with highly developed ‘cultural patterns’, so well described by Ruth Benedict’s
(1935) observation that “the life-history of the individual is first and foremost an accommodation to the patterns and standards traditionally handed down in his community” (p. 2).

Previous behaviours and lines of thought were disrupted on several levels by the relocation of old Arkwright. It is proposed here that it is these significant breaks (e.g. no passive social contact; spatial distancing from neighbours, family and friends; few venues for socialising; loss of previous cohesion as a mining community; and limited economic capacity for socialising) which have changed the emphasis from collective to individual functioning.

Such a trend from collective to individual functioning has been identified at the wider level by a number of cultural theorists. Martin (1981), in her book “A Sociology of Contemporary Cultural Change”, describes the change from collective to individual functioning which is in her view due to a global transformation in which “ego rather than any natural ‘tribal’ group forms the basic unit” (p. 236). She states that “the public sphere, the traditional arena for citizenship (that is brotherhood and mutual responsibility) has been abandoned and has turned into a no-man's-territory, …... … the only model for interaction becomes that of personal intimacy. All interaction assumes the shape of the private relationship …” (1981, p. 239).

However, even if the changes in Arkwright can be thought to have been influenced by such macro level changes, the transition to individual functioning did not occur until precipitated by the relocation. The mining tradition had already ceased to exist but within the old environment people continued to function largely as they had always done.

Thus, whilst cultural research in the 1980s identified the existence of a cultural transition from collective to individual functioning and found that people’s identity was, in part, derived from their individual material possessions, these developments only became features of the Arkwright community after the spatial environment had changed. Young & Willmott (1957) found that when people moved from terraced housing in East London to a more widely spaced housing estate their lives became ‘house-centred’ rather than ‘people-centred’ and “the competition for status [took] the form of a struggle for material acquisition” (p. 164).

Although separated by 40 years, the occurrence of the same change from people-centred to a more materialistic house-centred focus found by both Young & Willmott and this study suggests that this particular change in behavioural patterns may be facilitated by the spatial change. Barbara, a newcomer to old Arkwright made this observation at T5, two years after the relocation: “now the young people [who had been brought up in old Arkwright] are free to do what they want to do, they no longer need to hang on to traditions passed down by their parents”. Some behaviours were seen by the Arkwright
community as appropriate only in certain physical environments and when the physical context changed these patterns of behaviour were amended. It is proposed that the spatial aspect as perceived by the inhabitants functions as a catalyst or an inhibitor, providing constraints and possibilities.

7.6.2 Loss of connectedness to the group. In old Arkwright, verbal contact across some distance was the norm, i.e. social interaction was not limited to close face to face encounters. People sat or stood by their back or front doors and would wave to someone several houses away or shout across a greeting or some information. This form of communication has ceased not only because of the physical barriers and greater distance between the houses but also because of a perception that this is unacceptable behaviour in the new environment. Shouting from one row to another or along the row whilst, for instance, hanging out washing or going to the dust bin was a common occurrence in old Arkwright. This no longer seemed to be the case in New Arkwright and a number of people have felt rebuked when they behaved as they would have done in the old village. A participant from the wider sample commented at T4 that she had shouted at her young daughter, who was about 3 houses ahead of her and that she was given disapproving looks by another resident, so that she hasn’t shouted since. Bill remarked similarly at T5 when asked whether he would prefer to still be living in old Arkwright: “Yes I would because the atmosphere, it has changed completely. Now if anybody walks along the street shouting it’s all over the village ‘it’s them, it’s them’ but before nobody ever said anything. It’s all different now, hmmm, it’s become a posh place” (txt: 214-218). In addition to the reduction of shouting, verbal contact on the street had become less frequent and more cursory. Mary at T5 spoke for many participants when she reported that “people now say hello to you when they pass you in the street and that’s about it. They don’t stand talking like they used to” (txt: 383-384). When asked why she thought there was such a change, Mary replied: “I have no idea. I don’t really think about it, you just get used to it and do the same” (txt: 388-398).

It appears that the new socially constructed rules preclude shouting or standing in groups to chat and thus reduce connectedness to others. As Sadie explained at 6 months post-move, “previously it could take me up to four hours to wash my car, as everyone who used to pass me stopped and you’d be chatting. You don’t see anyone. Saying that, the lady across the road and I were watering our gardens and we actually stopped and had a chat but this was the first time that I’ve had a chat with anyone since moving in” (T4.txt: 433-468).

This loss of connectedness represented an extraordinary change for villagers. Norma reflected at T4 on why she did not feel like going out: “… going back to when I said I don’t feel like going out, I think it’s because I don’t know where everybody is, I’ve lost everybody … I have lost track of everybody. …I’m walking past all these houses and I think ‘I wonder who lives there’ and it’s like an alien world” (txt: 598-616). Dovey (1985: 43) views ‘home’ as “the schema of relationships that brings order, integrity,
and meaning to experience in place – a series of connections between person and world.” For most indigenous Arkwrightians and others who had lived in old Arkwright for many years, connectedness to the community was of paramount importance. Their past socio-cultural patterns, their previous connectedness to people was an integral part of their identity, an identity which now did not seem functional. There was also connectedness of the group through the place (through doing and knowing) and connectedness with the past through collective memories anchored in old Arkwright. As described in the previous section, following the relocation individual functioning replaced collective functioning resulting in being disconnected from the group. For some this represented a sense of freedom, whilst for others it was perceived as a loss.

Children were an important part of life in old Arkwright. As a participant explained at T4: “I would sit in the backroom with the door open and the kiddies would come by on their way to or from school and shout ‘heyup Mrs. P.’ and that was lovely. Now, well, I haven’t seen a kiddy since we moved down here, and you miss it, don’t you!” Children were usually allowed to walk around the old village by themselves and minor accidents like a grazed knee, etc. were frequently dealt with by whichever adult happened to be nearest to the child. This no longer occurs as children, in general, are not allowed to venture far from home. Norma particularly missed other people’s children’s excitement on Christmas morning when they used to wander through the old village to show off their presents. At T4 she explained: “You saw no children on Christmas morning and that was awful. It was dead, just like a cemetery” (txt: 1798). Norma went on to contrast this with Christmas mornings in old Arkwright: “You see, you would see the children running through the streets with all their toys and their new bikes and you’d go outside and say ‘ooh, I like that bike, has Santa brought you that’ and that were so nice. Well, they are not going to run round these roads, they’ll have to stop in their own place. It wasn’t Christmas” (txt: 1785-1791) (referring to the first Christmas in New Arkwright). Tom expressed the same sense of loss at T5: “… it weren’t the same. … We had our family Christmas but that was it. In the old village, you saw the kids outside, they came to show you their toys, bikes or whatever. Everybody was out and about visiting each other. You’d be shouting ‘Happy Christmas’ all day long. We didn’t see a soul other than family. It was dead” (txt: 310-319).

In old Arkwright, people did not need to seek connectedness to others, it was always there. The opportunities for ‘casual encounters’ (Cooper-Marcus & Sarkissan, 1986) in the new village are few, there is no physical centre to the village, and there are few public meeting places. Thus, achieving the desired level of connectedness with others will demand a different mechanism, i.e. people have to actively seek it. Previously learned mechanisms for high density living are no longer functional.

7.6.3 Loss of behavioural guidelines. At T4 Penny likened New Arkwright to the Channel 4’s Brookside story. She explained that in the soap opera people behave “half like Arkwright [people] and
half like middle class [people] or they try to be [middle class] but eventually their true selves come out because they can’t sustain that behaviour. ... or they constantly struggle with their new identity, what is it, what are they meant to be” (txt: 1120-1134). Penny continued: “this is what it is like here, [normally], when you move to a different estate ... one can observe the residents and interact accordingly ... but here you’ve nothing to observe, nothing to set yourself into. There is a word I’m trying to use ... there is nothing to conform to here, that’s what I’m trying to say, there is no conformity. The village, the community hasn’t decided what boundaries they want for themselves, what standards, what is acceptable and what isn’t” (txt: 1138-1198). Penny was clearly talking about synchronising behaviour (Archea,1977) or rather not being able to synchronise one’s own behaviour, not only because of a lack of visual access but also because the community had not, as yet, established patterns of behaviour. Hormuth (1990) also emphasizes the monitoring by newcomers of traditional activities and habits with a view of fitting in, at least at the beginning, an issue which will be discussed further in the following chapter. Penny developed her thoughts further by saying: “... you can counter-argue that people’s general standard of living has increased. If you look at everybody’s garden, they are really nice and there were some dives in old Arkwright. ... so I’m sort of contradicting myself. Maybe materially people have found a standard that they believe to be acceptable but within their own culture they haven’t” (txt: 1202-1229).

Penny verbalised the difficulties experienced by not having any ‘guidelines’ which would ease the transition from doing things the old Arkwright way to behaving ‘appropriately’ in New Arkwright. Looking to social psychological theories, Sherif (1966a) found that individuals look to others to help them define an ambiguous situation. Millward (1998, p. 372), referring to findings by Campbell & Tesser (1986) and Asch (1952), suggests “that subjective uncertainty (e.g. self-doubt, situational ambiguity, and so on) is the condition under which both normative and informational processes of influence are optimally at work. This presupposes that individuals are in some ways vulnerable (due to lack of information and/or confidence) and therefore dependent on the group for normative and informational support.” This informational support was precisely what was not available in New Arkwright, creating a conflict, an inner tension, which needed to be resolved. It is proposed here that initially, however, participants withdrew into their private domains and focused their attention on their gardens and properties, developing their individual selves and reducing the salience of their previously important collective selves. This can be seen to have implications for the observable increase of individual distinctiveness (Chapter 8) and the reported loss of external stimulation (Chapter 9).

7.7 Summary
The relocation of Arkwright provided a ‘break’ with villagers’ previous habitual practices which had already lost some of their meaning due to the closure of the deep coal mines. This left some people feeling bereft and others delighted. The reduced visual access in the new village (due to new fences,
curved roads and hilly contours) not only diminished a sense of connectedness to others but also restricted an information flow which had been part of the functioning of the group in old Arkwright. The complexity of the new road system prevented some participants from exploring and appropriating their new village as their previous socio-spatial schema had become redundant. In addition, previously learned privacy mechanisms were found to be inappropriate in the new setting. Those residents who participated in the initial stages of the community architects’ consultation programme had stressed the need for increased privacy in the design of the new village. The effectiveness of the final design in creating this privacy resulted in a mixed response, part welcomed, part regretted, part ambivalent.

The participants’ responses quoted and referred to in this chapter suggest that the previous collective functioning of the community has been replaced by more individual functioning. It is proposed here that spatial aspects provide constraints and opportunities for different behaviour patterns, especially when there are few communal facilities in place. This change from collective to individual functioning represented a sense of freedom for some but a loss for others. The loss of behavioural guidelines and the arising ambiguity left a cultural vacuum, resulting in behavioural uncertainties which had not been resolved by T5.

The findings highlight the crucial importance of the physical environment in understanding cultural/behavioural change and illustrate the essentially dynamic relationship between person/group and place.

Although there is an inevitable overlap between the empirical chapters (all chapters are concerned with the process of change and the link between attachment to place and identity), they are also distinct in that this chapter described the spatial change in New Arkwright and collected together participants’ quotations concerning changed behaviour patterns. This can be described as a ‘bottom up’ approach, where the data guides the content of the chapter. The findings were then interpreted using environmental and social psychological theories. The following chapter, however, represents a ‘top down’ approach, where IPT was used to organize the data, i.e. quotations were selected in support of the theory.

**Chapter Eight**

**The relationship between spatial change and the identity processes**

**8.1 Introduction**
Chapter 7 described the spatial changes in New Arkwright and discussed the evidence and evaluation of behaviour pattern changes. This chapter focuses on the spatial change and the identity of members of the Arkwright community before, during and after their relocation to New Arkwright and in particular on whether spatial change affects identity processes. In addition the relationship between place attachment and identity will be further explored.

8.2 Identity Process Theory
Chapter 3 discussed Breakwell’s Identity Process Theory (IPT) and reviewed some work based on IPT. To reiterate briefly, IPT postulates that individuals seek to generate a structure for their identity. This structure has content and value dimensions, of which the content dimension contains the information about the person which makes that person special or unique (this will include behavioural styles, values, attitudes, belief systems, self ascribed attributes as well as group memberships), whereas the value dimension consists of the values attached to each content element (Lyons, 1996). In addition there are two cognitive processes (assimilation/accommodation and evaluation) by which identity is formed and maintained and these processes are guided by principles (distinctiveness, continuity, self esteem and self efficacy). These principles are the motivational basis of identity and define which endstates are desirable for the structure of identity (Breakwell, 1993). Importantly, Breakwell sees the identity structure resulting from a dynamic process between intra-psychic and social influences, within a developmental and temporal framework.

Given that the new spatial environment appears to be evaluated differently and affords different behaviour patterns, people are likely to assimilate and accommodate this new information and feedback to their identity. This chapter will examine some of these processes.

8.3 The Principles
The four principles guiding identity processes, according to Breakwell’s IP Theory, namely distinctiveness or uniqueness of the self, self esteem, continuity of the self and self efficacy, have been adapted for this study.

8.3.1 The principle of distinctiveness. Breakwell (1988, p.195) points out that “much of the evidence for the power of the distinctiveness principle comes from theorists concerned with aspects of identity derived from group memberships”, who have shown that people use inter-group comparisons to achieve personal distinctiveness. Breakwell suggests that interpersonal comparisons operate similarly and she defines distinctiveness of the self as the need of a person to be distinctive or unique. Quotations coded under this category include those containing any comment which refers to a feeling of uniqueness or distinctiveness for the participant, including any specific expression of non-distinctiveness. It also
includes any comment which describes the distinct quality of a particular environment (home or village) and the special relationships people may have with these environments. Breakwell points out that for distinctiveness to guide the identity process, it has to be positively valenced. Hummon’s (1990) work on community identity and his focus on perceived distinctiveness derived from being a ‘city’, ‘town’ or ‘country’ person. Feldman (1990; 1996) demonstrated that for some people, loyalty to a distinct type of settlement is the overriding motivator for action and Twigger & Uzzell (1996) report that distinctiveness was both sought and achieved by residents of the Surrey Docks on three levels of spatial scale, i.e. settlement, place and locale, and on a temporal scale, i.e. before and after the redevelopment.

8.3.2 The self esteem principle is about the desire to be evaluated positively, guiding identity processes to provide “a feeling of personal worth and social value” (Breakwell, 1986; Lyons, 1996). Breakwell acknowledges that “distinctiveness and self-esteem go hand in hand” (1988, p. 195) and that “self-esteem is sometimes seen to operate in tandem with the desire for self-efficacy ...” (1988, p. 194). Quotations selected to illustrate self esteem express participants’ intrinsic pride in their sense of self, their overt achievements and/or their situation. Awareness of self esteem indicators in relation to place and identity has been heightened through other researchers’ work, e.g. Twigger (1994), who demonstrated that positive evaluation of the local environment by oneself and by others resulted in pride and thus conferred self esteem. Devine & Lyons (1997) found that historical places can be seen as providing symbols which enhance self esteem. Korpela (1989) suggests that when children are distressed they seek a favourite place to enhance self esteem and Lalli (1992) postulates that people living in an historic town can feel a sense of pride by association.

8.3.3 The principle of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy theory was developed within the framework of social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) and defined as “the wish to feel competent and in control of one’s life” (Breakwell, 1988, p. 194). For this study self-efficacy is defined as the person’s perceived ability to function competently and autonomously in a social and/or physical environment. This definition also includes Winkel’s (1981) concept of environmental manageability. Thus quotations containing a reference to a participant’s sense of being/not being self-efficacious or having/not having control over the old or new environment are included.

8.3.4 The continuity principle is seen as motivating action to preserve continuity of the self between past and present self-concepts. This category contains quotations which demonstrate a person’s sense of persistence over time, linking past, present and future self concepts and includes any references to any break in continuity in terms of temporal, social, spatial or cultural aspects of the person’s self or life. This study focuses on the importance of ‘subjective or perceived continuity’, thus allowing for change and development whilst maintaining a clear idea of an individual’s on-going continuity across situations and time. Twigger & Uzzell (1996) found support for two forms of self-environment relationships
relating to continuity, i.e. ‘place-referent continuity’, when places act as referents to past selves and actions and thus provide a link between past and present identities; and ‘place-congruent’ continuity, when characteristics across places remain the same and are, therefore, transferable, as in Feldman’s concept of settlement loyalty. Imposed loss of place-referent and place-congruent continuity (Fried, 1963; Speller, 1988; Nanistova, 1994a) has been found to result in identity confusions, with responses ranging from dissatisfaction to severe grief reactions.

It is important to understand that Breakwell did not see the four principles of identity as being exhaustive nor, importantly, as being fixed either cross-culturally or temporally.

8.4 The research questions
The research questions addressed in this chapter concern the degree to which the participants’ identity processes were affected by changes in the spatial environment:

(i) Was the spatial change associated with any change in salience of the principles of identity over the course of the relocation?

(ii) Did spatial change affect participants’ evaluation of particular elements of their previous identity structure?

To answer these questions, this chapter will present evidence from the interview data and observations by the researcher relevant to each of the four principles of identity over the five time phases. Quotations from interviews with the participants have been selected to provide both evidence of reduced or accentuated salience over time of the four principles of identity, as well as changes to the participants’ previous identity structure in terms of the content and value dimensions.

8.5 Findings and discussion for each of the four principles of identity
The principles have no hierarchical order and will be examined in the order of distinctiveness, self esteem, self efficacy and continuity. Within this sequence, participants’ responses are followed over time to discover the degree to which each principle became salient/not salient. Only trends which applied to more than one participant are included.

8.5.1 The principle of distinctiveness. During the interviews prior to the relocation, comments displaying distinctiveness focused almost exclusively on the collective uniqueness of the old mining community, rather than, as IPT theory predicts, individual distinctiveness. Tom, at T1, explained that he had moved into the village in the 1970s and gave his reasons for liking Arkwright: “it is a unique place. ... [at that time] no one knew anything other than the coal industry. I remember, when I came first into
the village, with being a joiner, ... and they seemed to be almost shocked to see anyone not in the mining industry. And people are different because of that. Arkwright really is unique, just the way it is built, where it is. ... it is a one-off place but the new village will be all over the place.” At T2 Tom did not address distinctiveness but at T3 he talked disapprovingly of people keeping up with the Jones’s and predicted that “it will definitely get worse.” At that point he talked nostalgically about place-related collective distinctiveness, such as the street parties they used to hold and the exciting times in old Arkwright they had enjoyed and then he said: “I don’t think it will be the same. ... I mean the setting’s ideal for here. ... I’ve worked all over the country, different places, you know, and never come across a place ... like this.” In Goffman’s (1959) terms Arkwright was the setting on which Tom had bestowed meaning through transactional processes (communal parties, carrying out carpentry work in a number of houses, etc). Milligan (1998, p. 2) argues that physical sites “become the stages for social interaction, stages that are both physically and socially constructed ...”. For Tom, Arkwright was unique because of its physical structure (e.g. the straight terraces made it easy to put up trestle tables for street parties, not so easy on curved roads) and the social interactions which it facilitated (in particular the passive social interactions, as discussed in Chapter 7).

At T4 Tom did not refer to anything which would indicate his feelings on the subject of distinctiveness and at T5 he clearly disapproved of the way people had changed in terms of their own newly developed feelings of distinctiveness: “some of them are just trying to think they are more than they were. ... all of a sudden, they seem to have jumped up a gear and that’s ... probably another thing that’s messing things up.” Tom thus evaluated the individualisation negatively.

Illustration 8.1:  The new emphasis on individual difference
At T1, Sadie emphasized the lack of overt individual distinctiveness. She had only recently moved into old Arkwright and appreciated that “everybody is the same, it doesn’t matter what you’ve got, they don’t want to know. It’s lovely.” At T5 she commented on the change from collective to individual distinctiveness: “In the old village, nobody seemed to feel the need to make the outside different from other houses but now everybody wants to outdo their neighbours!”

Old Arkwright was not totally devoid of external distinctiveness but in comparison to New Arkwright, it was barely noticeable. The differences were limited to the design of net curtains, some muted colours of front doors and some pebble-dash exteriors (years ago someone offered a cheap job lot). Two houses were more distinctive than others because of bay windows and one had a picture window. The most notable house was white with black tudor beams added to it but this was the work of an outsider who had lived in the village for a short period of time.

Phillip’s comment about the outside of houses at T1 supports Sadie’s perception. Phillip was asked whether the way the outside of his house and garden looked was important to him to which he replied: “I don’t think many people bother about the outside. I don’t bother about what the outside looks like. If the grass gets too long I get it cut, I keep it tidy and that.” (txt: 209-210). Phillip spoke for the majority of residents. There was little indication of distinctiveness on exteriors of houses. Hormuth suggests that “when a person is new in an environment, socially provided and shared meanings of the environment are accepted and made use of in self-presentation” (1990, p. 198). This would account for the lack of self-distinctiveness displayed even from newcomers (with the exception of the mock Tudor house), although some, like Sadie, found that the sameness reflected their own values.
It was mostly at T3, four weeks before the move, when participants began to verbalise a desire for future individual distinctiveness, when thinking about their new homes. Les, for instance, began to talk about personal distinctiveness: “you will be able to do enough that if you do want [your house] to look better than anybody else’s within a few years, ... yeah, believe it or not, I am actually looking forward to that bit of it.”

At T4 Les made a stronger statement: “we are trying to enhance [our house and garden] and I think that is part of our job, to individualise it, if you like. ...people will have done different things. Houses that at the moment look all the same will eventually look all different. It’s nice when you can individualise it.” Les’s identity structure now accommodated this new component when he said: ‘I think that is part of our job’ and he gave this a positive evaluation ‘it’s nice when you can individualise it’.

Illustration 8.2: One of many varied back garden designs

Bill, too, responded to the opportunity to display individuality. Between T2 and T3 residents could make a number of individual choices for their future homes, e.g. the colour of their front door. At T3 Bill explained how easy it would be for people to locate him in the new village: “... It’s the only house in the village with a purple door, just with a number 1 on it.” (txt: 192-194). Bill had not painted his door purple in old Arkwright. Like Les, he was delighted and comfortable with expressing his uniqueness in New Arkwright.

The absence of any mention of individual distinctiveness at T1 could be explained within Breakwell’s theory as being either due to the absence of any threat to identity, hence the distinctiveness principle was not salient, or due to the existence of cultural values within the community which deemed individual distinctiveness inappropriate or simply not relevant. Indeed, the negative evaluation of individual
distinctiveness and the mention of communal distinctiveness at T1 suggests that the distinctiveness principle was operating in terms of collective rather than individual distinctiveness. Dave’s first interview was at T2. He had moved to Arkwright in 1981 when he had married an Arkwrightian. He talked about the communal distinctiveness which was important to him: “I think one of the things that surprised me ... was the ‘spirit of Arkwright’. If you talked about this to the newspapers they say, ‘yes, the spirit of Arkwright’ but they don’t really understand what you’re talking about. It really existed, it was a real, almost tangible thing.”

At T3 Dave emphasized the importance of Arkwrightian sameness by telling a story about someone who had moved to Arkwright within the last few years: “... they are doing their level best to be Arkwright people ... She came up to our yard the other day, ... she had got an ice cream or something all down the front of her blouse until she was the same colour as us, do you know what I mean? And she just said, ‘look at me, I’m not fit to go anywhere’. And I said, ‘don’t worry about it, now you look like the rest of us’, and she just laughed instead of being [off-hand] like she would’ve been two years ago” (txt: 863-880). Still on the subject of sameness, Dave explained: “... at the moment anybody who’s got a type 2B house has got the same as say, for instance, at least a dozen others. ... It will take at least five or six years to build a character into the houses ...”. Dave’s main point here is again the lack of distinctiveness of New Arkwright at T3, although foreseeing that in time to come it would change. This is in contrast to Les who, at that time, had evaluated the change to individual distinctiveness positively.

There is no evidence of an accentuated personal uniqueness in Dave’s interviews. It neither became salient in his narratives (he also did not comment on other people’s expression of distinctiveness) nor had he displayed much distinctiveness in his front garden or the outside of his house by T5. There is no evidence that he experienced any threat to his identity which would demand that the content of his identity should be modified.

This was not the case with Phillip. When Phillip was asked at T4 whether he had personalised his new home he replied: “I’ve not really personalised it. I won’t stick out, I won’t be thinking I’m better than anybody else like some of them” (txt:1404). He clearly disapproved of other people’s efforts towards self distinctiveness and resented the outward change in the village. Unlike Dave, who seemed blissfully unaware of any change, Phillip evaluated the change negatively, retaining his previous identity content.

In summary, Breakwell states that “distinctiveness can only be achieved by being willing to reject standard expectations and orthodoxies in the interests of creativity and uniqueness” (1986, p. 113). Before the relocation the pressure on residents to ‘be the same’ was part of the cultural/behavioural patterns which had developed within the coal mining community (as already discussed in Chapters 4 and 7). Breakwell suggests that “principles will achieve priority according to the social context” (1986, p.
25). Distinctiveness of the self had little priority in the old village as far as overt distinctiveness is concerned. Yuki & Brewer (1999) distinguish two different types of group representations, i.e. as an undifferentiated collective, where group loyalty is derived from perceived similarity, or as a network of interacting individuals, where group loyalty is derived from attachment/connectedness to other group members. Both types of group representations were evident in old Arkwright but it was the former which resulted in an unwritten law that cohesive group similarity should also be expressed externally. This changed, however, over the course of the relocation so that, ultimately, individual distinctiveness was clearly evident and positively valued by most, although not all, residents.

8.5.2 The principle of self esteem is closely linked to the principle of distinctiveness. It is defined as a positive self-evaluation and the reflected positive evaluation of oneself by valued group members. This definition includes participants’ intrinsic pride in their sense of self, their overt achievements and/or their situation. Although villagers had experienced much hardship in the past through poor pay and working conditions in the deep coal mines, many participants proudly talked of their collective self esteem, their achievement of the impossible.

Exceptions to this norm were mostly related to managing the planning and organisation of the relocation. Several authors have demonstrated that personal positive evaluation of place enhances self esteem and by the same token it seemed that the inevitable deterioration of the old village diminished people’s self esteem. To take Enid as an example, she was concerned about the deterioration of the old village at T2: “... this village is a disgrace now, everybody is letting everything go. It wouldn’t cost anything to keep [the village] tidy” (txt: 155-156). She returned to the subject again: “The more I look at this village I think, my God, this is a disgrace” (T2.txt:208-209).

There was also evidence of a decrease in personal self esteem during the pre-relocation period as many participants had difficulties when dealing with some of the project office staff. At T2 Enid described how she felt when she walked into the project office: “He is rude. He looks at you as if you were a fly on a piece of meat. ... He is there to do a job, to help you, not to look down on you but to me, that is what he is doing” (txt: 187). Enid, like a number of others, also felt snubbed by the project officer. “Right from the beginning she has had this attitude about her … As one person said in the village: ‘I am it and you are shit’. That’s what she thinks and yeah, that’s what they say.” (3.txt: 442-444).

Enid, at T3, was also rebuilding her self esteem. She pointed out the curtains she had made for her patio doors. “I am very pleased with these, because I fought him over the patio doors and won. That’s the only thing that we won, ... but I am pleased” (txt: 644-646). The importance of the curtains was far greater than the act of making them because they personified a victory over the intransigence of the project office staff. Thus they symbolised self esteem and self efficacy (including a sense of autonomy).
At T4 she proudly told of another instance of outwitting project office staff, clearly a successful attempt at regaining some control and self-worth. Both of these examples are concerned with successful actions for the new home, thus increasing self esteem and hence preparing the ground for attachment to the new home. At T5 Enid’s focus was firmly on her personal self esteem rather than on the village. Her house and garden had a number of hanging baskets and planters overflowing with flowers and Enid was pleased with the effect she had achieved. Thus Enid had made the change from collective to individual values. Even before her relocation she had gathered experiences which would imbue her new home with meaning. Her identity structure had accommodated personal distinctiveness and she was successful in carrying out her plans.

At T4 Norma reflected on the past: “Up till the pit shut [1988] it was a great village. It must have been the greatest village in England.” (txt: 1658). This comment could also be deemed to represent collective distinctiveness but since Norma’s self esteem was very much connected with the village community it is more relevant to this section. At T5 Norma stated: “People looked up to me for doing it and I felt as if I had achieved something for Arkwright. I felt part of Arkwright and its life. I don’t know how I did it when I look back. … but you did it for nothing, because the pits were shut, the methane and all that, …yeah, all our efforts and then [British Coal] beat us [finally, by getting] rid of our village.” (txt:71-99).

The culture of the Arkwright community made it often difficult to select quotations which explicitly reflected self esteem. It became clear to the researcher through the prolonged contact with the community, that it was culturally unacceptable for participants to verbalise feelings of self pride or to ‘boast’ of their personal achievements. It would be unlikely that Norma would phrase the T5 comment in terms of self esteem and therefore it could also be seen as an example of efficacy. There is a close relationship between efficacy and esteem but it was the tone of voice which made it seem better fitting here.

Alice did not talk about personal self esteem at T1 but concentrated on collective issues when she explained how her husband had tidied up after the coal delivery lorry and the dustmen to keep the village clean and tidy. At T2, collective issues no longer featured and her focus was on all they had done for themselves in making decisions about their relocation. She stated that she would be “a bit sad when it comes to moving. But knowing I’m going into something new, and knowing what I’m going into, I picked everything. I am looking forward to that. We have picked all the furnishings. Plus the fact we’re having new furniture and all that, so it will all be new, so that’s something, it will take my mind off moving.” (txt:572-578).
Breakwell (1986) argues that threats operate at both individual and group level and that threat to the principles is likely to result in changes to the identity structure. It can be argued that participants went through a process of redefining the meaning of certain aspects of their identity, i.e. at T2 the identity content ‘I am foremost a member of the Arkwright community’ underwent a change by T5 to ‘I am an individual, independent from the community’. This process may have been set into motion by people having to make individual choices at T2 not only in respect of the house style (there were three styles and eleven variations to choose from) but also individual choices for fixtures and fittings. The possibilities for increased individual distinctiveness and individual self esteem may have been realised at that time.

The relocation undoubtedly contributed to Alice and Morris’s self esteem. The T1 interview contained retrospective narratives about the community spirit before the year-long strike. Although Alice did not talk about herself she displayed pride in how her husband had looked after their home: “Now, if anything wants doing, Morris does it right away, not like some men who leave it hanging around. For instance, first thing he did after he retired was to knock this wall down and put in this sliding door. That was two days after he had retired” (txt: 108-110). They had displayed a positive attitude towards the move throughout, with only small lapses of sadness (see more of Alice in the next section, under the heading of the principle of continuity). At T3 Alice recounted a conversation she had with someone from the village who bought some of her furniture: “he is having those two chairs, that fire and that table. He agreed to have them before he had seen them but I wanted him to come and have a look at them. He said, ‘I know if you are selling them they are going to be alright, I am highly satisfied’ and I said ‘I’m glad’” (txt: 283-287). At T4, Alice was talking about how much money they had spent on items for the new house and garden, explaining that “we wanted to better ourselves. Morris just bought some [brass] fittings for the front door and has put them on” (txt: 698-699), thus continuing to improve and work towards increased distinctiveness and self esteem, whilst demonstrating self-efficacy.

Illustration 8.3: One of many varied back garden designs
At T5, however, Alice was most upset because Phillip McLeod’s article had just been published in the Daily Telegraph Magazine which she felt was demeaning: “What bothered me was that it said that people had sort of lifted themselves to middle class by naming their houses, by putting butterflies on the walls and all this. I said, well, it would be interesting to know what category we were in before we got to middle class. I didn’t like that bit. … Even though we were miners, we did think ourselves a little bit more than lower class, you know, because there is lower class and lower class, isn’t there. But the way he worded it was that we were giving ourselves airs and graces and we hadn’t. We are still the same people. We had only bettered ourselves by coming into better properties and we want to keep it better properties. To put it in a nut shell, it was really disgusting, that article. … It makes you wonder what they thought about us when we were over there” (txt:545-561). Here, Alice is using continuity (“we are still the same people”) to overcome the threat to self esteem brought about by her understanding of the Telegraph article.

Alice and Morris, although into their mid-seventies, had adjusted well to the spatial change. Jackie, very much younger, found it more difficult once she had moved to New Arkwright. At T4 she focused on her lowered self esteem, for instance, she felt upset about the neglected landscaped areas owned by the Council. “… it looks such a mess. To say it’s a new village, it’s disgusting really” (txt:129-131). She was also concerned that it may reflect on the residents, “it’s not fair, really, because it is not our bit, is it, it’s the Council’s.” (txt:134-136), thus Jackie was still focused on collective self esteem. Later Jackie talked about the brickwork on her house. One whole wall of her house had been taken down and rebuilt but Jackie felt the poor workmanship reflected badly on themselves and was therefore unhappy: “the wall is probably level now but the brickwork is still disgusting. You walk round the rest of the village and there is no other brickwork like it. Some lads came from Derby the other day to lay some paving
slabs and one said ‘I have seen brickwork in my time, but this looks like the YTS (Youth Training Scheme) has done it. But what do you expect when it’s been given to you!’ You see, this is what people from the outside think about it. It’s still our home, after all. … it is our own house, it’s not nice if people think this. He had heard it on the media!” (4.txt: 507-526). As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 9, Jackie had struggled throughout the relocation process because of the lack of autonomy and the implication that they should be grateful to BCO. This was particularly difficult for her as the poor workmanship did not reflect her own standards and diminished her self-esteem. At T5, Jackie talked less about their house and focused on their garden. They had worked for many hours to create something special: “It’s nice to have a garden and Huw made a good job of it. That’s something that you never had before and that gives you identity, doesn’t it” (txt:343-348). Jackie also said: “It’s big, isn’t it. There are not many people who have got more than us. … I mean, it’s not just the back, it’s the front as well, isn’t it and the side. So we are quite pleased with it” (txt: 544-552). Through appropriation of their garden, which will be discussed in Chapter 9, she had gained in uniqueness and self esteem. Jackie did not feel the same about their house as she explained at T5: “… with a new house, well, you are stuck with it. You can’t do anything to change anything inside, … there are a lot of stud walls, not brick walls, … and there is a lot of wasted space” (txt:55-61). This is where we can see the link between place and identity in that it is the place which gives expression to identity, through the person functioning within and appropriating the place. The dynamic process forged through these cumulative experiences allows the place to reflect the self through maintaining and enhancing the four principles of identity: distinctiveness of the self, self-esteem, self-efficacy and, in time, self continuity. It is suggested here that the more meaningful these transactions within a place are, the more likely it is that an emotional bond with place, i.e. place attachment, will develop and meanings derived within this place will through identity processes be assimilated into the person’s identity structure. Les evaluated his achievements positively on a personal level as he talked about how each generation of his family had progressed: “… my father did much better than his father had done and my kids started better than we had done, it’s a very big progression each time, you know …” (4.txt: 1772-1773). He returned to this account later and said: “I never thought I would get this far” (4.txt:2028). At T5 Les focused on what a difference their decision to pay for an extra bedroom had made. “I probably can go as far and say that Alex might not have got to college if we were still in the old house. Here he could go to his room, it was warm, it was light. Their room in the old house was quite dark as I remember it but here he was very, very comfortable. They’ve both got televisions and music centres. OK, perhaps I haven’t done that badly financially because we’ve got

Illustration 8.4: One of many varied back garden designs
everything and you just go and get more and more, don’t you. I think that part of it is totally amazing. I
mean, he was happy going up to his bedroom doing homework all the time, ...” (txt: 212-222). Thus Les
clearly linked the new house with his son’s success in obtaining a higher education place, a further
source of increased self esteem.

On a personal level Les evaluated his new situation positively. At T4, however, he was also thinking
collectively and evaluated the impact of the relocation negatively: “... it wouldn’t have cost any more
money to have [the acoustics in the Arkwright Centre] done properly to start with. We all get that
impression, that they think, well, that it doesn’t really matter what we do here, it’s only Arkwright. If
you look at the way they made the dell, they just virtually knocked the soil over, there is no attempt to
grass it or spray it and then grass it ... it’s as if they think ‘oh, it’s good enough for them’. I think
everybody’s got that feeling but then you know, we do have a chip on each shoulder and it doesn’t seem
to go away (4.txt: 55-79). ... Imagine if they had planted daffodils along the dell, it would have looked
nice” (4.txt: 104-106).

Illustration 8.5: The Dell
Marjorie focused on their individual gains. At T2 she commented on how lucky they had been to move to Arkwright just before the methane scare and how the relocation had advanced them: “We could never have afforded a new house for £50,000 – £60,000. ... We started with nothing, we did not even have a settee to sit on when we moved in” (txt: 121-123). At T4 Marjorie stated: “yeah, I’m happier now, because it’s, it’s the house I like. Across the way (old village) it were just getting me down a bit because it were only like a first home to get us started (the relocation forced them to remain in old Arkwright longer than they had planned). We have got a good deal. I mean, I don’t think we would have been able to afford to have a conservatory built if we had bought our own house [elsewhere]” (txt: 899-903).

At T5 Marjorie recounted the story of one of Jonathan’s friends visiting: “... he had not seen [our new house] before, so he saw it at its best (Marjorie and Jonathan had just redecorated the whole house) and he just couldn’t believe it and Jonathan said ‘yeah, we are lucky because we had some of it given to us but we also worked hard and made the most of it ourselves” (txt: 15-18). When Marjorie was asked if her new house now felt like home, she answered, “oh yeah, yeah, I love it” (txt: 25-25). She proudly pointed to the new York stone path which wound round the side of the house to the front gate and said, “yeah, Jonathan did that” (txt: 333). Marjorie’s self esteem was clearly accentuated by the positive feedback she had received from Jonathan’s friend which supports similar findings by Twigger-Ross & Uzzell (1996).

For many people the post-relocation phases saw an increasing salience of individual self esteem and a concomitant lessening of importance of collective self esteem, although self esteem in general was felt to be threatened when autonomy was diminished. It can be seen that for both Jackie and Marjorie, the link
between identity and place attachment is created through enhanced self esteem. These examples demonstrate that the relationship between identity and place attachment is formed when accumulated meaningful experiences (e.g. appropriation of house and garden) result in greater salience of self esteem.

8.5.3 The principle of self efficacy is defined as the person’s perceived ability to function competently and autonomously in a social and/or physical environment. As discussed under both previous sections, the Arkwright culture did not support overt distinctiveness or self esteem. This also applied to self efficacy, i.e. long-term Arkwrightians only rarely reported explicitly self efficacious abilities since it would be interpreted as ‘boasting’. This, again, made the selection of the responses relating to perceived self efficacy difficult.

Penny was one of the few exceptions to this norm in that she was able to talk about personal achievement in an objective manner, demonstrating her ability to organize meetings. When asked whether there was a sense of community in Arkwright at T1, she replied: “I wasn’t really aware of the community spirit before the methane because I was relatively new, I had only been here about two years but once the methane had occurred I actually set up an action group because people were tending to sit and moan and not do anything and I was trying to get all those feelings together and take some action. So we ... got together on that ... and that was when I first sensed a community spirit” (txt: 16-20).

Also at T1 Penny explained why she joined the Liaison Committee: “I believe that you never rely on anybody else and that you take responsibility for what you want. If I want something then I believe I should do it and I wouldn’t, I would not be happy for anybody else representing my views. That’s why I have done it. I think, if there are so many things that I want in that village then it is up to me. It is not just on a personal level, it is also on a disability level. I don’t think a lot of people have got much experience on issues with disability and I have done it professionally as well, so may be that will be helpful. It is not just about disability per se, elderly people often have terrible access problems and it is just not thought about and there is no excuse with a new village” (txt: 365-371).

At T2, Penny again exhibited a sense of self efficacy: “I found also that if I write letters, type letters in a formal manner, you get a much speedier response than just whinging to them, so I usually put my argument in writing” (txt: 927-929). At T2, BC had not allowed Penny to have the style of kitchen she wanted, they had agreed only to adapt a cheaper model to her needs. She said: “I think it’s all about choice, isn’t it. We as disabled people, we didn’t have the same choice as other people and that was my argument and it still stands, I mean, I haven’t got my kitchen sorted out yet” (txt: 876-879).

At T3 Penny felt that the people of Arkwright have ‘simply given up on the community’ and would not respond to other people’s efforts: “... and we’ve tried as a Parish Council. We’ve built the New
Arkwright Centre, lots of things for the community. I’ll give you an example, two weeks ago we set up a bonfire night, ... fireworks and food for £3. Not one Arkwright person came. Not one. They all came from outside [Arkwright]. Nobody was bothered. I mean, just total apathy” (txt:108-129).

There was no indication of self efficacy from Penny’s T4 interview but at T5 she stated: “I’ve put a lot of hard work into this village. ... I mean, I’m looking for things that I can do in the village, maybe other people aren’t looking. There are so many opportunities. I think this village has empowered people but they can’t see that” (txt: 165-170). Later, in the same interview Penny’s self efficacy was less obvious than previously indicated when she said: “I think I do feel very isolated at times even though I’m very independent” (txt: 508-509).

Hayley explained at T4 that they regretted not having been more efficacious: “I don’t envy other people but some have had a lot of extra things done. ... I suppose if we had squawked loud enough, we’d have got more. I don’t know. Some seem to have got things and some don’t, but I don’t want to keep thinking about it because I want to be pleased with what I’ve got” (txt: 660-663). Thus, Hayley’s cultural belief that you do not ask for something extra for yourself resulted in her feeling a lack of self efficacy.

Alice recalled at T1 how her mother had felt when they had moved previously: “... the only time I moved was within the village. They were renovating houses (in the 1960s) and we moved into a house with a new bathroom and that was a big thing. I was looking forward to it but to my mother it was very upsetting because she was as old as I am now (in her late 60s) and I remember how upset she was when she moved. So, I think, I might be the same when I move from here, you see, because you think about what you have done and what you have put into [your old home], you see” (txt: 83-87).

Breakwell (1992:36) states that “In keeping with social learning theory, expectations about self-efficacy are said to be derived from three major sources of information: (1) past performance; (2) vicarious experiences which inform estimates of what is necessary for the task; and (3) estimates of one’s capacity made by other people.” Alice’s only experience of moving was within the village and it was a positive event for her (for the first time having the use of a bathroom) but she also observed her mother being upset and she expected to feel the same as her mother, having now reached the same age. When she was asked at T4 about how she had felt on the day of the move, Alice replied: “Well, rather upset, ... rather upset at leaving. The last minute. If the removal men had come on time (they were half an hour late), I wouldn’t have [felt upset]. I hadn’t thought about it but we were just hanging about waiting for them and it just ... it gave me time to think about it, you see but after that I had got too much to do so it didn’t bother me” (txt: 726-738). Busying herself with practical needs, Alice demonstrated how being efficacious helped her to cope.
Alice also explained that they had been back to their old garden to dig up some plants: “... I was determined that it wasn’t going to bother me. Probably if I’d given way to it, yeah, but I didn’t, because I knew we had bettered ourselves by coming into a bungalow and I’d got what I wanted, you know, I wanted a separate kitchen and I got that and I’d got everything nice, so I thought, well, I’m going to dwell on that part of it ...” (txt: 749-756). Alice’s focus was on her individual gain. She occasionally referred to collective issues during T4 and T5 but she had clearly made the change to individual functioning by then.

At T2 Tom had managed to have some joinery work on his own house in the new village subcontracted to him, which pleased him immensely. At T3 he was looking forward to “... doing, maybe a lot of work in the garden, and, you know, around the house and all that sort of thing. ... once I’ve got started on that and I’ve got my garage and I can do all that sort of thing ... I shall be well away. I shall be into enjoying everything” (563-567). Thus Tom’s perceived self-efficacy remained high.

Barbara explained at T2 that she would be concentrating on the garden once they had moved, “because I’ll have nothing to do in the house. You know, not like when we came in here or other houses where you’ve got to strip the walls and decorate and all that sort of thing. There won’t be anything to do, just put furniture where you want it and sort cupboards out” (txt: 360-365). At T3 she added: “I have no stress attached to [the move] whatsoever. I might be a little bit stressed on the day that we are actually moving but getting ready for it doesn’t worry me at all. I think I’ve done it so many times, and this time somebody else is doing it for me, so it takes the hassle away, doesn’t it” (txt: 237-241). Previous experience of moving house had made this relocation appear easy for Barbara, whereas for others, who had not moved before, it had seemed an enormous task.

In summary, the data demonstrates that efficacy is not automatically transferred to a new context. Penny, who had acted efficaciously throughout T1 and T2 began to receive negative feedback from the community at T3, 4 and 5. Hayley, perceived a lack of self-efficacy but did not relate it to attenuation of her self esteem. Instead, she made a conscious effort to retain her self esteem and perceived efficacy by saying ‘I want to be pleased with what I’ve got’, in order to protect her identity structure. It can be concluded that functioning within a changing place affects the salience of self efficacy and that place is an important part of a person’s identity structure since it demands that the individual re-evaluates previously held values either positively or negatively during and after the spatial change. This can be clearly seen when considering the change from collective to individual functioning during the relocation process. When individual functioning was evaluated positively it was accompanied by increased work on individual properties, thereby also increasing distinctiveness and self esteem.
8.5.4 The principle of continuity. This is defined by Breakwell (1986) as the need for continuity over time and situation and is seen as guiding identity processes and motivating action to preserve continuity between past, present and future self-concepts. Breakwell (1988, p. 195) points out that “continuity of self-conception is regarded as a major motivation and director of action and cognition”. For a number of participants, their need for continuity with the previous lifestyle was not salient until after the relocation. It was only then that people became aware of the effects of a different lifestyle and began to miss the past. Milligan (1998, p. 11) suggests that such nostalgia is a device often used to create continuity and that the “crucial common denominator in this link is, frequently, a specific physical site ... Thus [it] serves as an organizer for the past through categorizing the site-specific memories as continuous.”

Although the miners’ strike ended in 1985, old Arkwright, until its demolition, remained as an anchor for place-dependent memories, providing a place referent continuity (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996). The physical structure of old Arkwright had embodied many social symbols which were invested with social meanings and importance. The loss of the social symbols and meanings represented a discontinuity for the residents, the loss of tangible connections to their identity. Milligan (1998) proposes that in the same way that humans can serve as “mnemonic others” to help us remember experiences of the past, so can “places act as mnemonic devices by verifying that certain experiences did occur” (p. 12). The demolition of old Arkwright removed all place-dependent mnemonic devices of people’s personal and collective past. The monument to old Arkwright, a clumsy brick pillar, which was erected about 3 years after the demolition, is seen by many participants as a poor tribute to Arkwright’s past.

Participants’ responses embraced three types of continuity, i.e. collective/social, spatial and continuity retained through possessions, examples of which are given below.

8.5.4.1 Collective continuity. Ben described the discontinuity of the social behaviour of old Arkwright at T5: “... you know, if you hadn’t seen [people], you’d go and see if there was something up and of course, if one of them was ill, then you’d go and ask, you’d say, ‘How is your wife getting on?’ or your husband or your daughter. ... Now they don’t. No. It seems like everybody’s in their own little nest and they don’t want to come out or to invite people into it” (txt: 683-687). In response to the question, ‘Do you feel part of the village community now?’, Ben replied: “I don’t think we do, really, do we Dora? ... We’re just on our own. That’s about it, to be honest” (txt: 734-738).

The compactness of old Arkwright ensured frequent interactions with people. At T4 and T5 there were many comments about the lack of interaction with others and simply not seeing people any more, hence it represented a discontinuity of the previous way of life. Charles commented on New Arkwright at T5: “... there don’t seem to be people milling around the village like you used to see in the old village. I
mean, quite a few times I walk down to the post box and I’ve not met anyone. It’s like a ghost town! It’s very odd” (txt: 24-26).

Norma echoed the same feeling at T4 (txt: 1167-1177): “you look out of this window and ... you don’t see what you want to see ... you were so used to looking out of the window over there and seeing people that you know ... and it’s so changed now.” Milligan (1998, p. 9) explains that when spatial continuity is disrupted, “it acts to close a category of past experiences. ... the closing of a door on a particular interactional past”. Norma’s powerful comment, ‘you don’t see what you want to see’ reflects the knowledge of the closed door, a door which Norma would have preferred to keep open.

When Enid was asked at T4, ‘What in your opinion is the least satisfactory aspect of New Arkwright’, she also commented on the changed way of life: “This, this loneliness. It is like a grave to me down here. ... You used to see people up and down [the terraces]. You didn’t go to people’s houses in particular but we met up at Mrs. H’s at night time. Well, that’s gone (Mrs. H. had been admitted to a Nursing Home and later died). Well, everybody’s busy, aren’t they. Moving in and doing and ... Christine is a good way away now, isn’t she. Mandy is a good way away. You don’t get contact with anybody much at all.” (txt: 108-125). A person’s identity is, in part, confirmed by others and for this reason the perceived emptiness of the new village was disturbing for some of the residents.

The latter three examples of discontinuity quotations could also have been placed in the previous chapter under the heading ‘loss of connectedness to the group’. The theoretical overlap is acknowledged here. They are placed here to indicate that participants perceived this change as a sudden discontinuity to their previous life style.

Participants also reported collective discontinuity. Tom at T5 talked about the loss of the sense of community: “… it’s not the community that is was, … not as we used to know it. It’s like a, well, really modern village, if anything. ... Like this Christmas, it just wasn’t, it didn’t seem the same, it definitely wasn’t the same” (as recounted in Chapter 7). Tom returned to the same subject later in the interview: “It’s just the atmosphere that’s gone, there is something that we are missing …” (509-510).

Alice also recognized the changes in the sense of community. At T5, to the question, ‘Do you feel part of the village community now?’ she replied: “well, only as a resident. We don’t go to any functions or anything like that because for a start there aren’t any and we can’t go to this [community lounge]. No, I don’t think we do feel part of the community” (txt: 285-289). Nevertheless, Alice retained her continuity as a member of the mining community. To the question, ‘Do you still see yourself as a member of the mining community?’ Alice replied: “yes, because that is how it has always been, it has always been in the family” (txt: 533-535).
When asked the same question Ben responded initially, “yes, I always will” but then added: “It’s a big chunk of my whole life, it was 22 years. I met a lot of good friends at British Coal, and of course it’s gone, and it’ll never come back” (txt: 1053-1058).

At T5, in answer to the question, ‘What is the least satisfactory aspect of New Arkwright?’ Enid replied “hmmm, there is no community now” … No. No, there isn’t, because you don’t see anybody” (txt: 57-62). A little later Enid stated that she would prefer to be still living in old Arkwright: “I would if I could pick up this bungalow, if I could pick it up and take it, I would.” When asked, ‘why’ Enid replied: “Well, I think it is because it was so different, you saw people all the time” (5.txt: 86-98). She returned to the same subject later: “I hardly see Mandy or Christine now, you just gradually, you just lose contact” (5.txt: 280-282). When Enid was asked whether her relationship with her close friends had changed in any way, she replied: “Not really, you chat when you see them but you …… you don’t know what’s happening in their lives, day to day” (5.txt: 544-546). Enid stated that she did not feel as content as in old Arkwright: “probably we lived there too long, I don’t know. You classed it as home for all these years, didn’t you and then it’s gone, ………… it’s gone” (5.txt: 241-242). Enid was steeped in the culture of old Arkwright and perceived the changes as disruptive to her social network. Social support was an integral part of everyday life within the old community. Granovetter’s (1982) work on ‘The strength of weak ties’ proposes that it is the ‘weak ties’ which are often more important than the stronger ties of kinship, since they function as a bridge between closely knit groups in a community, thereby spreading information efficiently. Within the old Arkwright setting the interconnectedness of people, (e.g. Enid missed knowing ‘what is happening in other people’s life day to day’), the bridging between kinship groups, provided not only a sense of belonging which was much less obvious in New Arkwright but far more, that is immediate access to information, guidance on how to assess a particular situation, unsolicited offers of help with cumbersome tasks (as people were around to notice when help would be welcome) and more.

Bill explained how in old Arkwright, front doors were opposite front doors and back doors were opposite back doors, easy to achieve with straight rows of terraced buildings: “It’s less (sense of community) … because you’d only got to walk through the old village and somebody would speak to you but hardly anybody speaks, they are hardly ever out now. I don’t know why. In the old village, people used to sit outside. … There were still people on their gardens and they’d talk like that but it’s not … it’s very rare you see people like that now” (5.txt: 386-398). Bill continued: “it’s the loss of contact, everybody is spread out all over. That’s it. You can’t get to see everybody, people don’t come out anymore” (5.txt: 491-494).
Charles at T5 talked about the many strangers living in the village. “I remember when I was at school you could go up and down the old roads and say so and so lives there, so and so lives there and go right through the entire village and you knew where everybody lived, whereas now, I don’t know where people from the old village live. I only have a rough idea, I wouldn’t be able to go to their dwellings” (txt: 195-199).

On the subject of Norma’s choices for their chalet bungalow she commented: “yes, I’m actually very pleased with all the choices [we made], I can’t fault any of it.” She continued: “I like this house. It’s just, it’s just … well, you’re living in a certain style of life and then all of a sudden it’s changed and it takes some adjusting. … That’s the only thing, you know. I’m quite content to be in [the house] all the time, not go out. That’s how it’s got me.” (4.txt: 948-956).

Norma continued to explore her feelings later in the interview: “Even when I handed the keys in I went back to [the old] house and had a look at it, ... After a long pause Norma said: “I’d go back tomorrow, you know, how can you [feel like this] when you’ve got a nice house and everything? ... It’s the way of life that I want back, you know, when everybody is friendly and they’ll do anything for you and, you know, that’s what I miss, that way of life” (4.txt: 1747-1766).

That way of life included sharing the excitement of Christmas presents with the children of the village as reported in Chapter 7. “You saw no children on Christmas morning and that’s awful” (4.txt: 1800-1813). Norma gave another example of how different life is now in New Arkwright: “You see, children used to play all round the back of the houses. They won’t dare now to go onto your property, you know, because we’re fenced in. It’s your property, isn’t it and it’s, it’s out of bounds, you see” (4.txt: 1895-1901). Both these examples express the previous sharing of property, such as the joy over presents and communal use of back gardens. The community had been Norma’s extended family and she felt bereft. Also, the community had been the source of her identity, a source which now was no longer available, neither through social interactions nor spatial mnemonics. She had not, as yet, assimilated/accommodated a more individualistic life style.

Another erosion of ‘this way of life’ was visible in New Arkwright at T4. In the old village easy access to neighbours and friends was by the back door. Initially, a number of notices like the one below appeared on front doors in New Arkwright but by T5 most had been removed. The architectural design of the houses, which included drives and paths to the front doors and the fencing in of back gardens and the acceptance of a new life style facilitated the discontinuity of a century old custom.

Illustration 8.6:  Holding on to the old way of life
The discontinuity with old Arkwright did not represent a loss of meaningful experiences for all participants. Barbara explained at T2 that she would be happy to move: “I don’t mind what happens because I wasn’t born here, I haven’t lived here for donkeys’ years. I admit it was going to be last stop before heaven sort of thing but I’m not unhappy to leave it.” (txt: 506-509). Barbara’s house was close to the Pub and the Miners’ Welfare Club and they were often disturbed by noisy revellers. “I shall be pleased to leave that … and we’ve had a lot of trouble with children. … breaking fences down and jumping over, trampling the plants to death and that sort of thing ...” (txt: 524-531). Thus Barbara’s values had been incongruent with old Arkwright and such a state of dissatisfaction was found by Hormuth (1990: 199) “to imply a readiness for change and openness to new experiences.”

8.5.4.2 Spatial continuity. Sadie was aware of the need to retain some physical connections. When asked how she thought she would feel about the old village being demolished, she replied: “I don’t think all of it should be demolished. I think part of it should be kept like a heritage, to show what it was actually like. It should not be demolished and be gone, there has to be something to remind people. I think to just knock it down would be wrong” (T1.txt: 165-169). Sadie continued this theme later: “I think the school would be ideal, it’s a place many people went to. I think it would be a shame if there was nothing left whatsoever, without any memory left of any of it” (T1.txt: 179-181).

When Enid was asked at T1 which thoughts occurred to her most often when considering the move, she replied: “I can’t envisage them knocking all this down, it all going, I can’t imagine that and I can’t imagine what it will look like at the moment. I’ve no vision at all of what it’s going to look like. You can’t picture it” (txt: 102-105).
At T5 Alice talked about the symbolic continuity of old Arkwright. “They did ask us what we wanted to have done with the site of old Arkwright and I suggested a plaque, you know, a walking area and a plaque to say that this was old Arkwright. They seemed to like that idea but nothing has been said since. I really think there ought to be something to remind us of old Arkwright, well, for the younger generation coming up. It’s history, isn’t it, yeah” (txt: 615-619). (The memorial was erected 18 months later).

Places which do not physically change also offer the opportunity for people to revisit or relive their past (even if reconstructed through the eyes of an autobiographic present). When Jackie was asked at T1 how she felt about her house being demolished, she replied: “I feel sad about that really because it is the only house I ever had apart from living with my parents. ... it’s the only little piece of England that was ever mine ... most of the alterations are our own work and to see all that flattened by bulldozers will be sad. ... When you sell a house and move on, that house is still there, you can always drive past it. In this situation it is going to be completely erased” (txt: 159-167). Jackie much regretted the threatened discontinuity with her past life.

8.5.4.3 Continuity through possessions. Some participants did not consider that their identity was at all related to the continuity of their possessions. When talking about the belongings which she might take with her and which would provide a sense of continuity, Enid stated: “Nothing from this room is going with us, I’ll have to have a giant car boot sale” (T2.txt: 214-215).

Norma explained that it had been easy for her to dispose of her old possessions: “... it just didn’t fit in with new house, you see. I wanted all nice things around me. When I say ‘nice things’ I mean in keeping with the new house. Everything wanted renewing, it were old, weren’t it, our furniture. I like change, if it’s the right kind of change” (T4.txt: 1946-1978).

Others, whilst still wanting new possessions for the new house, expressed some feelings of attachment to their possessions. At T2, Alice explained that they were buying all new furniture and that her old furniture was being given to her granddaughter, who had just become engaged: “... my granddaughter is having my suite, that unit there, that cabinet there. ... She is having my fridge freezer, oh yeah, and my cooker. ... She has always liked my suite and I said to her your granddad said you can have that suite and she said ‘oh can I Grandma’ and I said ‘yeah, if you want it’, so she is looking forward to it” (txt: 584-629). As Alice had given many of their belongings to her granddaughter and other members of her family, she was asked whether she was now missing any of those items. Alice replied: “None of them because they are still in family, yeah. Those that have got any value are still in family. Funny you should ask me that, I’ve been doing my kitchen cupboards and I found 2 or 3 things that I’m going to give to my other granddaughter. There’s a pair of plates, one of my mother’s wedding presents. They
must be about 70 years old or more. ... A little teapot, that’s about 40 years old, little bits of things like that, which I know she’ll save. And I thought well why have them shoved at the back of this cupboard when she can be using them” (4.txt: 791-806). This had both eased the disposal of their old belongings and provided Alice with a sense of personal continuity reflected in possessions since her belongings were staying in the family.

Breakwell (1988) emphasizes that it is ‘subjective or perceived continuity’, not ‘objective continuity’, which is sought to maintain identity. Alice provided another example of subjective continuity. At T4 (txt:1110-1115), during a period of obvious change, she focused on continuity of herself and place referent continuity: “my photographs. I mean I wouldn’t get rid of my photographs”. Referring to a specific photograph she says: “I was only five when it was taken with my mum and my dad and I’ve still got it hung in the spare bedroom. It was in the spare bedroom, which was my mum’s room at home (in old Arkwright) and yeah, it’s still there now” (in the new spare bedroom). Note that Alice said “it’s still there now”, clearly seeing continuity between the spare bedroom which was her mother’s room in the old house and the spare bedroom in the new house, even though her mother had never lived in the new house. Alice thus successfully created a subjective continuity.

In summary, the principle of continuity is evident throughout all 5 time phases. It is suggested that it is possible to differentiate between participants who perceived themselves as ‘static’ selves and located in a past time frame, and others who perceived themselves as ‘developing’ selves, hence located in a future time frame. In addition, old Arkwright was the setting for past experiences but viewed by participants in two ways. For some, experiences were perceived as important personal and collective milestones tied to the old setting and people felt bereft of these experiences without the setting. For others, experiences were perceived as unwanted ‘baggage’ which could not be discarded whilst remaining in the old setting. For them, the enforced relocation represented a new beginning in their lives. This illustrates the dynamic nature of the relationship between place and identity and underlines the claim that the relationship is not deterministic. Principles were made differentially salient over time and the new content evaluated either positively or negatively, thus impacting on participants’ identity processes.

8.6 Overall summary
The Arkwright relocation context provided an abrupt and clear incident of socio-spatial change on an individual and collective level. Some participants had not adapted well to this change by the time of the last data phase (2 years post relocation). This can be interpreted as these participants not having assimilated and accommodated any changes to their identity structure. This is particularly the case for people whose identity was based on their being members of the old mining community, where the emphasis was on ‘being the same’ and this sameness represented a sense of belonging. Although the solidarity of the old Arkwright community had lessened after the miners’ strike in 1985, the community
remained in the same place and the same unwritten rules were largely adhered to. It is suggested that the relocation to a spatially different environment released the individuals from their previous commitment to the community and increased the salience and positive evaluation of individual distinctiveness and individual self esteem, i.e. individual distinctiveness and self esteem replaced collective distinctiveness and self esteem. As demonstrated by the data, self efficacy is not automatically transferred to a new context. Participants who did not feel efficacious in New Arkwright felt alienated and seemed less able to create an emotional bond with their new home. Further New Arkwright did not provide a place-congruent or place-referent continuity and faced with the loss of collective continuity embodied in old Arkwright, participants evaluated the new situation and the threat to their identity in different ways. For some, the increasing salience of individual distinctiveness and self esteem more than compensated for this loss whilst for others the issue of discontinuity became highly salient.

What then are the theoretical implications of this work? The framework of Identity Process Theory as developed by Breakwell (1986; 1992), and as expanded by Twigger-Ross & Uzzell (1996) and Devine-Wright & Lyons (1997) to include the importance of place, proved helpful in interpreting the impact of change across the relocation period.

The evidence presented here suggests that place is an integral part of identity and plays an important role in maintaining and/or enhancing the four principles of identity: distinctiveness, continuity, self esteem and self efficacy. Place is also an important link to identity as it organizes past experiences of individuals over time and their subjective interpretations. Vignoles (2000) argues that “identities are embedded within wider systems of meaning, which are constructed through processes of perception, cognition and social interaction” (p. 381). In the Arkwright context, there is another important addition, i.e. perceptions, cognitions and social interactions were embedded in the physical place and without it much of the meaning of identity was lost for those participants whose identity was reflected in the mining group and the old village.

Returning to Yuki & Brewer’s (1999) distinction of group representations, it was suggested that both representations could be said to have existed in old Arkwright. The first, that people saw themselves as an undifferentiated group would have been the case up to the time of the Great Miners’ Strike. Since then, this loyalty to the group would have been weakened because of the split in the mining union, the closure of the deep mines and also because of an influx of non-mining people. The group representation after 1985 appears to reflect Yuki & Brewer’s second group, a network of interacting individuals, where group loyalty is derived from attachment/connectedness to other group members. In Vignoles, et al.’s (in press) terms, people who were distinctive by their relationships to each other (‘I am the person who looks after Nora’, or ‘I am the person who lives next to Mary and Ben’) lost these relationships in the new spatial environment and this could be seen as a type of deindividuation since everyone became
anonymous in their new home. Vignoles, et al. (in press) suggest that IPT would then predict that people would seek alternative dimensions of individual distinctiveness, such as an emphasis on making individual homes overtly distinct. The same can also be said for self esteem, efficacy and continuity. Identity is understood to contain both personal and social elements (after Deaux, 1992). For participants for whom the social element was salient, the loss of this source of this source of identity will be deeply felt. For some it will mean a future emphasis on the personal element of their identity, for others it may mean a shift in the salience of principles.

The data supports Breakwell’s suggestion that the four identity principles are culturally dependent and time dependent, so that as the cultural values change, the salience of the principles changes. In particular, in this study, it was initially the collective element of identity which was salient and hence, the relevant principles were collective distinctiveness, collective self esteem, collective efficacy and collective continuity. After the relocation the personal element attained prominence, i.e. individual distinctiveness, individual self esteem, individual efficacy and individual continuity became salient.

The findings also add support to Breakwell’s theory that it is not only self esteem which motivates and guides identity processes as suggested by other identity theories but that distinctiveness, continuity and self efficacy must be considered. However, although conceptually there is a clear distinction between the principles, when operationalized, differentiation between distinctiveness, self esteem and efficacy is not as clear. This applies to both the qualitative and quantitative approaches (the latter will be discussed further in Chapter 10). Vignoles, et al.’s (in press) suggest that there is a difference between the basic function of distinctiveness in giving meaning to identity and the additional function of positive distinctiveness in self esteem enhancement. It is the latter which overlaps with self esteem, thus further work may benefit from operationalizing the former. It is possible that a similar differentiation could be established between efficacy and self esteem but this awaits further research.

Finally, it is suggested that a further factor must be taken into account when applying IPT in certain cultural contexts, namely the operation of the identity principles which include both personal and social elements of identity. This factor clearly emerges as important from the Arkwright data. Not only do principles achieve priority according to the social context but also depending on whether the emphasis is on the personal or the social elements of identity.

So how does identity relate to place attachment? Quotations chosen for this chapter provided support for the principles of identity. In each case, whether in old or New Arkwright, participants expressed an emotional bond to place when they had achieved a desirable state of distinctiveness, self esteem, self efficacy and continuity of the self through creating and accumulating meaningful experiences within
place. The following chapter will propose that there are five aspects of place attachment and that these will further help to clarify the relationship between identity and attachment to place.

**Chapter Nine**

**Aspects of Place Attachment**

**9.1 Introduction**

The previous chapter described the effects of spatial change on identity processes at both the individual and collective levels, this chapter will concentrate on the various aspects of place attachment. The place attachment literature review revealed a number of definitions of place attachment. As previously stated this study is based on the Brown & Perkins (1992) definition, which defines place attachment as involving positively experienced bonds.

As discussed in Chapter 2, underlying most research work on place attachment is the belief that a sense of attachment to place is a positive experience, encouraging both stability and growth, providing a restorative environment conducive to physical and psychological well-being. In this light, therefore, and in the Arkwright context, residents would ideally undergo a process of detachment from their old home and village which were being demolished and then become attached to the new home and village. The extent to which this actually happened varied depending upon the degree to which participants had welcomed the change and engaged in the process of change. Across all participants, however, the data suggested that there are five important aspects of place attachment which, when present, facilitate the development of an emotional bond with place. These aspects not only seemed to lead to place attachment but also play an important role in order to maintain it. They emerged as important during the in-depth interviews at T2 and T3 and further support for them was found during the analysis of that data and of the interviews/analysis at T4 and T5. It should also be noted that these aspects are mutually interacting, i.e. they influence and co-determine each other’s development over time.

**9.1.1 The research question.** This question is in two parts:

(i) What is the nature of place attachment and, in the Arkwright context, what factors encouraged or inhibited its formation and maintenance?

(ii) What is the relationship between place attachment and identity?
Chapter 8 described the role of place in relation to identity and the degree to which place and identity are linked but did not address the issue of attachment to place. As described in Chapter 2, many authors define place attachment as an emotional bond to place but few writers define the origin and quality of these emotions. Numerous ‘satisfaction studies’ have hardly helped to increase knowledge of people-place relationships. Fuhrer & Kaiser, however, advanced the field by thinking of place as a facilitator of specific emotional needs, “represent[ing] the basis for regulating both identity and social interaction” (Fuhrer & Kaiser, 1992: 105). For this chapter, the intrapersonal process (emotional bases to place), Fuhrer & Kaiser’s (1992) third process, is important.

There are conceptual similarities yet important differences between Fuhrer & Kaiser’s work and this study. This study’s longitudinal design offered the opportunity to follow the processes of participants’ detachment from their old and re-attachment to their new homes and village. Although there is equal emphasis on the individual and collective level of analysis, this study does not focus on interpersonal relationships within the home (between family members) but rather, on the participants’ relationship with their home and the meaning it has for them. When it became clear at T2 and T3 that some participants were positive about the move and others were thinking of it in negative terms, the question arose as to what caused these differences. The focus is on the longitudinal aspect of the data, which made it possible to observe the emotional changes over time. Analysis of the data suggested that there are five aspects of importance which, when satisfied, facilitate attachment to the new home/village and, when absent, either facilitate detachment or inhibit re-attachment. These dimensions have been termed aspects of place attachment, which are: a sense of security; a sense of autonomy; desire and ability to engage in appropriation; optimal level of internal and external stimulation; and place congruence. All five aspects can be observed at both an individual and a collective level. Careful reading of the interview data and summarizing the entries under a specific category (e.g. security) gave rise to the following definitions:

Security is defined as the perceived freedom from risk or danger on a physical and/or psychological level within the home and the community. This includes freedom from doubt, anxiety or fear.

Autonomy is the perceived freedom of self-determination, being independent, unrestricted.

Appropriation is making something part of oneself, often through the process of ‘doing’.

Stimulation is eliciting or accelerating a physiological or psychological activity. At an individual level, the changed environment may animate or may motivate a person to reach for challenging goals. In addition, stimulation is provided by visual and verbal access to others and through real or vicarious community activity. This need for stimulation at the social level has been greatly apparent in this study.
It is proposed that the optimal level of stimulation will vary across individuals and situations and across time.

**Place congruence** is the psychological state of believing that the place reflects the person’s identity. Place congruence occurs at an individual level (person and home) and also when considering the larger environment (feeling at one with the community, the spatial design of the village and its life style). Congruence is being part of a place (home or village) and feeling comfortable within it.

Quotations relating to aspects of place attachment across the five qualitative time phases were selected for this chapter. Sections 9.2 to 9.6 below present these themes and discuss the degree to which the five aspects of place attachment are supported by the Arkwright data throughout the five time phases of the study.

9.2 **Sense of security**

To reiterate, security is defined as the perceived freedom from risk or danger on a physical or psychological level within the home and the community. This includes freedom from doubt, anxiety or fear. It also includes familiarity of place, a sense of community support, a sense of belonging and a feeling of permanence. The following examples include both security themes concerning old Arkwright and those which became salient in New Arkwright.

9.2.1 **Security themes in old Arkwright.** The responses can be divided into four themes.

9.2.1.1 **The methane danger.** Old Arkwright was built on gently rising ground and the houses at the higher level were found, in November 1988, to contain enough methane to risk an explosion. The emergency evacuation late in the evening was terrifying for all and many people returned to their memory of that event throughout the duration of the study. British Coal (BC) had installed an underground pump to prevent a further accumulation of methane at that point but not everyone felt reassured. Ben recounted their experiences of that night at T1: “It was terrible. We all said we wouldn’t want to go through that again. ... I shall be glad to [move to the new village], because it has been a big worry” (txt. 98). When the new village scheme was announced the North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC) spokespersons made use of this fear by talking about ‘a time bomb’, which some residents felt was unnecessary and unfair. As Jackie pointed out at T2: “How can you be sitting on a time bomb for 4 years without incident? ... They were wrong to do that. Once the pump was installed there was no need to worry. There was a problem that needed addressing permanently and the new village plan was the answer to that but there was no need to inflate the issue, it could have been dealt with more honestly” (txt: 175-179). Possibly because of these exaggerated statements a number of people continued to attribute debilitating effects (e.g. headaches) to the methane seepage. In both the
above cases (on a cognitive and emotional level), participants had accepted the need to move in order to remove the community from the methane danger. In this case the methane danger acted as a ‘push’ factor which eased the detachment from their previous home.

9.2.1.2 Insecurity through mistrust. At a psychological level mistrust, primarily of BC but also of the County and District councillors, resulted in much uncertainty about the relocation but most noticeably for people who had been or were employed by BC. There were two main areas of concern.

Firstly there was mistrust during the process of decision making and this made people doubt whether there would indeed be a new village at the end of this process. In the context of preparing for any future place attachment, this mistrust was damaging. Vicky talked about her husband at T1 (txt:116-117) and explained: “He has been in pit 20 odd years and he’s learned not to believe anything they say. Coal Board says they don’t tell lies, they just change their minds.” Norma at T2 (txt: 477-482) made a similar statement: “Coal Board can change their mind over night. We’ll believe it when the first house is built, hopefully it’s ours. ... We’ll be lying in bed that first night and think, oh, it did happen then!” The background to the distrust of BC was discussed in Chapter 4 and past experiences throughout the coal mining history have seemingly taught miners not to take promises at face value. In the case of the Arkwright relocation, the perceived unpredictability of the scheme through lack of trust in BC resulted in much insecurity. The interview data shows that this mistrust affected members of the mining community far more than newcomers to Arkwright or non-miners who took the promises at face value and, therefore, much more readily engaged in the process of the relocation scheme.

Secondly, participants felt insecure because they were not being given enough information. Vicky complained at T1 (txt: 190-192): “All the questions we can’t get answers for. Do we have any guarantee that there won’t be any methane across the road? If things go wrong 2-3 years after we have moved in, who will take the responsibility? They won’t, they’ll have moved on.” In addition to not being given answers rumours abounded. As Helen pointed out at T2 (txt: 1397-1398): “See, all these details people bandy about and exaggerate them, so you don’t know what’s true and what isn’t.” Penny commented at T3 (txt: 665-668): “[If I had been organising the move] I would have provided information in a readily accessible form that people could understand. I think that’s been the problem with information. It’s either come too late, in the wrong form, or not at all.”

9.2.1.3 Personal security. Marjorie, a recent newcomer to old Arkwright talked wistfully about the security in the old village at T2 (txt:138-148): “It is no longer a close knit community as it was years ago, some of the old residents can tell you more about that than I can, but it is one of those communities where nothing can happen without anyone seeing it. I wouldn’t say they are nosy but people watch. I feel secure in that actually. I know we can go away on holiday and our house will be safe.” Marjorie, at
that time, also expressed concern about security in the old village once people were beginning to move out, “but like when you get empty houses, like Nora, Enid and Jeff and Andy will have gone [before us] and then there is no one to watch our house. ... It’s not so bad for us because we are in the second lot to move out but I feel sorry for the ones that are left behind.” In her statement, ‘I feel secure in that’, Marjorie expressed what so many participants reported, a sense of belonging, being part of the community and in return, Marjorie shows concern for ‘the ones that are left behind’. Thinking collectively was evident at T1 and T2 across most participants. As discussed in Chapter 8, however, this changed for many by T3 when people became individually involved with their personal relocation problems.

Participants often talked about the good security in old Arkwright as there were always people about and people knew friends and relatives of their neighbours. As Vicky explained (T3.txt: 292-299): “… we know everybody who comes to Debbie ... and Shirley but [we don’t know who’ll come to our new neighbours], so we’ve got to learn now who is who.” Penny was a relative newcomer to old Arkwright. She was also disabled and said at T1: “the thing about this community is that I know I can leave my car unlocked and nobody would touch it. I can leave my door unlocked and nobody would come in, that is the way I feel. If somebody was going to [bother me], I feel that someone else will tackle that person on my behalf, you know, deal with it, not ignore it. … If I went to any house for help, nobody would turn me down, they would help me” (txt: 11-36). Later Penny added: “yes, I do get attached to places and to people. You get security and you know where you are” (txt: 148). For Penny, a sense of security was clearly an aspect which formed part of her attachment to old Arkwright.

Barbara, however, also a newcomer to Arkwright, did not share other people’s sense of security. She felt unsafe in old Arkwright on three counts and this was precisely one of the reasons why she was looking forward to moving. One, they had lived near the Miners’ Welfare Club and the Pub and had felt threatened by the noise and coarse language late at night. Two, their house had been burgled between T1 and T2, which was very upsetting for them. Three, Barbara was also a keen gardener and found it difficult to turn a blind eye when children ran through her garden and damaged her plants. Since she anticipated having a properly fenced garden in New Arkwright and with the promise of being relocated as far away from the Miners’ Welfare Club and the School as possible, Barbara found it easy to detach herself from her home in old Arkwright.

9.2.1.4 Financial security. There were fears of financial difficulties to come. Penny at T1 (txt: 149) said: “… financially I am secure here and that is very important.” At T3 (txt: 527-543), Penny felt less positive: “But the one negative thing that worries me is if people can’t afford to live in New Arkwright. ... I mean, who wants to live in a really nice posh house when they can’t afford to do anything else? That’s why I lived here in the first place, because I knew I could afford to live here.” Helen at T2 also
worried about this: “It’s frightening, you know, it’s frightening thinking, well, I might have to sell up and move back to something like this (a terraced house), because that’s why you moved here in the first place.” Later she returned to the same theme: “... you are going to have a lot more rates to pay, so you might be worse off than you are now. All right, you’ve got a nice house but you might not be able to afford to live in it” (txt: 1465-1472).

One reason for the fear of increased costs was the installation of water meters. By law, all new estates have to be fitted with water meters. The project office had asked for volunteers to have a meter in their old home to be able to assess how much water different households would use. The information gained, however, was never shared with the community, as Vicky explained at T3: “I asked the [water meter reader], I asked him, ‘is it a good thing for us [to have a meter]’ and he said, ‘I’ve been told I can’t tell you ... the project office will tell you’. We’ve heard nothing whatsoever. Stan brought it up at a liaison committee meeting because the older people wanted to know, they were frightened and still nothing” (txt: 1567-1571). This example is also relevant to the autonomy section but is pertinent here since the withholding of that information convinced residents that the future water bills would be extremely high. In the event, this fear was largely unfounded. Vicky continued this story demonstrating her collective thinking at that time: “I said to this [man], well, if I had known [that the information would not be shared with the community] I would not have agreed to have a meter fitted. I thought with having that fitted it would help people in this village” (txt: 1572-1574).

9.2.2 Security themes in New Arkwright. The responses relate both to anticipated insecurity and to actual experiences of the new village.

9.2.2.1 The issue of strangers. At T2 participants began to focus on what life would be like in New Arkwright and frequently mentioned the safety issue concerning strangers. In old Arkwright most people knew everyone and this knowledge provided security. The Metropolitan Housing Trust built 56 new homes in New Arkwright and a number of participants found this threatening. As Ben put it at T2: “[older people] are not going to want to come out, because there are going to be a lot of strangers and they don’t trust strangers ...” (txt: 1776-1777).

When asked at T5, ‘In comparison to old Arkwright, how safe and secure do you feel now?’, Christine replied: “I do tend to double check when I’m in the house on my own – make sure my doors are locked, which I never bothered with in old Arkwright. ... Well, you don’t see a lot of people here. Where I lived, I’d got people, people you knew always walking past. But here, you don’t know, you don’t know who is driving into the village, do you, but when I know I’m going to be in the house by myself, I make sure then. I [also] make sure that I don’t have to go out ... late at night. I’m not a frightened person, it doesn’t bother me, the dark. I just feel that I have to do this” (txt: 203-215).
9.2.2.2 Perceived lack of security through lack of community awareness. In the new village, new security themes emerged. At T5 Penny recounted an unnerving experience: “... I fell last year in the snow and there was just nobody to go and get help, whereas in the old village somebody would have seen me fall or somebody would have heard me shout. I just couldn’t get up, I was quite frightened actually. I did eventually manage but I thought, ‘What if this happens to an older person?’” (txt: 283-287). A similar incident did happen to an older participant in her own home. She had been living by herself and fell awkwardly one evening between her bed and a table. She could not get up and her calls for help were not heard. Although she had fallen in the room which adjoined her neighbours’ house, the superior insulation had made the houses more soundproof. In old Arkwright one of her neighbours would have heard her and if they had been out then passers by would have answered her call. Ann was found the next morning in a state of shock and with a broken pelvis. She spent most of the following months in hospital and died there. The story of Ann upset her friends, especially her neighbours. Everyone agreed that this could not have happened in old Arkwright.

Penny began to feel unsafe for other reasons and stated at T5: “I have always felt safe and secure until the other day, actually. ... our neighbour’s car got stolen from the Miners’ Welfare car park and then the Miners’ Welfare got broken into. Now, I always leave my handbag in the car but I thought, no, I better go out and get it. I always put the alarm on now. I didn’t bother much before but I do now” (txt: 191-196).

9.2.2.3 Increased sense of security. In contrast to the previous section, for some residents there was also an increased sense of security in New Arkwright because of security aids such as burglar alarms and lockable windows. In addition people realised that the fenced in back gardens would highlight the presence of strangers. Getting to know new neighbours also played an important part in people’s sense of security. At T2 and T3 Vicky had feared that the loss of their old neighbours would diminish their personal security in New Arkwright. For Vicky, at T5, her concerns had vanished: “as we’ve got to know the neighbours, they have more good points than bad points. Martin and James don’t go out a lot and if they saw anybody knocking about on our back, they’d phone the police. And it’s like Ian as well, for all his bad language, he’ll do anything for you, his heart is in the right place” (txt: 447-451). Vicky also explained that their alarm went off by mistake “and four people were round in no time” (T5.txt: 443). She felt hugely reassured by her new neighbours’ response. She had begun to feel again the previous sense of community support and sense of belonging. Her fears of reduced security in New Arkwright, however, had made the transition period difficult for her as she feared that the security mechanisms familiar to her (e.g. other people watching for you and being in close contact with people you knew) would no longer work. This inhibited detachment from old Arkwright and, by the same token, marred the ‘anticipatory’ process of place attachment to her new home and the village.
It was interesting to note that often opinions of lack of security in old Arkwright only emerged after the security of New Arkwright had been experienced. Neither Vicky, Ben nor anyone else had, for instance, voiced concern at the poor lighting in old Arkwright at Times 1, 2 or 3 but both Vicky and Ben mentioned the improved lighting in New Arkwright at T5 as an additional safety factor. First Vicky: “I feel safer now. ... over there, there were no lights at the back (their home had backed onto open country) and I am not a mardy person but I was lonely over there at night with no lights. Now here, I have no trouble” (T5: 430-437). Similarly, Ben recalls at T5 that there were “lots of dark holes in old Arkwright where people could hang about. This is well lit. You are not far from one street light to another and it’s more open and less places for people to hang about” (txt: 349-350). It is possible that people just accepted these conditions in old Arkwright and only became aware of their shortcomings once they enjoyed better facilities.

Another positive security theme for New Arkwright was the fact that BC had done everything possible to make the new houses methane proof by applying a methane-proof layer of material to the concrete raft for each house at considerable additional cost. When Ben was asked whether he felt methane was still a problem at T5, he replied: “No, it’s not going to cause a danger. The people are safe, they’ve made sure of that” (txt: 1169).

9.2.2.4 Financial insecurity. Chapter 7 and the earlier Section 9.2.1.4 of this chapter discussed participants’ fear of increases to their cost of living when in New Arkwright. Although Helen had been concerned at T2, at T4 she stated that they could now manage because she had a good job but she expressed concern for her friend: “ ... her bills have been more than mine and I’m thinking, ‘how are you coping?’ but she, she gets by, somehow. She’s living hand to mouth. I feel, it’s a big increase” (txt: 1039-1041).

The threat of financial insecurity applied particularly to those tenants on low incomes who did not qualify for housing benefit. Metropolitan Housing Trust had stated that the previously low rents in old Arkwright would continue in New Arkwright for 5 years and would then be adjusted to the current market price. This was expected to result in a fourfold increase and was scheduled to come into force in May 2000. Some tenants who were in low-paid employment felt at T5 that they had only two choices: to move again to a cheaper property or to become unemployed in order to receive housing benefit. The future insecurity involved in either possibility did not allow them to form an emotional bond with their new home.

9.2.3 Summary of security themes. It could be said that participants in this study reported feeling secure when they were in familiar surroundings, when they felt a sense of community support, a sense of
belonging and a sense of permanence. The examples given illustrate the importance of security in forming attachment to place. On a physical level the danger of a methane explosion has been removed, the village is well-lit and spaces have been designed in an open manner which do not afford hiding places. From a financial view point people now know the cost of their utility services and are able to plan accordingly. There is still, however, some insecurity for those tenants who will not be able to afford the market level rents after May 2000. Many of the uncertainties which arose during the relocation process have now been clarified. Security, however, cannot be adequately described in terms of its physical form. There is also a new found psychological insecurity caused by an inability to depend on other people seeing or hearing when someone needs help. For a community which had functioned at this very close collective level, new mechanisms for dealing with this insecurity are being found but almost exclusively on an individual level, such as by the installation of burglar alarm systems and telephones.

9.3 Autonomy
Autonomy is defined as self-determination, being independent, unrestricted. This includes a sense of ownership, the ability to regulate interactions with others (i.e. privacy regulation), a sense of control and power and the ability to initiate change. The themes which belong to the autonomy aspect can be grouped under three main headings, i.e. autonomy issues as they were reported in old Arkwright, lack of autonomy during the relocation process, and autonomy issues in New Arkwright, both positive and negative.

9.3.1 Autonomy issues reported in old Arkwright. One important issue which has already been discussed in Chapter 7 is privacy, including the ability to control access to the self. Work by Harris, et al. (1996) suggests that attachment to the home is enhanced when privacy regulation is facilitated. Harris et al. only considered privacy inside the home, whereas for the purposes of this study this concept has been extended to include the community.

9.3.1.1 Privacy. The privacy concept has already been discussed in Chapter 7 but this will view privacy in terms of autonomy. Privacy was extremely difficult to achieve in old Arkwright because of the right of way along the backs of the terraces and the closeness of the properties. People had achieved as much autonomy as possible through privacy regulations which were appropriate for old Arkwright. When it had been a working mining community it had been a sharing community with people having similar expectations and similar use of leisure time. The closeness and collective action had been part of the culture and it was, indeed, difficult for newcomers to adapt to this culture. On the whole, newcomers perceived a lack of autonomy in old Arkwright regarding privacy, whereas none of the indigenous Arkwrightians talked about the lack of privacy during interviews at T1, 2 and 3.
9.3.1.2 Deferring/cancelling home improvement plans. There were other autonomy issues apparent during the pre-relocation period. Residents had to decide whether to redecorate or carry out minor repairs, not knowing when they would be relocated as the original three years of preparation for the new village ultimately became five years. Worst off were tenants who found it very difficult to have repairs carried out. Norma described the situation at T2 (txt: 130-134): “Well, at the moment we live in a house which is really run down. We don’t own our home and you can’t get anyone to come and do repairs. My home is like a prison to me, I just don’t like it.” A number of people were in that situation, having no sense of control or power or the ability to initiate change. To escape those living conditions was the main reason why people agreed to move out as soon as their house in New Arkwright was ready, rather than to wait, as previously planned, until all the houses had been completed and to relocate all together within a shorter period of time.

Another related issue for owners was that of having to put improvement plans for their house on hold for 5 years. It could be argued that they still had a choice although their plans had been frustrated. Vicky talked about this at T1 (txt: 105-120): “We had lots of disappointments because we had that many plans about what to do with this house. We were going to extend the kitchen and build a conservatory, all these sort of things. We had to shelve them.” Hannah at T3 expressed her dissatisfaction: “I am just so unsettled over here. ... I can’t do the things I want to do and that is so frustrating” (txt: 173-201). Whilst it was only the owners who had to put structural plans on hold, the lack of control over the improvement process was a frustrating experience for all.

9.3.1.3 Freedom from conformity. In old Arkwright there was no rigid application of planning laws and residents had accumulated old vehicles and other goods in public view. Les made an interesting observation at T1 (txt: 472-478): “I don’t mind the houses that look a mess from the outside. I think that is [people’s] right. That is the one thing that they’ve got in the old Arkwright that they’ll not have in the new, you know, that you have the right to do what you want in your own back garden, well, virtually, which can be a bit unsightly but then again, it’s a nice freedom to have. ... In the new village, it will be different. That’s going to be the biggest change. That’s why some of the people don’t want to go across there, because they are not allowed to do what they want to do.” As Les forecast, this ‘freedom’ in old Arkwright was diminished in the new village by the rigid application of Planning and Bye-laws.

9.3.1.4 Relocation perceived as enforced. Some argued that they had chosen to move when they voted in favour of the relocation at the first village meeting. Ben saw it differently. He was convinced that without the existence of the coal deposits BCO would not have rebuilt the village: “If there was no coal here then BCO couldn’t care less if we’ve got methane or not. It’s just fortunate that there are ten seams of coal here that BCO want” (T2: 1553-1555). Ben was resentful of the enforced relocation and became
more upset as time went on, mainly because of his private battles with British Coal. This is how he expressed his feelings at T2 (txt:149-154) when he talked about the relocation: “We had no choice. We wanted to live here for the rest of our lives but we haven’t been given that opportunity. I’ve spent all this money on this house and then I’m told that I’ve got to move. All Coal Board have given us is bricks and mortar and more bills”. Earlier Ben had said about his house in old Arkwright: “this is what we wanted and how we wanted it ... and now they are taking it off us.” ... everybody’s had an upheaval, they’ve been made to do something ... [which] they hadn’t in their mind decided to do. If me and Dora decided [to move], then it’s a decision ... that we make ourselves. But we haven’t made that decision.” He felt still upset at T3: “No, we can’t get away from the truth and the truth is that we’ve been made to move and that we’ve been conned to do a lot of things that we don’t want to do” (txt: 411-412). This quotation reflects his need to make sense of the situation but his interpretation is closely interwoven with negative emotions which serve to decrease self esteem. As described previously, because of the lack of autonomy over the relocation process, participants experienced the process as a threat to their identity, challenging their self esteem and self efficacy.

9.3.2 Autonomy themes during the relocation process. The following examples provide evidence of dissatisfaction at having been excluded from the decision making processes.

9.3.2.1 Relations with project office staff. As already reported in Chapter 8, relationships with the project office staff were often strained, in many cases because the staff were called upon to deal with issues for which they had not been adequately prepared. As Jackie explained at T2: “The people dealing with villagers’ problems aren’t the right people. I had to talk to a Chartered Surveyor about our personal problems and he got all hot under the collar and then he brushes you off” (txt: 34-37). Norma addressed an issue of information flow and spoke for many when she recalled that: “you went to meetings with questions and you could never get an answer [other than], ‘we’ll find out about it’. The minutes were sent about a month later, the night before the next meeting. Now the answers to those questions were never in the minutes, that was delayed again. By the time we got an answer the thing had changed, they had changed the margins” (T2.txt: 256). Jackie agreed at T2 (txt: 33-34): “Generally people don’t get a lot of feedback. Many decisions have been made by the Coal Board without informing anyone.”

Helen and Tony wanted to prepare the subsoil on their plot before the delivery of the top soil but despite several assurances their request was ignored. Shortly before their move, at T3, they had again asked the project office staff to delay delivery of the top soil for their garden to give them the opportunity to remove the broken bricks and general builder’s rubble. “we’d asked them to leave the [top soil] off and we’d sort it out ourselves. It makes it that little bit easier, but no, it didn’t work” (txt: 411-442). Many participants told similar stories. The building project had gained its own momentum and proceeded,
without any real concern being expressed for the future residents. It seemed that no personal wish was considered, creating much frustration and anger. Helen explained (txt: 447-450): “I have to control my [anger] because if I let go then Tony gets upset but I’m disappointed and I’m thinking of all the hard work we’ve got to do now ....”

9.3.2.2 Available options. In the case of Arkwright, it was the NEDDC who decided that the entire community should be moved and the villagers were not involved in any discussion on this point. As Enid said at T1 (txt: 37-38): “What I would like is for them to pay me a decent price to go where I want to go.” Later, Enid continued: “my point is that it isn’t our fault that this has happened and at least BC should have given us a choice. We spent a lot of money on this [house], new windows, new roof, new everything. I would just prefer to go and have my choice of where I want to go. ... We are getting older and it could be four years before we move and it really affects me thinking about it, so I’d rather root up now and go” (txt: 57-70). Many owners felt the same and if there had been adequate compensation for people to move before the village relocation many owners would have left the community. It would still have been an enforced relocation but the control over where, when and how to go would have remained in the hands of the residents. This, however, would have upset the balance and without the individual house owners, New Arkwright may have become an unbalanced community. Thus lack of autonomy for individuals in this case can be seen as a result of concern for the community by the authorities. This might be considered ironic in view of the change from collective to individual concerns found amongst the villagers over the course of the relocation.

Some participants felt overwhelmed by having to make numerous decisions and thought it would have been easier to have been given fewer choices. Others, and these were mostly private owners, would have liked more choice. Vicky, for instance, described her disappointment at T2 (txt: 46-59): “we want [the same central heating boiler] as we have now but we can’t have it. I said to [the BCO representative], ‘people will laugh at us when we say, we can’t actually have the type of heating that we wish’. We’ve got to wait until we move in and then get permission to rip it out. I said to him, people will look at me though I’m daft. ... He said he’d got the same [boiler] in his house and he just had a little grin on his face as so to say, ‘I’ve got one but you can’t have yours’. He did look smug and we can’t have the heating we want.”

People had limited choices for a number of items, i.e. bathroom suite, kitchen units, tiles, fire places, doors, etc. Once a decision was made, however, it could not be changed. Hannah reported at T3 how the project officer would not let her change her mind about the style of fire: “... that really made me angry ... she wouldn’t let us change our minds and it was gorgeous, just what we wanted, and she said we couldn’t change our minds. She was adamant about that. Oh, I could have cried. ‘No way’ [she
said], and they hadn’t even started building the house”. This inflexibility made it clear to the residents that they were not in control.

The original offer was for a house with 3 bedrooms and garage or a bungalow with 2 bedrooms and garage. Later a third option was added, a chalet bungalow with three bedrooms but instead of a garage there would be only a car-port. Initially people could pay for an extra bedroom if they wanted it but at the time of T2 it transpired that some people had been allowed 3 bedrooms and a garage with the bungalow option. The criteria for this decision were never made public but it seemed that if a couple were unable to share a bedroom for health reasons and needed a third bedroom for someone who would look after them, that constituted ‘special needs’. The project office was swamped with demands and the space in the new village was, by then, at a premium, so that eventually even people who were willing to pay to have an extra bedroom added to their bungalow could not do so. This caused immense bitterness. Norma recounted the conversation she had with the architect about the question of a third bedroom and felt that “there should have been an independent survey. The architect said, ‘what is the difference between two or three bedrooms’. I said, the difference is an extra bedroom. He then said, ‘sorry, we are not discussing it’” (T2.txt: 199-201). The impression was gained that only owners, rather than tenants, qualified for those ‘special needs’.

9.3.2.3 Issues of project control. Residents were allowed to state a preferred position for their house but inevitably, for practical reasons, it was not always possible to satisfy their preference. Barbara described her experience at T5 (txt: 187-212): “I had chosen to be next door but one to Hayley’s. That would have been ideal for me, bus wise. It wouldn’t have been that far to walk and you’re nearly over the hill there. I got changed three times, they said they couldn’t get the house in there. ... When it came to the fourth time I said, ‘why me?’ ... I was upset. I had been to every meeting ... I had filled in my forms and sent them back immediately. I did everything that was wanted, yet I was the one that got messed about and I really was messed about. ... They wanted me to change the style of the house but I put my foot down. They then wanted to put us on the other side of the village near the school with the kiddies running up and down and I had been plagued with them over there. In the end they offered us this location.”

At T2, Les felt manipulated: “... BCO keep saying when we have a bit of problem, ‘if you don’t agree, it will hold up the village’. I’ve got fed-up with this now. ‘If you don’t let us have a temporary access it will hold up the village’, ‘if you don’t let us put the playground where we want to put it, it will hold up the village’” (txt: 263-266).

Before the construction of the village commenced, the community architects were dismissed and the villagers perceived this as a cost cutting exercise. Hannah put it this way at T4 (txt: 319-351): “They took the architects out of [the scheme] and with that, they took out the people that were on our side.
And that was it. Once they got rid of them, they were laughing. And then, they gave the contract to build the village to Wimpey’s, they didn’t ask us. I wouldn’t buy a Wimpey house, but I mean, I have got one.” This is how Jackie saw the dismissal of the architects at T2 (txt: 76-83): “The architects managed to balance the mistrust towards BCO a little and actually gained trust, they were seen to be on the side of the people. For them to lose Stage Three of the contract and be removed from the project has horrified a lot of people. The only people they could trust have been taken out of the project. Big Brother has made a decision and there is nothing that we can do. ... There is no one fighting for the owners now. At the meetings there is British Coal, Wimpeys, NEDDC and the Housing Association but no one represents the owners.” Hannah felt at T4 that the quality of the rented properties was superior and asked, “why have the Council and MHT been allowed their standards and yet we haven’t been allowed ours? We all have standards” (txt: 81-82). The Council and Metropolitan Housing Trust properties were built to their specifications but private owners were excluded from regular meetings during the construction period. Most owners felt that their voice was not being heard.

Molly recounted how, when they were given the keys to their property, she found that the kitchen units had been fitted with the wrong work surface. When she complained to the project officer she was told that her choice, antique leather, had been discontinued. Molly was upset: “I said, ‘why wasn’t I asked to pick something else?’ I didn’t want [my work surface chosen by the project officer] and I have seen ‘antique leather’ and I much prefer it. I don’t care whether they said it was dark, if I didn’t like it when I had got it, that were my choice. ... I should have had a second choice if it had been discontinued. You see, that floor doesn’t go with that top now, I had picked the floor to go with the antique leather. I could have been funny and asked them to change it but it would’ve meant taking the tiles off and everything was running late and I said, ‘well, I’ll not quibble’, so I’ll just have to live with that one” (T4.txt: 193-278). Irrespective of the complexities involved in the organisation of a project of this nature, such actions failed to foster feelings of autonomy amongst the residents.

At the commencement of the construction of the village, the building site was fenced off and, for safety reasons, residents were not allowed to enter. Once the first residents had moved in, the site had to be accessible for them and it became easier for other residents to ‘sneak’ across. Some people adhered to the project office staffs’ instructions to stay away from the site but others delighted in visiting their house in the evening, once the construction workers and project office staff had left for that day. There were three official ‘open days’ during the construction period, one during the early stage of construction, one with the shell of a house finished and one showing a house fully furnished, which had been prepared by a Chesterfield department store. People, however, wanted much more connection with their new property and to take photographs of the building process. As already mentioned in the previous chapter, Tom, a carpenter by trade, even managed to have some of the work on his house sub-contracted to himself by a friend who was part of the construction team. He was delighted with being able to do that.
He also recounted how he managed to get around the site at T2: “I’ve been over a couple of times, you know, when I shouldn’t have been across. ... I went on the other day, just went on in. I think it’s because I’ve got a van and if you look half like a builder, you get away with it, just drive on and drive round and come out again. You can see what’s going on, whereas you wouldn’t get away with it in a car” (txt: 39-69). Tom was pleased with his success but there was another aspect concerning the ‘interest groups’ which made him feel angry. By T2 the community architects realised that there was a growing dissatisfaction within the community and initiated interest groups, covering areas like building standards, gardening, the practicalities of the move, etc. Residents could volunteer to join these groups with the idea that they should feel more involved and take responsibility for what was happening. It was perceived positively at first but soon petered out for a number of reasons, the main reason being that the project officer attended all meetings and took the Chair. As Jackie explained at T2 (txt: 124-134): “I think it is sad that the project office team, who are trying, have not got enough trust in people to make it work. ... The interest groups are being controlled and managed by the project office. They are meeting there and are answerable to them and too much again is in their control.” Because of his building expertise Tom had chosen to be involved with the ‘construction group’. The group had done a good deal of work on building standards and it had been agreed that they should monitor the work in progress. When it was time for the first visit the construction group members were not allowed on site or to have any monitoring function: “I am not very happy at all, because all the work we did with this construction group and everything. They’ve not let us follow it up and see whether our decisions have been put into practice ” (txt: 85-87).

Some other participants managed to circumnavigate the imposed rules and regulations. When Alice was asked whether she had been to see her bungalow she replied: “We’ve been on [site] a couple of times. ... I keep sneaking on [site] on a Saturday morning when there are only a few [construction people] working. We don’t go round the site itself, we just go and see our own” (T3.txt: 184-187).

“They promised us keys three times and three times we didn’t get them” (Enid, T4.txt: 577). This became almost a charade. People would go to the Project Office to collect their keys on the day on which their relocation had been scheduled, only to be told that the construction work had been delayed and that they should come back the following day or the day after that. This was reported to be one of the most upsetting periods, giving rise to much anger and frustration. Some people had arranged for carpets to be fitted on a certain date, others had arranged for a son or daughter to take time off work to help with the move, which could not always be rearranged. It undoubtedly was difficult for the project office staff to cope with inevitable construction delays but it was the lack of concern over the residents’ problems and the power struggle over the keys which clearly assigned control to the project office staff.
Residents had to consult the project office staff if they wanted to have rectified any mistakes made by the builders. Although this was understandable on the one hand it also meant that there were many delays with messages not being passed on. Les had problems with his central heating and the wall insulation had been omitted. “It was the problem that I think everybody suffered from, that we weren’t in charge. It doesn’t matter whose fault it is, when you are in charge you can put it right. We were not in charge. If we had been in charge we could have put it right quite easily ... [As it is now], you have to put it to somebody, they put it to somebody else and they put it to somebody else” (T5.txt: 413-420).

The defects with the greatest impact were all connected with water, i.e. through leaking pipes or rainwater entering the house. One participant from the wider sample had to live for weeks with his carpets saturated and two others experienced mould growing on all internal walls. In each example, tracing and rectifying the origin of the damage took several weeks. The failure of the project managers to rectify, as soon as possible, problems as they arose made residents feel they lacked control over their new homes, which the literature on place attachment (e.g. Fuhrer & Kaiser, 1992) would see as inhibiting the attachment process.

9.3.2.5 Participants’ attempts to gain autonomy. Some residents at T2 were keen to try to bring people together by forming an informal residents’ club. Jackie explained the idea: “... he wants to form an informal club and invite people like the Cooperative Society, carpet manufacturers and so on to get a discount. It would be totally voluntary, it would be something we have done for ourselves and I think that’s the biggest prize out of it. We could do it in the Pub because it would need a bigger place. ... People can sit round tables, have a pint, chat informally, do something together and bring back a bit of the spirit of togetherness. ... It will be an achievement as we have done it without the project office, BC or the Council. We are doing it ourselves and we can give one another a pat on the back. Instead of arguing we’ll have one focal point and that is how to get the best for everybody. We are going to get a leaflet printed inviting people to the first meeting, it is just a start. We might be able to discuss other worries and work some of the problems out between us, be supportive towards one another” (T2.txt: 202-217). This, however, did not come about. Even before the first leaflets were printed it became clear to the initiator of this scheme that there would not be enough support for it amongst the residents. It would appear that the community had already begun to change from acting collectively to acting individually.

9.3.3 Autonomy themes in New Arkwright. Autonomy themes are decidedly less salient in New Arkwright than they were during the relocation process. The element of project control had been removed and participants’ autonomy was no longer threatened. Nevertheless, the following themes emerged.
9.3.3.1 Restricted personal freedom in old Arkwright. The greater control over private space and not having the previous physically close interactions made Jackie ponder at T5 about her experience of living in old Arkwright: “... probably in the old village, ... you weren’t allowed to grow your personality ... or individuality, because everybody set out to be the same or you were expected to be the same” (txt: 559-561). Later Jackie continued: “... it’s probably because you’ve got something different you can do something different with it, you are not so set into a uniform” (T5.txt: 714). The three different house styles and differently shaped gardens, it appears, have given people the opportunity to be individuals and this has freed people from being compelled to conform to the previous sameness.

9.3.3.2 Pressure to conform to middle class standards in New Arkwright. Some participants enjoyed a change in lifestyle and talked about having a living room now instead of a front room, as discussed in Chapter 7. Others, however, resented the enforced middle class standards. Norma talked about this at T4 (as detailed in Chapter 7) and Jackie spoke for many people when she said, “I do feel [people] have become a bit snobbish” (T5.txt: 715).

9.3.3.3 Feeling powerless against MHT bringing in ex-prisoners. Many participants felt unease at T5 and reported that a number of ex-prisoners had been moved into the MHT properties. When Phillip was asked whether he thought there was anything the community could do to persuade MHT to be more selective he replied (T5.txt: 255): “Well, we can’t, no way!” People still did not have a sense of collective autonomy and did not consider it within their power to initiate change.

9.3.3.4 Freedom to move away. As discussed earlier, the freedom to leave New Arkwright was now a possibility but only for owners. At T5, only one of the participants to this study had moved but others had contemplated moving. Les explained: “I find it comforting that ... we can sell this house to live on [the proceeds] for the rest of our lives. That is the security and comfort it gives me, that at the end of the day it gives us options” (T5.txt: 322-324).

9.3.4 Summary of autonomy themes. The relocation brought about a change in the focus of autonomy for the Arkwright villagers from the collective level to the individual level. The process of the relocation itself caused residents to feel a general loss of autonomy. During the community architects’ tenure many people felt that their wishes were being accommodated but this changed drastically once the architects had been dismissed. Autonomy and the power to initiate change was then held and used by the developers whose main concern was the successful construction of the new village. At that point people were denied real involvement in the decision making on both the collective and personal level. Some participants gained self autonomy by going against the wishes of the project office staff (e.g. visiting their new property during construction and beginning the process of appropriation or removing fittings from their old house) or refusing to move until at least the important changes had been made to
their new property, which, although it was stressful, returned some control to them. In some cases, however, their success alienated them from others and previously popular members of the community are now finding themselves more isolated than most. The relative dearth of autonomy themes in New Arkwright suggests that autonomy had ceased to be an issue for most participants. Moreover, the greater control over private space prevalent in New Arkwright made some participants aware of the previous lack of autonomy which the physical close interactions and conformity to historical patterns of behaviour had demanded. Some participants felt comfortable with the new middle class standards, others viewed them as an enforced life style. Some residents chose to move away, an option which provided autonomy but was, on the whole, only applicable to owners. It is worth mentioning the concept of autonomy as a ‘negative only’ factor here, i.e. lack of autonomy prevents place attachment but having autonomy does not facilitate place attachment. At T5 participants, generally on an individual level, conceived themselves “to be autonomous (Apter’s emphasis) in the sense of being in charge of [their] own lives ...” (Apter, 1983: 77). To conclude, for many participants, the lack of autonomy during the relocation process prevented ‘anticipatory’ attachment to their new property and caused much anguish and frustration. Soon after the start of the relocation process and especially after the architects’ dismissal, the power of the villagers as a group diminished and the original concept of a collective relocation process, now reduced in importance, was replaced by an individual approach to the project.

9.4 Appropriation
As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.7, theorists like Marx, Vygotsky, Graumann and Robinson emphasise the dynamic qualities of appropriation in person-place transactions, the process which gives meaning to possessions (village, home, objects). For Heidegger (1962) it involves both a ‘caring’ for a place and a ‘taking’ of that place into our being (Relph, 1981). The caring aspect includes responsibility for the place, the taking involves incorporating that place into our identity. Dovey (1985: 48) states that “the dialectic of appropriation embodies the emergence of environmental meaning through interaction. It is the dialectic between personal change and environmental change, the process through which we change our environment and we are in turn changed by environmental experience.”

This analysis of the in-depth interview data confirms this to be an important aspect of place attachment. The responses are grouped under three headings: non-appropriation assisting the process of detachment; inhibitors to appropriative behaviour; and evidence of appropriation in New Arkwright.

9.4.1 Non-appropriation assisting the process of detachment. The inability to make maintenance or improvement decisions which would have resulted in nurturing attachment to their home in old Arkwright effectively aided the process of detachment by the participants but, nevertheless, the five year wait was a lengthy and frustrating process for all.
When Marjorie was asked at T2 whether she was now feeling less attached to her present house, she replied: “yes, in a way, because there is nothing that you can do to it. You can’t improve it anymore, although it needs decorating” (txt: 31). Marjorie clearly linked not being able to work on her home with feeling less attached. Vicky, however, felt differently about the same situation. She was upset because she had not detached herself and still wanted to engage in appropriative ‘doing’. She repeatedly mentioned the plans they had made for their house and the frustration she felt at not being able to carry them out: “I think you’ve always got it at the back of your mind, ‘no point doing this, no point doing that’ and not planning anything, because there is nothing more you can do. I think that is the biggest upset” (T1.txt: 177-178). This clearly demonstrates Milligan’s (1998) point that when place attachment is disrupted, people not only lose the link to their past which had been experienced as meaningful but also the link to their potentially meaningful future. Vicky’s plans for the future (extending their kitchen, adding a conservatory, etc) came to an abrupt halt and she was feeling bereft.

Penny explained at T3: “... I feel very ambivalent towards this house now. I think I have detached myself. I can see my house deteriorating and the village is deteriorating, and I’m ready to go. ... I had a lot of pride in my house but you can’t see it as much now, because you just don’t carry on the ... maintenance that you would normally do. That’s really sad”. (txt: 5-33). In answer to the question, ‘What has been the least satisfactory aspect of moving the village to a new site?’ Penny raised another point: “... basically, watching one’s home deteriorate in front of you. I mean, if you leave normally, you leave the house, don’t you, in a fit state, because you know somebody else is coming into the home and you want to leave an impression that you cared for it” (txt:477-481). Thus Penny clearly described the close link between appropriation and self esteem, i.e. the relationship between place attachment and personal identity and the role which non-appropriation had played in the detachment process.

9.4.2 Barriers to appropriation. There were seven main themes which can be viewed as inhibitors to appropriation of the new place.

9.4.2.1 Refusal to believe that the relocation would happen. Many participants repeated throughout the period of planning: ‘I’ll believe it when I see it’. This was yet another factor which meant that residents were not able to become truly involved in the planning process. This attitude was still evident at T2 after Wimpey had moved onto the new village site, created the infrastructure of roads and services and had commenced work on the foundations of the houses. Three explanations were forthcoming. The first was offered by Charles: “I think it’s the die hards that actually don’t want to move from the present village. ... They are quite happy where they are and they still don’t want to move. ... They are actually deluding themselves” (txt: 116-126).
A participant from the larger sample explained that people were merely protecting themselves against feeling foolish, having believed BC’s promises.

An additional personal rationalisation was given by Les at T1 who explained that he didn’t dare to believe it because of the disappointment he would face if the new village fell through (txt: 656-659): “I’m not that bothered about going to [the architects’ meetings] but that is a defensive mechanism, I must admit. When I was a little boy, my mother and father used to promise us lots of things but, you know, we knew we couldn’t have them. ... No, I can’t envisage [the new village].”

9.4.2.2 Missed appropriation opportunity. Graumann (1976) considers the naming of places as one of the main modes of appropriating space from a psychological perspective. When asked by the project office staff to come up with street names for New Arkwright, Barbara put her heart into it and entered four suggestions, three of which were accepted by the project office staff to be put forward to the Council’s Planning Department: “I went on the phoenix theme (Phoenix was the name of the monthly communication leaflet issued by the project office), the big bird theme, Peregrine Close, Merlin Avenue, Kestrel Drive. ... Well, the council always puts a damper on and now they have come up with Penrose Crescent (used to be Penrose Road), that’s where I am going to live” (T2.txt: 1001-1008). Later during the interview Barbara returned to the naming of the streets: “... a brand new village, brand new houses, admittedly not brand new people, and the Council has to give us the same old names again, Penrose, Rosling, Hardwick ...” (T2.txt: 1043-1047). Barbara felt that her input had been disregarded; she felt that if the Council had used any one of Barbara’s suggestions or even explained to her their reasons for rejecting them, it would have made her feel more involved with the new village. It could be argued that by keeping the old street names, a sense of continuity would have been achieved. This was, however, contrary to what Barbara sought. For her New Arkwright was a new beginning and she was looking for a break with the past.

9.4.2.3 Appropriation during the construction period. The decision to make the site of the new village ‘out of bounds’ during the construction period acted as an inhibitor by preventing residents’ practical and emotional involvement with the development of their new home and village. Barbara at T2 regretted that they had not been allowed to watch their house grow: “... the first view close to that we’ve had was on the first open day when they were about half built. The next time we went they were fully built, just an empty shell and on the next [open day] we’ll be able to see one in its entirety. Well, I would have liked to have seen the in between bits” (txt: 440-445).

In contrast, Hayley did not respect the restriction of access. She was very upset at the thought of having to leave her house. After a turbulent life she had moved to Arkwright and the terraced house became her symbol of safety and peace. As she explained (T2.txt: 49): “[this house] has protected me and it has
given me happiness.” She dreaded having to leave it and it was important for Hayley to start the process of appropriating her future house as soon as possible. As their moving date was to be towards the end of the construction period, it was easier for her to ‘sneak’ across, which she did regularly. She recalled her first visit at T2: “I felt a lot better when I went in. I stood in what’s going to be my doorway and looked out of the back door and looked at [what was going to be] my garden and I claimed it” (txt: 1491-1497). Hayley continued her visits and when seeing the cavity walls being built she had a brilliant idea. She would express the meanings her present home held for her on a piece of paper and hide it in the cavity wall of her new house. “[that way] I’m going to take it all with me and we’ll have a happy home across there” (txt: 1511-1512). Hayley returned to this story at T3 (txt: 80-83). “I wanted it to be our home and with it just being an empty shell, I wanted to give it a foundation of love. ... I wrote it in shorthand and we put it in a plastic wallet and sneaked it in between the bricks and it has now been plastered over.” When Hayley was asked at T5, ‘how do you feel about your home now’, she replied: “I feel it’s home now, not just a holiday home, a home home” (txt: 6). She continued later: “If I had just left my other house and not done any preparation for this [house], I would still feel that pull ... but I tried to bring the spirit of the old house and give it to this house and I think I have, I think it is here (T5.txt: 159-162). Hayley has appropriated her new house by this action. In addition she had created subjective continuity for themselves. Hence there is a clear link between this aspect of place attachment (appropriation) and the principle of continuity of the self.

9.4.2.4 Perceived opportunities for appropriation. A number of participants felt that there was nothing they could do to their new house since everything had been done for them. This was particularly the case at T4 when residents were asked not to make any changes until all outstanding maintenance work had been completed. Jackie, however, still made this point at T5: “with a new house, you’re stuck with it. You can’t do anything to change anything inside” (txt: 56). Milligan (1998: 16) states that it is the “range of experiences that are perceived as possible in a given place [which] will greatly influence the degree of attachment to it.” Jackie felt that the new house did not provide her with opportunities to appropriate it, not seeing opportunities she didn’t engage with her home and hence did not attach.

9.4.2.5 Inability to visualise contours and layout of the new village and conceptualise house designs from architects’ plans. Although people could choose a preferred area for their property, it was not obvious from the plans that New Arkwright would be much more hilly nor, it seems, were people given advice on taking the contours into consideration when deciding on the preferred location for their property. Because of the physical difficulties some participants did not venture out and therefore did not gain the necessary knowledge to become familiar with the new village (the concept of socio-spatial schemata is also relevant here but has already been discussed in Chapter 7). Familiarisation with public areas (Korosec-Serfaty, 1976b; Dozio & Feddersen, 1976) has been shown to lead to appropriation by gaining control and a sense of efficacy. Persons who can give directions to others have made the area
theirs (Moles, 1976). At T5, two years after the relocation, only a minority of people could say that they knew the names of the eight streets in the new village and also could direct an outsider, an indication that participants had not appropriated New Arkwright.

Cullum (1986) believes that “The inhabitability of a space is more a matter of its capacity to be assimilated within the imagination of the individual. ... the space represented has to be recognised to be convincing. ... It is the element of recognition which allows one to mentally reconstruct ... what it would be like to actually inhabit the pictorial space” (p.35). Few researchers have addressed the problem of how well laymen are able to translate shapes and spaces contained in a drawing into a conception of the space and form as it is experienced in reality (Thorne, 1974). As Les explained at T2 (txt: 348-354): “What has been handled so badly is that we have still not been able to see a plan of our house. We have seen a plan of our style of house and despite all the extras we are having built, no one has given us an idea of what it will be like, neither a plan nor how it will look from the outside. All we had is , ‘this is your type of house’. The time they brought it to us it was a mirror image, it was horribly confusing. We are on the left hand side and this was the house on the right. It was impossible. I think that has been handled very badly.” Plans were eventually produced but neither the new village nor individual house styles were ever represented in the form of a three-dimensional model. This would have been enormously helpful for people to understand the contours of the site, the spatial relationships with other houses, the relationship of their property to the school, the Dell and the Lake and walking distances involved within the village. This would have provided the villagers with the necessary overview. Only then would they have been able to appropriate the new site.

9.4.2.6 Inability to conceptualise where others lived. A further sign of non-appropriation is the fact that many people did not know where their previous neighbours and friends now lived. Norma explains this so well at T4: “we didn’t take any Christmas cards round ... because we didn’t know where everybody lives. ... It’s going to take time to know where everybody lives and then we might get back to some normality. ... I think more Christmas cards passed hands in the Welfare Club than through letter boxes”(txt: 750-764). As already reported in Chapter 8, it was important to people to know where others lived and, as Charles reported, this had been the case in old Arkwright. This ‘not knowing’ prevented participants from feeling part of the new village and made New Arkwright for them so different from the old village.

Proshansky (1976) points to a distinction between intended and unintended appropriation of a place. Intended appropriation occurs when a person sets out to master an environment, whereas unintended appropriation can occur simply through familiarity with the environment. In New Arkwright, at T5, there was little evidence amongst respondents that they had taken a conscious decision to master the new environment, nor did there appear to be much unintended appropriation apart from routes to the bus
stops for some. The only public places in the village at that time were the Miners’ Welfare Club, the Arkwright Centre and the School. Charles lived quite close to the Club and the Centre and he had no connection to the school so that he had no incentive to explore further. He had, therefore, no personal need to become familiar with the remaining village and hence did not appropriate it.

9.4.2.7 Efficiency of new kitchen equipment. One of the Liaison Committee’s achievements was to obtain agreement that kitchens would be fitted with white goods (i.e. cooker, refrigerator, washing machine). With hindsight, a number of participants regretted having given away or sold their own equipment as the supplied goods were, at times, thought to be inferior in quality. Hannah found it difficult to use the grill on her new cooker and had problems cleaning it: “they’ve bought the cheapest again. It went brown first time I used it and I can’t get it off” (T4:txt: 1305-1337). Norma explained at T4: “I’m not used to that cooker yet ... it’s not as good as my oven, ... it takes longer to bake things” (txt: 2247-2255). The dissatisfaction also applied to other items. Molly replaced the kitchen sink: “It was rubbish! ... Too small. As Toby said, they were caravan sinks, really, he changed his” (T5: 524-529). In Marxist terms, it is not possible to appropriate an object without the skill or aptitude to operate it. It is suggested here that the unreliability of the new equipment and the lack of training in its use inhibited appropriation of the new home for some. Although the explicit link between participants’ expressions of frustration and the extent to which participants felt that they had not appropriated their new property is not made in the interviews by the participants. It is, however, suggested that the frequent co-occurrences of statements about being able to function and lack of appropriation strongly suggest that feeling able to function within the new environment is a necessary condition for appropriation (Winkel, 1981; Graumann, 1988).

9.4.2.8 Relinquishing previously appropriated objects. The majority of people felt the need to have everything new for their new home. Subsequently, however, they tended to miss items such as easy chairs which ‘fitted like a glove’ from years of use or ornaments which held sentimental value. As Hayley explained at T4: “I miss my three-piece suite. I was so comfy on that. I’m only comfy on this (new leather couch) when I’m sort of half sprawled because my feet won’t reach the floor if I just sit. I feel like a midget sat there, perched up, so I can’t really sit on it” (txt: 394-397). The change from the old to the new couch also served to highlight the end of an era. Describing the loss of the old couch in terms of difference from the new entailed the loss of past experiences (Milligan, 1998).

One of the participants in the wider sample explained how she still had, in boxes in the garage, a number of old ornaments which her children had given her over the years. She could not part with them because of their sentimental value but equally she felt they did not fit in the new house as ‘they looked out of place’. She explained that a new house needed to have new things in it because the old things which fitted well in the old house, would look drab and dingy. Belk (1991a) researched people’s attachments
to gifts and found that such objects generally represent an attachment to the giver. The gift, therefore, becomes a mnemonic device. By relinquishing objects which hold meaning about the relationship with the giver, participants also relinquished a sense of stability (McCracken, 1988) and a sense of the past (Belk, 1988a).

The question why residents wanted everything new in their new home is an interesting one. Milligan (1992), however, cites Wood & Beck (1994) and Nippert-Eng (1996) who observed that objects may have different meanings in different locations, i.e. objects may be used to emphasise boundaries between sites. This may be one explanation for participants wanting everything new, in order to celebrate this new era in their lives.

9.4.3 Evidence of appropriation in New Arkwright. Evidence of villagers’ appropriation of their home and village in New Arkwright has been divided into two themes.

9.4.3.1 Appropriation of home, including garden. As discussed in Chapter 2, Graumann believes that “appropriation is more than acquisition, it is maintenance which, as a rule, means work, mostly of the physical kind” (1988, p. 62). Sadie, at six months post-move, had already redecorated her bedroom walls to her own design and had appropriated her garden through her own efforts. The topsoil which had been supplied was generally of poor quality and presented a challenge. Korosec-Serfaty (1976: 47) saw appropriation of space as “a dynamism aimed at exercising mastery over a space. It represents an effort at making the latter congruent with the individual”. Sadie demonstrated this as she explained at T4 (txt: 1114-1138): “I don’t like a perfect garden, ... I like a random setting, you know, you’ve got a shrub here and a shrub there and [climbers] up the fence. ... That’s what I have done on the side of the garage, I’ve got the firethorn and everything down there. .. I love those. Well, all [the plants] are from my father’s garden.” Sadie does not express a direct link between her garden and her identity but her comment, ‘all the plants are from my father’s garden’ can be perceived as evidence of the identity principle continuity, as discussed in the previous chapter and, therefore, the link to identity can be made.
Christine, who had found it very difficult to detach herself from her previous home, had nevertheless begun to settle in at T4. One reason was the convenience of her new house and she had also begun to appropriate it: “I had the boiler moved out of the kitchen into the garage [and] I’ve extended the patio. ... I do get out in the garden more, which I quite enjoy. ... I’m sure it’s good to be outside and do something to sort of be able to say, ‘Oh gosh, I’ve made that grow’” (txt: 1131-1132). But it is not only the joy of seeing something grow. In Graumann’s (1976) terms Christine, by ‘doing’, had taken possession of her home and had began the process of personalisation, which will serve to communicate aspects of her identity to herself and to others (Fuhrer & Kaiser, 1992). These interpersonal processes occur in addition to the intrapersonal process, which is giving meaning to the ‘doing’ and thus creating an emotional bond to place.

At T4 Les explained with pride how his wife had appropriated their garden. “... the work she did in the garden! I mean she [collected] all those turves that were being thrown into the skips but ... it worked” (txt: 173-174).

Graumann (1976, p. 120) argues that “each appropriation of something dialectically implies self realization and – development. Having space available, e.g. as private ... property without utilizing it (in
the broadest sense of theoretical, aesthetic, practical activities) is not appropriating it.” This can be clearly seen from Marjorie’s statement at T5, which was more fully reported in the previous chapter under self esteem: “we were lucky because we had some of it given to us but we also worked hard and made the most of it ourselves” (txt: 18). Within 2 years of moving into their new house Marjorie and Jonathan had redecorated every room most intricately and had created a garden. When she was asked at the beginning of the T5 interview, ‘How do you feel about your home now?’, Marjorie replied: “Oh, I’m happy now. ... We are fine, I love it” (txt: 5).

Alice at T4 also verbalised the importance of appropriating their home. Since their hall had little natural light Alice and Morris had replaced their wooden living room door with a glass door to avoid the need for electric light during daylight hours. This functional aspect, however, was only part of the reason for change. Alice felt pleased with the result and explained: “I said to Morris, I want something different, so that’s what we’ve done. To make it more different, not to be different from anybody else but to make it more how we want it, not how Wimpey wanted it” (txt: 1121-1126), a clear example of appropriation, simultaneously guiding identity processes and evaluation of the identity content through the principles of distinctiveness, self esteem and self efficacy.

When Barbara was asked at T5, ‘Does your house feel like your home now?’ she replied: “Yes, oh yes, I made it mine.” When she was asked to describe how she made it feel hers, she answered: “Putting all my knickknacks around, all the photographs, all those personal things, personal touches” (txt: 144-151).

Vicky and Stan had a patio at their old house which Stan had built. This patio had been important to them because they could sit out and enjoy the view across the park. At T4 the new patio was in place: “... we did bring the paving stones from the old house, so that saved us a bit of money” (txt: 76-81). Not only had they begun to appropriate their new garden, they had also created a subjective continuity with their former place.

Enid at T4 explained that they had brought their white PVC and glass front door from their former house: “we are going to have the doors put on, we brought the doors with us, so we are going to have them put on in the Spring. Yeah, I can’t get used to looking at that door, it’s like a dungeon to me because it is all closed in bar that little window. I’m so used to having light, that’s why I want that glass door on here” (txt: 696-707).

9.4.3.2 Appropriation of Council owned land. Several small pockets of land throughout the village had been designated ‘Council property’. Initially they were planted with small shrubs but after that received no further care and soon looked neglected. Some owners, whose property adjoined these areas, replanted them and continued to look after them as in the illustration below.
9.4.3.3 Appropriation through problem solving. The ground was heavy clay and had also been compacted with mudstone to provide a secure base for the foundations of the new village. As New Arkwright was constructed in a depression, rainwater drained into the site from the surrounding area and many of the gardens, especially those on the periphery, became flooded. Eventually Wimpey installed additional drainage in the worst affected areas but not before many newly planted gardens had been spoiled. Molly and Neville decided to alleviate the problem themselves: “we put some drains in outside, to get rid of the water that runs off the back. ... we don’t get flooded now. We had up to four inches of water standing outside [the back door]. We used an old pipe he had picked up somewhere and drilled in holes and filled it with stones and dug it in. It seems to be keeping [the water level] down” (T5: 537-546).

Molly and Neville’s initiative echoes Proshansky’s (1976) concept of appropriation, of ‘conquering’, ‘overcoming’ or ‘dominating’ a difficult physical setting. They succeeded in their task of ‘overcoming’
the problem of flooding. This process enabled them to create a workable garden which would be incorporated into their identity (salience of efficacy), giving meaning on the cognitive, affective and behavioural level. The relationship between these meaningful events and place demonstrates the importance of appropriation as an aspect of place attachment.

9.4.4 Summary of appropriation themes. Appropriation was defined as making something part of yourself through the process of ‘doing’. The dynamic qualities of the process of appropriation imbue places with meaning and it is these accumulated meaningful experiences which result in the emotional bond with the place (home or village), i.e. place attachment.

It is further suggested that the inability to carry out maintenance and other creative work on their properties in old Arkwright, work which would have resulted in a maintenance of their attachment to their home, effectively aided the process of detachment from their previous homes.

Graumann (1976) states that “the appropriative character of human activity is reflected in all modes of activity, in perception, orientation and acting” (p. 119). Hence, the process of detachment from the old home/village and attachment to a socio-spatially different environment involves relinquishing previous appropriations and beginning the process of appropriating the new home and the new village.

Analysis of the data disclosed seven main themes which can be viewed as inhibitors to appropriation of the new place. These included participants’ own refusal to engage in the planning process; the decision to make the site of the new village ‘out of bounds’ during the construction period which limited residents’ practical and emotional involvement with the development of their new home and village; participants’ inability to see the range of opportunities for appropriation presented in the new home or village; their inability to visualise contours and layout of the new village and interiors and elevations of houses from architects’ plans; their inability to master new equipment; and, the break with continuity through the replacement of loved possessions with new items perceived as more suitable for a new home.

There is general reference to identity in the appropriation literature but it does not explicitly make the link between appropriation and the principles of identity. The examples given describe appropriation behaviour but in each case, through appropriation, these examples also provided subjective continuity of participants’ previous lifestyle. Thus appropriation is clearly linked with identity through the identity principles. Although continuity is the most apparent principle in these examples, there is also evidence of self esteem, distinctiveness and efficacy.
Evidence of appropriation of the new home was found to centre around personalising the new place and successful problem solving. Graumann (1976; 1988) states that by ‘doing’ one takes possession of one’s home and engages in the process of personalisation, which will serve to communicate aspects of identity to oneself and to others (Fuhrer & Kaiser, 1992). These interpersonal processes occur in addition to the intrapersonal process, giving meaning to the ‘doing’ and thus creating an emotional bond to place.

9.5 Stimulation

At an individual level, the changed environment may animate and/or motivate a person to reach for challenging goals. In this study, however, it is the need for stimulation at the social level which has been more apparent. In old Arkwright stimulation was provided by visual and verbal access to others and through real or vicarious community activity, little of which exists in the new village.

The socio-spatial changes, as described in Chapter 7, much reduced the occurrence of external stimulation. Chapter 4 described how the old village had a communal grassed area between the backs of the terraces for 70 years. The back access to the houses consisted of a tarred path either side of the grassed strip and remained a right of way even after the communal grass strip was divided into individual gardens. People passing so close to the terraces created a number of impacts, as already discussed in Chapters 7 and 8, which facilitated passive interaction and vicarious living. Indigenous Arkwrightians had developed mechanisms to enable them to cope with this amount of external stimulation and many, especially those housebound and village-bound participants, felt a keen sense of aloneness in New Arkwright.

The lack of stimulation in New Arkwright can be described in terms of both a physical and psychological context.

9.5.1 Less stimulation due to physical changes

9.5.1.1 The changed street layout. Penny commented on the lack of movement in New Arkwright at T5: “It’s like a ghost town. I didn’t appreciate this until I moved in, it just doesn’t work! I think in the old village, there were shops at the top of the street and everybody could more or less see them, or they had to pass each other to get to the shops, so there was a lot of movement in the old village. There isn’t now. There is no movement, there is no flow. ... there isn’t an area where everybody has to cross to get from A to B. The Centre was supposed to be in the centre but it isn’t, it doesn’t work” (txt: 60-82).

Ben anticipated at T2 that the shops in New Arkwright would be out of reach for many people: “A lot of old people come to the shop not because they want something but because they want to talk to [somebody]. Across there, the shops are going to be a long way from where they live and they’re not
going to come to the shop, are they. So that’s one outing they’re not going to have” (txt: 1772-1775).

At T3 Ben, who had not yet moved out of old Arkwright, described his view of the lifestyle change in New Arkwright: “... I don’t think that we’ll communicate with people like we used to do. At the moment, you can walk past people’s doors and know they’re there, people that you’ve known. In the [new village], at the end of the day ... you’ll come home, put your car in your drive and go in the house and that’ll be it” (txt: 1256-1262).

Hannah, when asked at T4, ‘What do you miss most?’, replied: “being able to talk to people at the back. ... [now] you have to go [to friends’ houses] and then they’re not in” (txt: 1528-1536). At T5 Hannah still missed seeing people: “I miss the straight streets. I miss being able to look down the street. ... I live in the back of the house, so I don’t see anybody. Maybe if I were living in the front it would be better but you don’t get people coming down here, you don’t get people walking past in any case. ... Now you can’t get to know people just through seeing them go up and down every day, which is the way it happened before. ... it was the way I got to know people before apart from the people living next door. It’s a shame” (txt:85-92). Thus Hannah supports Festinger, et al.’s (1950) findings that brief passive contacts, if they are frequent enough, develop from a nodding acquaintance to a speaking relationship and, given the right psychological conditions, into friendship and that passive contacts are determined by the physical structure of the spatial environment. As already discussed in Chapter 7, and as Hannah pointed out, the spatial structure of old Arkwright was ideal for facilitating passive contact, whereas this is not the case in New Arkwright.

At T5 Penny commented on another structural change. She expressed concern for the elderly: “I must admit, if I were on my own and an older person, I would find it very isolating. The older people at least could see out of their window [in old Arkwright]; you can’t see out of these when you are sitting down, they are just far too high” (txt: 274-278).

9.5.1.2 Lack of communal facilities. When Penny was asked at T4, ‘What, for you, is the least satisfactory aspect of New Arkwright’, she replied: “... it’s the lack of facilities. There is nowhere to meet easily, other than drinking establishments [but] if you don’t particularly want to drink, or want another type of environment, then it’s not there” (txt:70-75). Later in the same interview Penny addressed the difficulty of functioning in New Arkwright: “... the main bone of contention is not having the shops, a post office and the bus route, the bus route is still not in operation. ... and I think also there aren’t as many things to watch, whereas in [old Arkwright] there was always somebody going up the street or down the street. There isn’t now. ... Well, there is nowhere to walk to, is there. ... It’s a bit sad, really” (txt:1027-1042).
Hannah also talked about the lack of casual encounter places at T4: “The Pond is disappointing, the Dell is disappointing. These were all supposed to be features where you could sit and have a picnic. Now there is nowhere to sit round the Pond and nowhere to sit along the Dell, what’s the point?” (txt: 192-208).

Illustration 9.3: The sociofugal bench

There is one bench in New Arkwright. It is situated between the Arkwright Centre and the shop but it is round, encircling a tree. Holahan (1982, p.301) cites Evans (1979b) who states that “we should use our appreciation of the social function of physical space to help us to design settings that facilitate rather than impede the natural patterns of social interaction between people.” A round (convex) bench “orient[s] people in space so that eye contact is difficult” (Evans & Mitchell McCoy, 1998), which is known as a sociofugal (discouraging) arrangement (Gifford, 1997). Thus the only bench in New Arkwright effectively impedes social interaction.

At the first meeting which announced the proposed village relocation, residents were promised the same and additional facilities for the new village. One of the additional facilities was to be a community lounge, originally termed the reading room, where daily papers would be available and people could drop in for a cup of coffee or tea and chat with others. After the community architects’ dismissal it was decided by the NEDDC that this facility should only be available to council tenants and MHT’s
sheltered housing residents for three mornings a week. The remaining time it was to be unused. The original concept would have provided a much needed ‘encounter’ facility to bring people of all ages together. Vicky felt it was a wrong decision: “It’s discrimination against [others], I think it’s totally out of order. We are paying Council Tax, so why can’t we use it! It’s disgraceful” (T3.txt: 1092-1158).

When Alice was asked at T4 how well she thought the new village was functioning, she talked about the community lounge: “We can’t use it because we are not [in sheltered accommodation]. ... We’re pensioners but we can’t use it. We can go if we are signed in as visitors but somebody has to sign us in. Well, we didn’t want to do that, it’s ridiculous. ... That’s a disappointment because we were really looking forward to being able to pop round some morning when you’ve got a couple of hours to spare. It breaks the monotony, doesn’t it, especially in the winter. But no, we can’t use it” (txt: 79-166).

Norma explained at T4 that there were fewer activities, mainly because the cost of renting a room for the activity had become unaffordable: “We don’t run some of the classes anymore, like the whist drive, that’s gone. I used to do cake icing and slim and trim, that’s gone. We used to have history group every Monday and now we have it once a month” (txt: 1489-1510). In a small and self-contained place like Arkwright, it is necessary to provide interaction places to facilitate social cohesion (in terms of interpersonal attraction). Not having these places means not having shared experiences; not having shared experiences deprives villagers of developing meaningful experiences; and not having meaningful experiences translates into non-attachment to the place (Milligan, 1992).

Marjorie made another point. She felt that the classes provided at the Arkwright Centre were too expensive for people to join: “It was like a Rosemary Conelly one (keep fit class) and it was like £10 to join, £10! and then £3 every week and that’s not the sort of thing people in this village like. ... I mean £3 is quite a lot of money a week, isn’t it” (T4.txt: 1161-1194).

Illustration 9.4: The Arkwright Centre
Helen reported at T5 that few people were frequenting the Club now: “They are struggling in the ... Club now, you know, it’s really struggling at the moment. ... the [Arkwright Centre] is there, but it seems that it is mostly outsiders that use it. Also we’ve got to go to Chesterfield to play badminton, yet there is ample room in the Centre but the Parish Council didn’t want lines on the floor because it would detract from other functions they are holding. I think it’s ridiculous. ... it’s a massive room, it would be brilliant, they could probably get five or six courts in” (txt: 59-76). Helen felt positive about the line dancing which had recently started and the playground for very young children but “the older ones are just hanging about and loitering. They can’t get on a bus into Chesterfield because it costs money, so they are just hanging about the village. ... I think that’s the problem, there is nothing here for the youngsters and it’s too remote for the old people to get together. There is the community lounge, which they can’t all use” (txt: 96-113).

9.5.2 Psychological effects of diminished stimulation

9.5.2.1 Sense of isolation. When Charles was asked at T5, ‘How does the sense of community differ from old Arkwright?’, he replied: “... people aren’t mixing the same as they used to do, particularly the older people that I’ve spoken to. They feel isolated and perhaps, I think, they feel isolated because each property has got a front and back garden, which is basically making them feel isolated, whereas in the old village, people were walking right by the doors. It’s very quiet for them now” (txt: 205-211).

Even if people are not participating in a conversation, hearing others helps them to feel part of that conversation, albeit only as a listener. By overhearing a conversation, their mind is focused on matters outside themselves, providing stimulation. In addition, just hearing passing foot steps can tell a story,
for example, ‘that’s Amy, she is back from Chesterfield’. It is just such a vicarious involvement which connected people to others and it is this stimulating connectedness which is now missed.

Christine, when asked at T4, ‘What do you miss most about old Arkwright’, replied: “I miss my old neighbours and I miss people going past my door. I can sit here and see people go past but not past my door. That makes it a bit more private, I suppose and that’s, you can’t have it all. But when you’ve lived in the village all your life you do miss the closeness” (txt: 2052-2069). Christine still felt the same at T5. In answer to the question, ‘What is the least satisfactory aspect of New Arkwright?’, she replied: “Not seeing enough people. Hmmm” (txt: 121). Earlier Christine had said: “I like to see people and you don’t see them” (txt: 44).

As already discussed in Chapter 7, Lee’s model of socio-spatial schemata is of importance here as it is able to explain part of the isolation felt by Norma and others. In addition Vicky felt isolated because the previous comradeship appeared lost. When Vicky was asked at T4 about the sense of community in New Arkwright, she replied: “there isn’t one now. Even when I go into the Club on a Friday, I mean everybody used to joke and laugh … but now, folks’ll say hello but it’s just a matter of respect, saying ‘hello’, you never have a conversation with [any]one. You see, in the old Club, they used to shout across. If somebody was sat over there, they’d have a conversation with you shouting from there but now, you can be sat where you are and they’ll just say hello, you know. I don’t know why” (txt: 1002-1029). Bill agrees: “The atmosphere in the Club in the old village, I miss that most” (T5.txt: 559-560).

Molly also talked in terms of atmosphere at T5: “To me there is no atmosphere at all here. … You don’t see anybody really and now that the bus stop has moved to up there people don’t walk past here anymore. It’s very rare we see anybody, very rare. … In [old Arkwright], when you walked to your door step you knew you’re going to see somebody” (txt: 112-135).

9.5.2.2 Lack of sense of belonging. Not being able to use the community lounge alienated a number of participants and only one person was happy to be ‘signed in’ by a friend who was entitled to use the lounge. Helen also missed some of the previous facilities. At T5 she expressed dissatisfaction with New Arkwright and when asked ‘why’ she replied: “Because there isn’t the comradeship that used to be in the old village” (txt: 58).

When asked at T5, ‘What do you miss most about old Arkwright?’, Ben replied: “It was nice to walk to the pub, that’s the only thing I miss, you know, to go out and have a drink with your old mates like you used to” (txt: 3054-3058). The Public House had not been replaced, since it had been decided that it would not be financially viable, but most people who used to frequent it did not feel that the bar in the
Arkwright Centre was a suitable substitute, resulting in the loss of another previous place for casual encounters.

9.5.2.3 The need for an ‘other-focus’. Penny talked about how life had changed in New Arkwright and felt that, with hindsight, she had chosen a dull location: “there is nothing to look at at all where we are” (T4.txt: 187). This need for an ‘other-focus’ is referred to by Evans & Mitchell McCoy (1998), who state that whilst “focused or voluntary attention can create mental fatigue ..., involuntary attention or fascination facilitates recovery from mental fatigue” (p. 91). Hartig & Evans (1993) and Kaplan & Kaplan (1989) found evidence that direct contact with nature as well as being able to view a natural scene provide restoration. This may, in part, explain why participants at T4 often commented on how they missed seeing birds in the new village. Old Arkwright had adjoined farm and parkland and a variety of birds was a common sight. As there was hardly any tree cover and little natural food, birds had not yet populated New Arkwright at T4. As Vicky pondered: “We’ve not seen our robin. He used to come and see us regularly. I saw a couple of magpies the other day but whether it’s them that used to come to us, I don’t know. ... I used to think that they are coming to see me, you know, especially that little robin. He used to sit on the wall, at the bottom or on the washing line” (T4.txt: 135-176).

Not all but many of the houses in old Arkwright had enjoyed an extensive view across the surrounding countryside. Vicky and Stan had a wonderful panorama from Sutton Church across to Bolsover Castle which was floodlit at night, a scenery ever changing throughout the seasons, witnessing the many moods created by the weather, at different times of day or night. In addition, being able to survey a large area makes one feel part of that expanse, whilst providing a sense of being on a higher level. This encouraged a concentration on an outside existence. Since New Arkwright nestles in a depression most people’s view became restricted with the concomitant loss of being part of a wider scene. When Vicky was asked, ‘What do you miss most about old Arkwright?’, she thought for a while and then said: “talking, the view, and birds (T4.txt.2678). All three are stimulations external to the self. As Enid observed at T4, in old Arkwright, one would always have something to focus on outside: “… even if they were only bobbing about, pegging washing out, or whatever, … it was something going off, weren’t it, some movement.” Enid went on: “you know what Jeff said to me the other day? he said, ‘you’re only happy when you’re out.’ And it’s true. When I’m out talking to somebody else” (txt: 153-167). Enid returned to the same subject at T5: “…you know, … I can stand here or have a walk to the end and sit on that wall and I don’t see a soul, not a soul, not even a soul to pass the time of day with” (T4.txt: 609-610).

9.5.3 Summary of stimulation themes. Whereas in old Arkwright there had been much external stimulation, the geographically enclosed position, the spatial structure of the new village and the lack of communal facilities contributed to a reduction in contact with other residents.
Some facilities like the community lounge were not fully used, yet they could have provided a much needed venue for all. By restricting access, the council effectively split the community instead of working towards achieving cohesion. In addition, the cost of hiring rooms at the school had increased to a level which was no longer affordable, whereas the old School facilities had been available for any community activity at an affordable cost. The Arkwright Centre was created as a centre for the Parish. It needed to attract high paying functions, e.g. weddings, etc. to avoid becoming a burden on tax payers. For this reason it was mostly used by outsiders and could not be used as a sports hall, although this would have answered a need for the active members of the community.

The shop and sub-post office opened shortly before the completion of the T5 data collection. At that time also the football pitch had been made ready for use and the Arkwright football team became a focal point for some. The bowling green facility, which would also provide casual encounters, is still not useable, five years after the relocation. Neither the Dell nor the Lake had fulfilled their intended role as places which would provide residents with social and environmental stimulation.

It is suggested that the lack of detailed knowledge of the complex road system resulted in fears of being lost and that this contributed to people staying in their new houses, thereby reducing not only their own stimulation but adding to the ‘ghost town’ effect for others.

It is proposed that for people with a high salience in social identity, not having the passive interactions with others and being deprived of feeling part of the group because of the group’s invisibility, had resulted in feelings of isolation. This not only applied to the older indigenous Arkwrightians but, surprisingly perhaps, also to a young person who had lived in the village for as little as four years prior to the relocation announcement. It is further proposed that participants whose social identity had been highly salient, e.g. Penny, Helen, Norma, Enid, Jackie, Molly and Hannah, found a lack of stimulation in New Arkwright since the village no longer functioned at the collective level for these participants. This lack of stimulation inhibited the development of attachment to the village. By T5, as Section 10.4 demonstrated, most participants had forged an emotional bond with their home through ‘doing’ but this did not apply to the village. Milligan’s (1998) work is important here. She viewed the physical site as the stage for social interaction and these interactions are both physically and socially constructed. The phenomenon of place attachment occurs when a site has been the stage for meaningful interaction. Milligan states that “the degree of meaningfulness of these experiences translates into the degree of attachment to the site itself, i.e., the more meaningful the interactions that occur there (or are otherwise perceived as linked to it), the greater the place attachment to the site” (1998: 2). The types and frequencies of interactions which people had in the old village tend not to occur in the new village for
several reasons (e.g. a far more complex road system, too few casual encounter places, much of the
‘stage’ designated as private) and even by T5 the potential for interactions had not yet been realised.

9.6 Place congruence
As discussed in Chapter 2, in certain environments people may feel less or more themselves, thus place
congruence is defined as the psychological state of believing that the place reflects the person’s identity.
Place congruence occurs at an individual level (person and home) and also in the context of the larger
environment (feeling at one with the community, the spatial design of the village and its lifestyle).
Congruence is being part of a place (home or village) and feeling comfortable within it. Norma
expresses this well: “I am settled in a way now. ... The village has gone now and this is our home but it
feels strange when I come through this door, it just doesn’t feel real if you like” (T5.txt: 103-106).
Quotations have been listed under the headings of place congruence in old Arkwright and place
congruence in New Arkwright.

9.6.1 Place congruence in old Arkwright. As discussed in the previous chapter, the desire to preserve
continuity is a powerful motivator of action (Breakwell, 1986). Twigger-Ross & Uzzell (1996)
distinguish between place referent and place-congruent continuity and it is the latter which is of interest
here, defined as the fit between the environment and the residents’ desires and values.

9.6.1.1 Feeling at home in old Arkwright. Ben did not explicitly state that he felt congruent with old
Arkwright but he recounted many wonderful tales, with Arkwright being part of his family history. His
grandparents had lived in Arkwright “ ... for years and years” (txt: 130) and he was born and had lived in
Arkwright all his life. At T2 Ben expressed warm sentiments towards their current house and anticipated
difficulty in forming place attachment to the new house: “ [this house] has been good for us. ... It’s
been good for our marriage. I come home and I’m comfortable, it’s home” (txt: 1379-1383). Later
again, Ben said: “all right, the other one, in years to come, might be the same but, at the moment, this is
home, it’s comfortable and it’ll hurt to leave it” (txt:1743-1746).

At T3 Ben talked about feeling comfortable with his present house: “I think you can only get one home,
like I come in that door, and I think ‘I’m home’. I take my shoes off and I come and sit here, Dora puts
the kettle on and I put my feet up and I’m comfy” (txt: 642-645). Ben verbalised how their work on
their old house had made it feel theirs. He linked it, albeit implicitly, with the quality of their marriage,
i.e. their work on their house was a symbol of their marriage (and yet this symbol was going to be
demolished): “ I think the reason I like this house is because me and Dora built it for us. We’ve got a
good marriage, ... a marriage that works but you have to work at it and it’s hard work sometimes. When
we moved in here – it was nothing, of course. We worked hard .... We both put our ideas together ... and
that’s how we did it, between us, like. We sat, we discussed, we went over [it] for months and
months and of course, you buy little bits and then you work and [you say] ‘oh, what about this and what about that’, like. We talked about altering this house for a long time before we had the money to do it” (txt: 660-694). By altering their house in old Arkwright to be congruent with themselves, they achieved what Giuliani (1991) terms ‘congruency of identity’. This, Giuliani explains, “means recognising oneself in the object, ... to lose the object is a little like losing oneself” (p.140). At four weeks before their relocation, the threat of losing themselves was a threat for Dora and Ben.

Congruency with place had also been lost for Norma. Between T4 and T5, after the demolition of old Arkwright, Norma stated: “I can look outside and it doesn’t mean anything to me, it isn’t my village. This should not have been called Arkwright. It is not Arkwright and it never will be. We have a lovely house and garden here but we don’t feel that we belong. We can’t explain it. It is as if we have been plunged in the middle of nowhere.”

At T2 she explained that she had strong feelings for her current home because of memories of her dead husband: “I don’t want to go. All my memories are here because this was our first and only house together. We made all the decisions together. It will be very stressful to leave it behind” (txt: 66-67). At T3 Christine had still not detached herself from her home: “... hardly a day goes by now when I don’t think, ‘next year, I won’t be here and I won’t be doing this next year’. When you see the flowers, like the daffodils, I think, it’s the last time I am seeing them, you do, don’t you. ... I don’t want to leave all these bulbs. When they have died down, I’ll dig them up ...” (txt: 45-48). At T4 Christine reported that she had found the move difficult: “In the beginning I was really weepy and had a lot of bad heads. Nasty tempered, I was, no patience, I should say ... but I’m calming down now” (txt: 1411-1423). Christine was still grieving for her husband. Their previous home had reflected both their identities: “you think, oh, you’ve worked all your life for this house, which we have done, to get a nice little home, and then I was leaving it” (txt: 1697-1705). Milligan (1998: 10) states that “even if the same people and the same possessions are transported to a new house, the interactions that occur in the new house are not the same because they are no longer spatially linked to the previous interactional past.” As Christine said, “I always used to be able to imagine him coming in our old house. I can’t imagine him coming into this new house ...” (txt: 2185-2193). It was their previous home which organised their past experiences and transmitted aspects of their shared past. The image of him coming to their previous home was not transferable as it was spatially linked to their old home. Christine explained: “I felt terrible. I felt so empty and lost in here, I thought, I shall never settle here. This is not my home” (txt: 1656-1664).

Fuhrer & Kaiser’s (1992) interpersonal processes require that for place attachment to occur there should be perceived congruence between the person’s self and the place so that it reflects what is of importance
to the person. A person who does not feel congruent with the new environment is less likely to feel attachment to it.

9.6.2 Place congruence in New Arkwright. One of the difficulties experienced by a number of participants was that although they could choose a house style and interior details, they could not get a feel for how it would fit together and whether the many parts would eventually create an environment which was congruent with them. Jenny expressed this difficulty of not knowing what their new place would be like: “We are a bit wary that they might say, ‘oh, this is your bungalow’, and we might not like it” (txt: 112-113). This anxiety was mostly unfounded and only very few people did not feel immediately congruent with their house or bungalow or could not make changes in order to make it congruent with themselves.

9.6.2.1 Feeling at home in New Arkwright. To return to Dora and Ben, although they were anxious before the move, they felt that their new home was right for them almost immediately. At T4 Dora said: “We like it” and Ben responded: “Yes, now we’ve settled down, it’s made it homely, like. ... Dora put a lot of touches to it” (txt: 122-126). We are into gardening and one thing and another, which we like. ... I wish I could pack up work now that we are over here because it’s nice”(txt: 1173-1189). Later in the same interview Ben stated: “We love it here. I know we’ve moaned and groaned like most people have, but I wouldn’t like to go back, although our [old] house was nice, ... this is a lot better. ... we had a nice place, don’t get me wrong ... but this is a lot better” (txt: 2853-2860).

At T5 they both felt very positive towards their new home: “We love it now.” When asked, ‘Would you prefer to be still living in old Arkwright?’, Ben replied: “No, because I love it here. We’re just about right. We’ve been very fortunate, it’s just what we wanted” (txt: 451). They had appropriated every room and especially the garden. The situation for Ben and Dora, however, was not completely positive. When Ben was asked, ‘Do you feel part of the village community now?’, he responded: “I don’t think we do. ... We’re just on our own. That’s about it, to be honest” (txt: 738). Thus, although feeling congruent with their new home, they had lost the feeling of being part of the village community.

Helen, although she had felt congruent with old Arkwright, had focused on the new opportunities which the relocation would provide for them, particularly having a garden and more privacy. At T4 she evaluated the relocation positively: “Oh, it’s much more ideal (than the previous house). The layout, everything. ... I’m glad I had the kitchen and dining room together, that’s a decision that I’m really pleased with, it suits us” (txt: 1373-1398). Helen returned to the same subject again: “It’s better for us, it’s spacious, there’s plenty of room, the rooms are excellent sizes, it’s just more comfortable, well-insulated, all double glazed. ... I said to someone the other day, if I’d have gone to buy a house, I couldn’t have bought any better” (txt: 1511-1531). They decided against buying expensive bedroom
furniture and opted for spending that money on their garden: “Tony said he’d rather have a nice garden, with [our] personal stamp on it. He’d get more pleasure out of that than out of expensive bedroom furniture” (txt: 1837-1849). Nevertheless, Helen, too, missed the interaction with others: “I do miss, um, that contact with people on the street. ... I miss having the Club and the Pub. That was like a social thing, on a Saturday, to go between the two and pass people and that was nice. It was ideal and it was that close to home and now it’s a long way up to the Club. You’re a bit isolated” (txt: 1594-1630). At T5 Helen was more critical of how the village was functioning than at T4 and was trying to make improvements: “The football team, they are doing really well. They’ve won both matches .... That’s something else we’ve started to do, we never used to do before: go and watch the football. We are big fans now! It’s all part of being a community, joining in” (txt: 356-358). Helen had also accepted the role of ‘tree warden’ for the Parish: “I’ll do a bit by looking after the trees” (txt: 205). Helen also hoped to establish autonomy over the village maintenance: “I think we’ll resolve the problems and disputes over who is maintaining what with the Parish Council and Budge. Get Budge out of it, let that, as soon as possible, be history and maybe we can get somewhere with maintenance [of the Council-owned grass verges and pockets of land]” (txt: 373-376). Helen felt that their home reflected their identities and by making a conscious effort through involvement with the community, she worked to enhance cohesion for the community and, at the same time, she identified with New Arkwright.

9.6.3 Summary of place congruence themes. As discussed in Chapter 8, New Arkwright did not provide place-congruent continuity (Twyg germ-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Feldman, 1990; 1996) for residents. The example of Ben points firstly to the need for project staff to be sensitive towards individual needs and to acknowledge other people’s values and the importance of past achievements. Secondly, this example also illustrates that people did find it difficult to visualise their new home and village. It is argued that Ben and others could not mentally transpose themselves into their new home because the available information was too abstract. Three-dimensional models of various house styles and a magnetic board with room sizes to scale and items of furniture to scale would have been hugely beneficial in terms of orientating residents.

Christine demonstrated that spatially linked memories are an important part of place attachment. At the time of her relocation Christine had not separated herself from her dead husband and the relocation had denied her the image of her husband returning home. Her identity was a shared identity at that point in time and yet only Christine had access to the new home. This example clearly demonstrates that past experiences are linked to the place in which they occurred.

Helen felt congruence with her previous home but had accepted the move and anticipated positive lifestyle changes. Helen and her husband very quickly personalised their house and garden and created a
person/environment fit. By T5 Helen had taken positive steps towards improving the spatial and social climate in the village and creating a better fit between her and the new village.

Whatever the pattern and individual variations in each case, feeling that one’s home reflects one’s identity emerges as an important aspect of place attachment. Participants who perceived themselves as congruent with their new home were also able to engage in appropriation, which in turn increased their place congruency. This functioned particularly well at an individual level. Only a minority of the participants, however, reported congruence with both the community and the village at T5. Close social interaction had been a main feature of the Arkwright community, facilitating a highly salient collective identity. Instead of being passively available, social interaction now has to be consciously generated, a process which may have begun.

9.7 Overall Summary
It has been argued that there are five aspects of place attachment which, when achieved, facilitate an emotional bond with place and when absent, facilitate detachment and/or inhibit attachment to place. These aspects of place attachment are: a sense of security; a sense of autonomy; the desire and ability to engage in appropriation; an optimal level of internal and external stimulation; and congruence with place. A suggestive link with Breakwell’s Identity Process Theory has been made, in that these aspects also guide and motivate behaviour, cognitions and evaluations in order to achieve a positive identity.

Experiences are always spatially linked (Milligan, 1998) and the loss of a specific site also implies the loss of meaningful experiences which were specific to that site. As quotations used in this chapter indicate, the Arkwright relocation evidenced this phenomenon. Accumulated meaningful behaviour in old Arkwright was found not to transfer to New Arkwright so that previous cultural patterns became redundant.

There were various impacts on the five aspects of place attachment:

9.7.1 A sense of security. By T5 there was a heightened sense of physical security apparent in New Arkwright. The danger of methane gas seeping into the houses had been removed; street lighting and an open structural design had avoided dark hiding places; and much of the previous insecurity caused by ‘horror’ stories of impossibly high running costs had abated. There was loss of security for those who were left behind as residents gradually moved out of old Arkwright. This, indeed, helped participants to detach. There was, however, still the doubt whether some tenants would be able to afford the increased rents due to come into force in May 2000. The possible threat of a further relocation prevented participants thus affected from bonding to their new house. There was also evidence of a new found psychological insecurity due to the inability to depend on other people seeing or hearing when
someone needed help. Hopefully, in time, new mechanisms will be found for dealing with this insecurity.

9.7.2 A sense of autonomy. Lack of control over the relocation process resulted in much anger and frustration. Once the community architects had been dismissed, residents were denied real involvement in the decision making on both the collective and personal level. For some participants this lack of autonomy served to increase their attachment to their previous home, others regained some control by ignoring rules and refusing to move until certain conditions had been met. In some of these cases, however, their success alienated them from others. The effect of not being given adequate control over the relocation process prevented ‘anticipatory’ attachment to their new property and village. The power of the group had dissipated and was replaced by individual functioning.

9.7.3 The desire and ability to engage in appropriation. The process of detachment from the previous home/village involves relinquishing previous appropriations. This could be clearly seen to be the case. Not being able to nurture a previous place attachment through ‘doing’ effectively resulted in detachment. Seven themes which can be viewed as inhibitors to appropriation of the new place were evident, ranging from refusal to engage in the relocation process to replacing loved possessions with new items as these were perceived to be more suitable for the new home. The Arkwright residents’ work on their new homes often involved personalisation of the home or problem solving and thus began to anchor a set of memories and meanings in their home. Additionally, the personalisation, memories and meanings enabled the home to act as an indicator of the self to the person and as a communicator of aspects of the self to others. Thus appropriation can be seen as exemplifying the two interpersonal aspects of Fuhrer & Kaiser’s (1992) processes of place attachment formation.

In addition, each of the examples of appropriating behaviour described in this section was also found to provide a clear link with the principles of identity. Although continuity is the most apparent principle in these examples, there is also evidence of self esteem, distinctiveness and efficacy.

Thus by engaging in appropriating behaviour, participants not only developed an attachment to their new home but were shaping their identity which shows an important link between identity and place attachment.

9.7.4 Optimal levels of internal and external stimulation. The lack of communal facilities, especially during the first two years post-relocation was an important factor and increased the sense of isolation for many. In addition, the lack of detailed knowledge of the complex road system resulted in the fear of being lost. This contributed to residents staying in their houses, thereby reducing not only their own stimulation but adding to the ‘ghost’ town effect for others. It is proposed that for people with a highly
salient social identity, not having the passive interactions with others and being deprived of feeling part of the group because of the group’s invisibility had resulted in feelings of isolation. This lack of stimulation inhibited attachment to place, especially the village. By T5 most participants had forged an emotional bond with their new home through the process of appropriation. This did not apply to their feelings towards the village. In Milligan’s terms, the phenomenon of place attachment occurs when a site has been the stage of meaningful interaction. Past interactions have not been transferable to the new village and by T5 the potential for new interactions in the new village had hardly been realised.

9.7.5 Place congruence. Places are used for non-verbal processes (the basic assumption of Fuhrer & Kaiser’s (1992) model). Since places can be changed to meet personal needs, places can represent the individual, and, as such, aid identity formation and externalise their identity to others. The examples used demonstrate that not being able to visualise oneself in the new home prevented participants from anticipating congruence. Better facilitation with 3-D models would have been helpful in terms of orientating residents. There is a close link between appropriation and place congruence. Perceived congruence resulted in active appropriation which, in turn increased place congruence. There is also a clear link with the identity principles, working towards increased salience of distinctiveness, self esteem, continuity and efficacy. The deterioration of the old village aided loss of congruence for many people and hence eased detachment. There was little evidence of congruence with the new village at T5 although, for a few, the process had begun.

It has been demonstrated that a number of participants would have benefited from practical and emotional support across the time phases, which would have made the relocation a more positive and less stressful experience for them. People’s own values are paramount in the process and authorities need to recognise and include residents’ past achievements in the compensation package. The lengthy process, five years from the announcement to the relocation, increased anxiety and uncertainty which inhibited the formation of attachment to place.

This chapter has explored the aspects necessary for the formation and maintenance of place attachment. The literature review highlighted the dearth of theorising on this question; whilst there are numerous studies on the subject of place attachment, the various aspects giving rise to place attachment have not been fully explored. For this reason the work of Fuhrer & Kaiser (1992) is seen as important. However, the empirical work at Times 1 and 2 of this study strongly suggested the need to extend Fuhrer & Kaiser’s research. Whilst this study has made a contribution by expanding their concept of arousal to include external stimulation and emphasising the importance of appropriation as an aspect of place attachment, further research is needed to advance the concept.
Chapter Ten

Examining the measurement of variables

10.1 Introduction

Although the emphasis of this study has been on the phenomenological aspects of participants’ perception of the relocation, a quantitative survey of a wider sample was included in order to obtain numerical support for the broad links being made between theoretical concepts which arose out of the qualitative data. This would offer the triangulation of findings and multiple measures as recommended by a number of authors (e.g. Stiles, 1993; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Smith, 1996a) and discussed in Chapter 5. It must be borne in mind, however, that it is in essence impossible in a longitudinal study using grounded theory (or any other approach which allows the theory and, sometimes, the definitions of the relevant concepts, to emerge from the data during the research) to establish in advance what the exact nature of the concepts and the relationships between them will prove to be. It is, therefore, difficult to be sure that the instruments used to give quantitative measures at the various stages of the research will, at the end of the research, prove to be relevant, sufficient, or to be focussing on what prove to be the most interesting questions. For this reason a number of scales were discontinued or begun at various points in time. On theoretical grounds, it was known that certain measures were needed in order to help understand the target phenomenon. For example, place attachment had to be monitored over time, the links between identity and place needed to be examined and the focus on community issues was important. From this perspective, therefore, it was clear which measures needed to be constant over time and which specific theoretical concepts should be explored across the four data waves.

10.2 Research questions

The research questions addressed in this chapter are as follows:

1. Do levels of participants’ attachment to place change before and after the relocation? It was anticipated that levels of attachment would decrease at W2 and increase at W3 and W4.

2. Does participants’ psychological sense of community change across the four data waves? It was anticipated that there would be a decrease in the level of sense of community across time.

3(a). Does place contribute to self-evaluation in four different ways which correspond to the four principles of identity? It was anticipated that there would be evidence of a relationship between place and the identity principles.
3(b). Does place contribute to the maintenance of these four principles to a differing degree after the relocation? No differentiation was expected between W3 and W4.

4. Are there five distinct aspects of place attachment? It was anticipated that there would be support for distinct factors.

5. To what extent do each of the identity principles and each of the aspects of place attachment explain levels of place attachment after the relocation?
   It was anticipated that the principles of identity and the aspects of place attachment would be predictors of place attachment.

The rationale for questions 1 – 3 is based on theory and research reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3 while questions 4 – 5 arose from the qualitative data.

10.3 The analyses
This section will describe the analyses carried out. These comprised factor and reliability analyses using the individual items to derive new composite measures; ANOVAs and multiple regression analyses were also carried out in order to test the specific expectations outlined in Section 10.2 above. The purpose was to investigate any change over time in these variables and to find the best predictors for personal attachment, social attachment and behavioural attachment.

10.3.1 Deriving new measures. The factor and reliability analyses were carried out to establish the robustness of the four scales which were used for the final analyses. These are the place attachment scale, the psychological sense of community scale, the identity principle scale and the aspects of place attachment scale. In order to be able to make longitudinal comparisons, variables had to be computed across time using the same items throughout the four data waves. The following sections report the results for each scale by firstly describing the results of the factor and reliability analyses and secondly reporting on what further analysis was needed to answer the research questions. Only those variables which were computed for the final analyses across all waves are detailed.

10.3.2 The place attachment scale. As described in Chapter 6 some items of the place attachment scale were omitted and others changed to fit the post-relocation period. For this reason the factor analysis and reliability analysis will be presented in two separate parts, the pre-relocation Waves 1 and 2 and the post-relocation Waves 3 and 4.

10.3.2.1 Procedure for factor analysis (FA) for place attachment items. The 28 items of the W1 place attachment scale were designed to measure 4 sub-scales, i.e. personal attachment, social attachment,
behavioural attachment and place identity. A principal component factor analysis (oblimin rotation, criterion = mineigen) extracted 7 factors resulting in a complex pattern matrix, with several items loading on more than one factor. An intermediate confirmatory analysis of 4 factors did not result in a clear pattern and the reliability analysis was poor. A confirmatory mode of 3 factors was theoretically much clearer and has been used for the subsequent analysis. A total of 45% of variance is explained by the 3 factors. Table 10.1 lists the items, the rotated factor loadings and the percent of variance explained by the three factors.

Table 10.1: Pattern Matrix for W1 Place Attachment items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Attachment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were to move I would feel that I had lost something important</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My present home fulfils all my needs</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe and secure in this house</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to form attachments to new places ‡</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like changing houses it gives me a fresh start ‡</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I close my door I feel happy</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my memories are in these walls</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a wrench to leave a home that you have worked hard on</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am upset to think that my present house will be demolished</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often dwell on memories of the past</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have wanted to move to a bigger house soon anyway ‡</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general I enjoy looking forward, making plans for the future ‡</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am attached to objects I can take with me rather than to the house ‡</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Attachment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving the whole community will increase the community spirit</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t have agreed to move had they not moved the whole community</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very important to me to be part of the community</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not have wanted to move had it not been for the methane threat</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to me to think of myself as an Arkwrightian</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more tied to people here than to my house or belongings</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural Attachment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always thinking of ways to improve my house</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t mind where I live as long as I can go out to meet my friends ‡</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy caring for my home</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anywhere will do for me as long as it keeps me warm and dry ‡</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked a lot on this house, it feels part of me</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of variance explained for each factor</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Item was removed to increase reliability of the scale

The three factors had high loadings of the items specifically designed to operationalize the 3 place attachment components. However, one behavioural attachment item (raba3) loaded on personal attachment and one place identity item loaded on social attachment. Both loadings can be defended theoretically and were accepted for these factors. In addition 2 extraneous items loaded on the behavioural factor, i.e. one social attachment item and one personal attachment item. Neither fitted theoretically and both were removed to increase the standardised alpha for the component.

Table 10.2: Factor Correlation Matrix for W1 Place Attachment variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of variance explained for each factor</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The absence of high intercorrelations between the three factors of the place attachment scale confirm that these three measures are independent.

A principal component factor analysis (oblimin rotation, criterion = mineigen) was carried out on the 23 items of the W4 place attachment scale. It was intended that the same sub-scales as for W1 would emerge. Exploratory factor analysis extracted 6 factors and did not result in a simple structure as items loaded on different factors. The confirmatory factor analysis of 4 factors resulted in 3 clear factors. A total of 49% of the variance is explained by the three factors. The 4th factor consisted of only 2 social attachment items. A Pearson correlation was carried out. This was shown not to be significant and therefore the two items were not added up to form a scale. A confirmatory factor analysis of 3 factors was also carried out since the W1 analysis had resulted in 3 clear factors but the Wave 4 analysis resulted in a complex pattern matrix and could not be used. Hence the confirmatory analysis of 4 factors was used minus the two social attachment items. Place identity items were absorbed by personal and social attachment factors but in each case could be theoretically accepted. Table 10.3 lists the items, the rotated factor loadings and the percent of variance explained by the three factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.3: Pattern Matrix for W4 Place Attachment items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel out of place in the new village</td>
<td>-.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I still feel a stranger here</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the new village is me</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel at home here .68 .39
Having moved from old A. I feel that I have lost something important -.64 .38
Having moved the whole community has increased the community spirit ‡ .59
It is easy for me to form attachments to new places .54
My present home fulfils all my needs .53
I feel out of place in my new home -.50 .42
In general I enjoy looking forward and making plans for the future .37 .30

Social Attachment
It is important to me to think of myself as an Arkwrightian .86
It is very important to me to be part of the A. community .76
I often dwell on memories of old Arkwright .62
I like changing houses, it gives me a fresh start -.62

Behavioural Attachment
I enjoy caring for my home .85
I am beginning to put a lot of work into my home .78
When I close the door I feel happy .40 .57
Activities are more enjoyable in my new home .52
I am enjoying the challenge of bringing my garden to life .52
I feel safe and secure in this house .44
I am continuously thinking of ways to improve my house .31

Percent of variance explained for each factor 27.9 12.3 8.6

‡ Item was removed to increase reliability of the scale

Place identity items loaded on the personal attachment factor (Factor 1) but in each case they could be theoretically accepted. A social attachment item also loaded on Factor 1. This was inappropriate and was removed which also increased the reliability of the personal attachment component. Two place identity items loaded on Factor 2 (social attachment) and two personal attachment items loaded on Factor 3. All 4 could be theoretically accepted. The intercorrelation between factors is shown in Table 10.4.

Table 10.4: Factor Correlation Matrix for W4 Place Attachment variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absence of high intercorrelation between the three factors of the place attachment scale at W4 confirms that these 3 measures are independent.

Of the 10 items loading on Factor 1 personal attachment at Wave 4, 4 of these loaded on the same factor at Wave 1 (Wave 1 factor consists of 13 items). Of the 4 items loading on Factor 2 social attachment at Wave 4, 2 of these loaded on the same factor at Wave 1 (Wave 1 factor consists of 6 items). Of the 7 items loading on Factor 3 behavioural attachment at Wave 4, 3 of the items loaded on the same factor at Wave 1 (Wave 1 factor consists of 5 items). The comparability between the factors at different waves is explored in the discussion, Section 10.4.
It should be noted that the items loading on the social attachment factor largely related to social attachment to the community in old Arkwright. This factor should therefore be termed ‘social attachment to the community in old Arkwright’ but the label ‘social attachment’ is used for brevity in the tables below.

10.3.2.2 Reliability of derived scales. As shown in Table 10.1, W1 items were based on FA. To be able to make longitudinal comparisons, W2 items were built on W1 items, which represented the best alpha scores for both waves. For the post-relocation period, W4 items were based on FA (Table 10.3) and W3 items were built on W4 items. Reliability analysis performed on each of the factors for each wave indicated high reliability for the personal attachment scale at the 4 waves and good reliability for the social and behavioural scales with one lower reading of .61 for W3 social attachment. Table 10.5 lists the number of participants, Cronbach’s alpha, the mean, the range and standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Std. dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1 personal attachment (8 items)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>26.93</td>
<td>8-40</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 personal attachment (8 items)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>26.84</td>
<td>8-40</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 personal attachment (9 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>35.22</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 personal attachment (9 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 social attachment (6 items)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 social attachment (6 items)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 social attachment (4 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 social attachment (4 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 behavioural attachment (3 items)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 behavioural attachment (3 items)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 behavioural attachment (7 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>7-35</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 behavioural attachment (7 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>7-35</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.3.2.3 Research question 1: A repeated measures ANOVA was carried out to answer the first question, ‘Do levels of participants’ attachment to place change across the four data waves?’ and to find out whether levels of attachment had decreased at W2 and increased at W3 and W4.
As the place attachment scale’s number of items changed after the relocation (see above, Section 10.3.2.1) the variables were converted into z-scores. As this is a longitudinal study only participants who took part in all four data waves were included, which reduced the sample to 45. Pillai’s version is considered to be the most robust and most powerful (Norusis, 1988) in assessing differences in within-subject factors and is presented in Table 10.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace: value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attachment (PATT)</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>2.181</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Attachment (SATT)</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Attachment (BATT)</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the answer to the above research question is that there is no statistical evidence that the level of attachment to place (personal, social or behavioural) changed across the 4 data waves.

10.3.3 The psychological sense of community scale. In order to derive scales which comprised the same items in each of the data waves and which were reliable, scales were constructed on the basis of the factor analysis carried out on the Wave 4 data set. Thus, the items of this scale remained the same throughout the 4 data waves.

10.3.3.1 Procedure for FA for W4 Psychological Sense of Community items. A principal component analysis (oblimin rotation, criterion = mineigen) was carried out. This resulted in 8 factors with items loading on more than one factor. A confirmatory factor analysis was then carried out, suggesting 3 factors which resembled the structure found by Glynn (1981). This grouped items largely as intended, although some items loaded on other factors, all of which could be theoretically justified. A total of 42% of the variance is explained by the 3 factors. Table 10.7 lists the items, the rotated factor loadings and the variance explained by the three factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People believe in keeping up longstanding traditions</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in this community gives me a secure feeling</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If something needs to be done, the whole community gets behind it</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have much in common in this community</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are divided into small snobbish groups</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am quite similar to most people who live here</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People know that they can get help if they are in trouble</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I belong here</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People here have no say in what actions are taken</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a member of this c. is like being a member of a group of friends</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I just feel like talking I can generally find someone to talk to right away</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sense of giving and receiving support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You need to look after yourself, because no one else will</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard to make good friends here</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I like living in this community  .58
This is an ideal place to bring up children  .57
If I had an emergency, even people I do not know would be willing to help  .34  .52
I seldom feel lonely  .40  .30

Accepting responsibility for the functioning of the community
I am active and involved in this community  .86
I have been involved in solving community problems  .84
I feel useful in this community  .78
My friends are part of my everyday activities  .74
I get a lot out of being a member of this community  .63

Percent of variance explained for each factor  6.3  26.2  9.2

Some items from the support and responsibility sub-scales loaded on the sense of belonging factor but examination of each of these items suggested that this was theoretically acceptable since they also related to a sense of belonging. The support factor included 2 items from the sense of belonging sub-scale but again, these were theoretically acceptable. The same applies to Factor 3. Table 10.8 shows the intercorrelation between the 3 community factors.

Table 10.8: Factor Correlation Matrix for W4 Sense of community variables New Arkwright

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3 factors are not highly intercorrelated. It is therefore acceptable to consider these as relatively independent components of the community scale.

10.3.3.2 Reliability of derived scales. Reliability analysis for each data wave for each component indicated high reliability. As reported in Section 10.3.3, the optimal overall reliability was achieved when the new variables for W1 to W3 were built using the factor structure from W4. The results of the reliability analysis are presented in Table 10.9.

Table 10.9: Cronbach’s alpha for the Community scale across 4 data waves – rating New Arkwright at W3 and W4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1 sense of belonging (11 items)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>37.57</td>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 sense of belonging (11 items)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>38.63</td>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 sense of belonging (11 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>35.01</td>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 sense of belonging (11 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 giving and receiving support (6 items)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 giving and receiving support (6 items)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 giving and receiving support (6 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 giving and receiving support (6 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>20.26</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 taking responsibility (5 items)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 taking responsibility (5 items)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 taking responsibility (5 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 taking responsibility (5 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As described in Chapter 6 participants were asked at W3 and W4 (after the relocation to New Arkwright) to rate the same items when thinking of old Arkwright. Table 10.10 presents those reliability scores.

Table 10.10: Cronbach’s alpha for the Community scale across 4 data waves – rating old Arkwright retrospectively at W3 and W4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W3 sense of belonging (11 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>43.36</td>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 sense of belonging (11 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>44.99</td>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 giving and receiving support (6 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 giving and receiving support (6 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 taking responsibility (5 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 taking responsibility (5 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>18.73</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.3.3.3 Research question 2. A repeated measures ANOVA was carried out to answer the second research question: “Does participants’ psychological sense of community change across the four data waves?” It was anticipated that the level of community will decrease over time. As the community scale items remained the same throughout the four data waves, a conversion to z scores was not required. That apart, the same procedures for ANOVA were carried out as for the place attachment scale. Again the sample was reduced to 45, filtering out participants who had not taken part in all 4 waves. The analysis showed that the three components were significantly different across the data waves as is shown in Table 10.11.

Table 10.11: ANOVA for belonging, support and responsibility community scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace: value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging (BELG)</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>14.147</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving and receiving support (SUPP)</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>5.485</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking responsibility (RESP)</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>13.014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Pillai’s Trace was significant, repeated measures t-tests were carried out to evaluate the difference between two variable means. As six tests resulted from the 4 data waves (1-2; 1-3; 1-4; 2-3; 2-4; 3-4) a Bonferroni correction was used (dividing the alpha criterion of .05 by 6, which reduced the minimum significance level to .008) when evaluating the t-test results since only if the p value is .008 or lower can the results be regarded as significant. (see Table 10.12).

Table 10.12: t-tests showing details for the variable ‘sense of belonging’ (belng for W1+W2 and belng for W3+W4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Time and Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>W1belng</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>-6.12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>-.612</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2belng</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus the component ‘sense of belonging’ had changed significantly in 5 out of the 6 comparisons, indicating that sense of belonging was reduced between W1/W3, W1/W4, W2/W3, W2/W4 and between W3/W4.

The same procedure was carried out for the component ‘giving and receiving support’, which is illustrated in Table 10.13.

**Table 10.13: t-tests showing details for the variable ‘giving and receiving support’ (support for W1+W2 and sportn for W3+W4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Time and Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>W1spport</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W2spport</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>W3sportn</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1spport</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-2.590</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>W3sportn</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W2spport</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>-2.223</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>W3sportn</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4sportn</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>W1spport</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4sportn</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.829</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>W2spport</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4sportn</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only two of the 6 t-tests are significant, i.e. support is perceived as reduced between W1/W4 and W2/W4.

Table 10.14 represents t-tests for the component ‘accepting responsibility’.

**Table 10.14: t-tests showing details for the variable ‘accepting responsibility’ (resps for W1+W2 and respn for W3+W4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Time and Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>W1resps</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W2resps</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>W1resps</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W3respn</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.323</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>W1resps</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4respn</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>W2resps</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W3respn</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.876</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>W2resps</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4respn</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.936</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>W3respn</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 6 $t$-tests carried out, 4 are significant, again the mean of the different waves is reduced over time, i.e. W3 and W4 are lower than W1, W3 and W4 are lower than W2.

The same procedures were carried out for the retrospective rating of the community scale. Variables have been changed to end with ‘o’ for old Arkwright. Table 10.15 shows that the Pillai’s Trace test was significant for each variable.

**Table 10.15: Significant levels of repeated measures within-subject factors - retrospectively**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace: value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging (BELGO)</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>34.677</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving and receiving support (SUPPO)</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>3.256</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking responsibility (RESPO)</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since each of the above variables was significant at <5% level, paired samples $t$-tests could be carried out. Table 10.16 shows the results.

**Table 10.16: $t$-tests showing details for the variable ‘sense of belonging’ retrospectively (belng for W1+W2 and belgo for W3+W4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Time and Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>W2belng</th>
<th>45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>W1belng</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>-6.12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>W2belng</td>
<td>39.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>W3belgo</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>W1belng</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>-6.92</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>W3belgo</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>W2belng</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>-7.96</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>W3belgo</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 6 tests for the variable ‘sense of belonging’ all 3 which contained retrospective rating are significant. Interestingly, when participants looked back they rated the sense of belonging which existed in old Arkwright more highly than they had done when they lived in the old village. Paired sample $t$-tests were also carried out on the variable ‘giving and receiving support’. Results are listed in Table 10.17.
Table 10.17: *t*-tests showing details for the variable ‘giving and receiving support’ retrospectively (support for W1+W2 and sporto for W3+W4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Time and Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W1spport</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W2spport</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W3sporto</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>-.937</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1spport</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-2.083</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W4spporto</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W3sporto</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-2.582</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W1spport</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>-3.113</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4spporto</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W2spport</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>-3.113</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4spporto</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>-2.582</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this variable only one pair, comparing W2 in old Arkwright and rating ‘giving and receiving support’ at W4 retrospectively achieved significance at the <.008 level. In this case, again, the mean for the retrospective rating was higher than it had been at W2.

The following *t*-tests were carried out on the variable ‘accepting responsibility for the functioning of the community’ (Table 10.18).

Table 10.18: *t*-tests showing details for the variable ‘accepting responsibility’ retrospectively (resps for W1+W2 and respo for W3+W4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Time and Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W1resps</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-1.426</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W1resps</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-2.378</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W3respo</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>-2.120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W1resps</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-1.207</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4respo</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>-2.817</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W2resps</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-2.378</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W3respo</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>-2.120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W2resps</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-1.207</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4respo</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>-2.817</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the previous variable, only pair 5 can be deemed significant and again the mean is increased when participants look back.

Figures 10.1 and 10.2 illustrate graphically the changes in the mean scores across the 4 data waves.
10.3.3.4 Results for research question 2: In answer to research question 2, these results indicate that the psychological sense of community did change over the 4 waves. Participants’ sense of belonging was significantly less for all pairs of waves apart from W1 compared with W2 (when people were still living in old Arkwright) (see Table 10.12). The component ‘giving and receiving support’ is also reduced significantly but only between 2 pairs of data waves, i.e. W1/W4 and W2/W4 (see Table 10.13). This indicates that participants gave less and received less support at 2 years post-relocation compared to W1 and W2. For accepting responsibility for the community, of the 6 comparisons between waves, 4 are...
significantly lower in New Arkwright, i.e. W1/W3, W1/W4, W2/W3 and W2/W4 (see Table 10.14). Thus, the psychological sense of community did change across the four data waves, with a reduction when in New Arkwright compared with the levels of sense of community in old Arkwright.

The retrospective rating of the community items makes interesting reading. Participants rated all three components as higher when rating the past sense of community from the New Arkwright perspective. Of the 6 pairs of sense of belonging, 5 are significantly higher, with no discernable difference between W1/W2. The support component is only significantly higher between W2/W4 and the same applies to the responsibility component. These results will be discussed further in the final section of this chapter (Section 10.4).

10.3.4 Identity Principle scale. This scale was developed for W3 and repeated for W4. Items reflecting the identity principles (self esteem, continuity, self efficacy and distinctiveness) were generated from the pre-relocation interviews. The scale was piloted for meaning and some improvements were made when participants had difficulty in understanding the wording used but, because the pool of accessible participants was small, it was impossible to do a sufficiently large pilot study to assess the psychometric properties of the scale.

10.3.4.1 Procedure for FA for W4 Identity Principle items. A principal component analysis (oblimin rotation, criterion = mineigen) was carried out on the 39 items. The items were designed to measure the 4 principles of identity in the context of place, hence 4 sub-scales were expected, i.e. self esteem, continuity, self efficacy and distinctiveness. The exploratory factor analysis extracted 12 factors, with items loading on more than one factor. A confirmatory factor analysis of 4 factors grouped items neatly into the intended components, with only a few items also loading on other factors. A total variance of 44% is explained by the 4 factors. Table 10.19 lists the items, the rotated factor loadings and the percent of variance explained by the three factors.
### Table 10.19: Pattern Matrix for W4 Identity Principle scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
<th>Factor Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel New A. is a dream come true</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living here in New A. makes me feel fortunate</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My new home makes me feel unique</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The external appearance of our village is better than any other village in Derbyshire</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the media attention about New A. has made us famous</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My house/bungalow is easily recognised from afar</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to live in my new home for the rest of my life</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my new home is a dream come true</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thought of living in New A. for the rest of my life makes me unhappy</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my friends from outside A. envy me</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving the entire community to a new village makes us unique</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuity of self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about the good life we had in old A.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt more at home in the old village</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have lost part of myself now that old A. has been demolished</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish we could have continued to live in old A.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have lost the unique atmosphere of the old village</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel sad because I don’t see my old friends as much as before</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure whether I should use people’s front or back door</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where my friends and acquaintances live in the new village</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can direct strangers to any part of the new village</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love showing other people around the new village</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot remember where I have put things</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to New A. has changed my way of life</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The village is new but nothing else has changed</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me there is no difference between living in the old and new v.</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the whole c. together again, life will be the same as before</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All this new equipment is a worry to me</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self distinctiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoddy workmanship has made me feel less proud of my home</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am now more able to do things for myself in my new home</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hate having to show other people around my new home</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I quickly managed to organise myself in the new place</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel proud of my new home</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of variance explained for each factor</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 11 items which loaded on the component self esteem, 4 are distinctiveness items. Other research (Vignoles, 2000; Timotijevic, submitted) also found that although conceptually distinctiveness is different to self esteem, when trying to operationalize these the difference is much less clear. The continuity factor also includes 1 distinctiveness item. In addition 1 efficacy item loaded on the continuity component. Some of the items which were thought to measure distinctiveness loaded on self esteem and some of the self esteem items loaded the efficacy factor but all these items can be accepted theoretically. Of the 9 efficacy items, 4 are intended items, 4 are intended continuity items and 1 is self esteem. This item, ‘I love showing other people around the village’ could be interpreted as efficacy, as
it also demonstrates efficacy in wayfinding. The same applies to the continuity items, i.e. by preferring a status quo, efficacy is supported. The distinctiveness factor, however, should be treated with caution. The items loading on the distinctiveness factor showed that there is internal inconsistency in this component as, theoretically, the items did not reflect this construct. Of the 5 items, 3 are self esteem items, describing a sense of pride rather than distinctiveness and 2 items are from the efficacy statements. Nevertheless, these items did contribute to the reliability coefficient and were retained for further analysis, although with some caution.

The items loading on the continuity factor largely relate to continuity with the self in old Arkwright. This factor should therefore be labelled ‘continuity with self in old Arkwright’ rather than simply ‘continuity’. For brevity, however, the term ‘continuity’ is used in the subsequent tables.

Table 10.20: Factor Correlation Matrix for W4 Identity Principles variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absence of high intercorrelation between the four factors of the identity principle scale confirms that these measures are independent.

10.3.4.2 Reliability of derived scales. Cronbach’s alpha was used to test reliability of the identity principle factors. W3 was built on W4 items, as for the community scale, explained in Section 10.3.3. The alpha for self esteem and continuity with self in old Arkwright is high, perceived efficacy is good for W4 and acceptable for W3. Distinctiveness is good for W4 but unacceptably low (.52) for W3. This variable has not been used in further analyses. Table 10.21 displays the results.

Table 10.21: Cronbach’s alpha for the Identity Principle scale across 2 data waves – W3 and W4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W3 self esteem (11 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 self esteem (11 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>39.70</td>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 continuity of self (7 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>7-35</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 continuity of self (7 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>22.99</td>
<td>7-35</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 perceived efficacy (9 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 perceived efficacy (9 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 self distinctiveness (5 items)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 self distinctiveness (5 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.3.4.3 Research Questions 3(a) and 3(b). FA and Cronbach’s alpha provide the answer to question 3(a), ‘Does place contribute to self-evaluation in four different ways which correspond to the four principles of identity?’ It was anticipated that there will be evidence of a relationship between place and the principles. The items for the principle identity scale all included a reference to place and these loaded on 4 separate factors, which show very little intercorrelation. At W3 the principle of distinctiveness did not attain a good enough alpha (it is reported in Table 10.21 in grey) but it can be concluded that place contributes to self-evaluation through self esteem, continuity and efficacy.

Two-tailed $t$-tests were carried out to answer the question 3(b), ‘Does place contribute to the maintenance of these four principles to a differing degree between W3 and W4?’ No differentiation was expected between W3 and W4. The principle distinctiveness was excluded from this analysis because of its low alpha score at W3. There were no significant differences between self esteem, continuity with self in old Arkwright or efficacy between W3/W4 (see Table 10.21 for the respective means). Hence, there was no discernable difference between the contribution of place and self-evaluation (via the principles) at W3 and W4.

10.3.5 The Aspects of Place Attachment scale. The items were designed to measure 5 aspects of place attachment which had been evident in the interview data. It was concluded that these 5 aspects, a sense of security, a sense of autonomy, appropriation, stimulation and place congruence, are necessary to form and maintain place attachment. The questionnaire items were derived from the interviews.

10.3.5.1 Procedure for FA for the Aspects of Place Attachment items. A principal component analysis (oblimin rotation, criterion = mineigen) was used to investigate whether there was evidence for the 5 aspects of place attachment. This resulted in 10 factors from the 36 items with items loading on more than one factor. A confirmatory factor analysis was simpler, although not clear. A total of 45% of the variance is explained by the 5 factors. Table 10.22 presents the details.
Table 10.22: Pattern Matrix for W4 Aspects of Place Attachment scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There aren’t many signs of life, there are very few people about</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are very few people about now, the v. feels deserted</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People cannot be bothered to get involved in c. matters</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is always something exciting happening in the village ‡</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I can’t rely on other people noticing should I need help</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People miss bumping into each other and having a chat</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlike me, people are more concerned about themselves than other people</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel we, as a community, can do many things to improve the appearance of this village</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a community we are now able to make our own rules and regulations regarding the village</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel we, as a community, can get together and solve problems</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uneasy because there are too many strangers in this village now ‡</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still unsure about the village layout and feel more secure just staying inside my home</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where my old friends and neighbours live and how to get to them</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The layout of the village is now very familiar to me</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am now more dependent on others to do things for me</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has been difficult for me to do all the things I had planned to do in my new home</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stimulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My new home has given me more possibilities to do what I want to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is now easier for me to run my home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in my home at night ‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have felt more energetic since moving here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I now feel less motivated to do things around my home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things which are important to me are still the same ‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made changes to my home to make it feel it’s mine ‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new village gives me a safe feeling ‡</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very pleased that we have more privacy now than we had in old A. ‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where my old friends and n’bs live and how to get to them ‡</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am now more able to make my own decisions about how I want to live ‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place congruence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid that I will not be able to afford to live here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are having more fun now than they used to have in old A.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlike me, people have become very individualistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In New A. people feel that they have to conform &amp; that they are not free to be themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more acceptable now to be different from others ‡</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This new style of life isn’t me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living here now, I feel that I have fewer opp. to develop myself than I had in old A.</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of items loaded on 2 or 3 factors. In each case the highest factor loading was used. Items also loaded on theoretically inappropriate factors. After removing these items, a reliability test was carried out on each factor.

Table 10.23: Factor Correlation Matrix for W4 Aspects of Place Attachment variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1 (stimulation)</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 (stimulation)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 (security)</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 (appropriation)</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 (autonomy)</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5 (place congruence)</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no high intercorrelation between the factors. Place congruence is weakly intercorrelated with sense of security but all the other factors show even lower intercorrelations. These 5 measures can thus be seen to be independent of each other.

10.3.5.2 Reliability of the derived scales. Reliability analysis performed on each of the factors indicated high reliability for the security, appropriation and stimulation factors and a good reliability for the place congruence factor. The autonomy scale (.58) was not considered reliable enough to be included in further analyses. Table 10.24 lists the number of participants, Cronbach’s alpha, the mean, the range and standard deviation.

Table 10.24: Cronbach’s alpha for the Aspects of Place Attachment scale for W4 only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W4 security (6 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 autonomy (3 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 appropriation (5 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 stimulation (4 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 place congruence (6 items)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.3.5.3 Research Question 4 asked, ‘Are there five distinct aspects of place attachment?’ It was anticipated that there will be support for distinct factors. The factor analysis supports the existence of four of the aspects of place attachment: stimulation, security, appropriation and place congruence. The fifth item, autonomy, also appeared as a distinct factor but the lower reliability means that no conclusive evidence for this factor can be claimed and it has not been included in any further analysis.
Research Question 5: ‘To what extent do each of the identity principles and each of the aspects of place attachment explain levels of place attachment after the relocation?’ It was anticipated that the principles of identity and the aspects of place attachment will be predictors of place attachment.

To answer this question, a multiple regression analysis was carried out, using the factors from the preceding analyses. Correlations are shown in Table 10.25.

**Table 10.25: Correlations amongst place attachment, aspects of place attachment and principles of identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social place</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural place</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity - Self esteem</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity - Continuity</td>
<td>-.681</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity - Efficacy</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>-.998</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>-.407</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity - Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>-.372</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect - Security</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect - Appropriation</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect - Stimulation</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>-.344</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect – Place</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>-.408</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>-.566</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 100 for all cells
** correlation significant at 0.001 level (2-tailed)
* correlation significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

It should be noted that all factors are highly correlated with personal attachment to place. As explained earlier, 3 of the 4 items which loaded on the social attachment to place factor reflect social attachment to old Arkwright. This was not imposed by the questionnaire design but by how participants answered the statements, indicating that their group identity remains with the old Arkwright community. Therefore it is understandable that social place attachment and the principle of continuity (which is also ‘backward’ looking) are highly correlated but all other factors, apart from self esteem, are negatively correlated with social attachment, two of which are at the .001 level (security and place congruence). Of particular interest is its high negative correlation with place congruence, indicating that the stronger people are attached to old Arkwright the less likely they are to feel congruence with New Arkwright. Behavioural attachment is correlated with self esteem, efficacy, distinctiveness, continuity, appropriation, stimulation and congruence at the .001 level, although the relationship with continuity is negative. It is interesting
that the identity principle efficacy is highly correlated with appropriation and that distinctiveness is also correlated with stimulation, congruence and appropriation at the .001 level.

A stepwise regression analysis was performed in order to test the relative power of these scales and also to predict personal attachment, social attachment and behavioural attachment. The results are illustrated in Figures 10.3 to 10.5. The summaries of the stepwise regression analyses are shown in Tables 10.26 to 10.28 below.

**Figure 10.3: Variables predicting personal attachment**

![Diagram of variables predicting personal attachment]

**Table 10.26: Summary of stepwise regression analysis with personal attachment as DV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>-.466</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.506</td>
<td>-7.483</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>3.859</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>2.655</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=100  \( R^2 = .62 \)  F=54.49, p <.000

**Figure 10.4: Variables predicting social attachment**

![Diagram of variables predicting social attachment]

**Table 10.27: Summary of stepwise regression analysis with social attachment as DV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=100  \( R^2 = .54 \)  F=54.49, p <.000
Table 10.27: Summary of stepwise regression analysis with social attachment as DV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>8.085</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>4.587</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place congruence</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>-2.797</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self efficacy</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=99    R² = .54    F=29.45, p < .000

Figure 10.5: Variables predicting behavioural attachment

![Diagram showing variables predicting behavioural attachment]

Table 10.28: Summary of stepwise regression analysis with behavioural attachment as DV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>5.060</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>2.184</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=99    R² = .44    F=39.38, p < .000

The research question was, ‘To what extent do each of the identity principles and each of the aspects of place attachment explain levels of place attachment after the relocation?’ It was anticipated that the principles of identity and the aspects of place attachment would be predictors of place attachment. The results indicate that:

i) personal place attachment is predicted by lack of continuity with self in old Arkwright (β = -.51), self esteem (β = .30) and stimulation (β = .20); 62% of the variance in personal place attachment is explained by these variables;
ii) social attachment to the community in old Arkwright is predicted by continuity with self in old Arkwright ($\beta = .70$), self esteem ($\beta = .37$), lack of place congruence($\beta = -.25$) and lack of efficacy ($\beta = .16$); 54% of the variance in social place attachment is explained by these variables;

iii) behaviour attachment is predicted by stimulation ($\beta = .51$) and distinctiveness ($\beta = .22$); 44% of the variance in behavioural place attachment is explained by these variables.

### 10.4 Discussion

As described in Chapter 6, a number of measures were added and abandoned during the six year period of data collection. The sense of community measure remained the same throughout the relocation process, others were adapted for the post-relocation period (e.g. the place attachment scale components), and others were added for the post-relocation phases (identity principle scale at W3 and the aspects of place attachment scale at W4). These are the scales used for this final analysis and interesting longitudinal results have been obtained. These will be discussed in the light of whether they contradict or support the findings of the interview data and also, in terms of the methodological lessons which can be learned from this study.

#### Research Question 1.

Do levels of participants’ attachment to place change before and after the relocation? No evidence was found of any significant change in the levels of personal, social or behavioural attachment between the data waves. This is surprising, in view of the interview data, which indicated that personal attachment should have increased by W4 because participants were overall very pleased with their new home. One would also have expected a decrease in the level of behavioural attachment at W2 (since the houses were to be demolished there was little point in working towards improving the house) and an increase in behavioural attachment at W3, and even more, at W4 since by then, many participants had repainted and individualised their new houses and created their garden. The interview data would also suggest that social attachment would be reduced at W2, W3 and W4 compared with W1 - at W2, because of the focus on individual concerns relating to the move and the salience of intra-group (between individuals) rather than inter-group comparisons, both these reducing the importance to the individual of the social group; and at W3 and W4, because of a combination of focus on the individual and his or her home, and the reported reduction in social activity.

The following suggestions may provide some insights into the reasons for these discrepancies between the quantitative and interview data.

1. As already discussed in Chapter 6, the wording of some of the questionnaire items had to be altered between the waves (particularly, between W2 and W3) in order that the wording made sense in the
participant’s current circumstances. This need to change the wording applied particularly to the personal attachment scale.

Although the personal attachment scale items of the pre-relocation periods (based on W1) and those of the post-relocation periods (based on W4) were designed to be comparable and were believed to be conceptually similar, on closer examination, there is a difference between them. Of the 8 items which were used for the pre-relocation component, 7 are statements which address individual concerns, whereas for the post-relocation personal attachment component, the reverse is the case: most of the items which loaded on the personal attachment factor are addressing personal attachment to the village, mainly due to the 4 place identity items which loaded on this factor. Thus, the pre-relocation and post-relocation personal attachment factors (based on W1 and W4 respectively) are not directly comparable. It is not immediately clear how this problem could be overcome since, as already mentioned, the wording of the questions had to be changed to make sense to the participants. Proper piloting of the questionnaire followed by a preliminary analysis may have pointed to some of the problematic questionnaire items which could then have been improved or replaced. However, this was not practical because the pool of participants was too small, hence the scale items were checked for comprehensibility and not for their psycho-metric validity.

The above conjecture about the absence of any change in personal attachment scores over the four waves does not apply to the social attachment component as 2 of the four W4 items also loaded on the W1 factor. The remaining items for both periods are mostly socially orientated. Similarly, the explanation given in (1) does not apply to the behavioural attachment factor, since all those items are directly comparable or remained unchanged across the four waves.

2. The problem may lie in the scales themselves, which were created specially for this study (unlike, for example, the community scale) because no relevant established scales for attachment could be found in the literature. Thus, the attachment scales used had not undergone a thorough validation, but only a check on face validity.

3. The lack of any effect of change in place attachment may be due to the very nature of the longitudinal design, especially given the extended period before the move (3 to almost 4 years) and unpredictability of when the relocation would take place. It would seem easier to capture changes in the short term than after a period of adjustment had passed, a point explored more fully under point 4.

4. It is suggested here that some other forces may be at play. It was noticed during the questionnaire filling in sessions at W2-W4 (W1 was self administered) that participants responded in a general way rather than in a specific way when asked to rate the items. The decision was made that the researcher
would not question the response as the reason for going through the questionnaires with the participants was not to influence the responses but to simply assure participation with the study and prevent omissions. Much thought was given to this phenomenon at the time. Emotional bond to place, like any emotion, is embedded in a value system (Crawford, et al., 1992; Parkinson, 1995) and hence is closely tied to a constructivist position. If a participant’s value system contained the self concept ‘I am the sort of person who takes care of his home’ then this evaluation would override any enforced temporary lapse in behaviour expressing place attachment. The meaning of the temporary change would have been re-evaluated as not relating to the ‘real me’ whilst the responses to the items would reflect the core value system which did not change over time. For future research, the scale items need specifically to stress the momentary state in order to capture these emotive changes over time.

5. The possibility that the interpretation of the interview data is incorrect, and that there was in fact no change in attachment for the participants over the duration of the study, must not be dismissed without question. Nevertheless, the recurring examples in the interviews of reduced attachment to old Arkwright followed by strong attachment to the home in new Arkwright, make this explanation relatively unlikely. Another possibility is that place was of particular importance to these participants (why they remained in the study throughout the 4 data waves) and that this sample did not go through a process of detachment.

**Research Question 2.** Does participants’ psychological sense of community change across the four data waves? The results for the psychological sense of community (PSC) components indicate that participants experienced a significant decrease in PSC over time. This supports the interview data, which found a decline in sense of community between all waves apart from W1/W2. The decline in PSC was particularly marked for the sense of belonging component, which supports participants’ comments, e.g. “we have a lovely house and garden here but we don’t feel that we belong. We can’t explain it. It is as if we’ve been plunged in the middle of nowhere. I go through the motions, I tell myself that I should be grateful but it makes no difference.”

The scale presented no methodological difficulties as it has been validated for a wide range of populations and no items changed across the data waves. The retrospective perception of increased PSC in old Arkwright compared with that measured at the earlier, pre-move waves, is of methodological interest and serves to highlight the importance of adopting a longitudinal approach when the process of change is to be explored. It is, however, not claimed that a longitudinal design is free of recall biases or confounding of contextual (socio-historical or media influences at the time of sampling) and cohort/generational determinants (Breakwell & Fife-Schaw, 1995) but it is clear from these data that contemporary and retrospective judgements of PSC differ.
Research Question 3(a). Does place contribute to self-evaluation in four different ways which correspond to the four principles of identity?

The items for the Identity principle scale were all place related. These items loaded on 4 separate factors which, on inspection, can be described as relating to efficacy, self-esteem and continuity and distinctiveness. Therefore, the factor analysis supports the findings from the interview data that self esteem, continuity and efficacy are linked to place. The post-move interview data found also strong evidence for the distinctiveness principle but this was not clearly demonstrated in the survey data. As already explained in the results section, the W3 component was deemed unreliable. The items of the W4 component, although they were not the items intended for the distinctiveness component, these items obviously contributed to distinctiveness from the participants’ perception. It can, however, be said with confidence for at least 3 of the 4 components that these data support the anticipated result that place contributes to self-evaluation in ways which correspond to the principles of identity.

Research Question 3(b). Does place contribute to the maintenance of these four principles to a differing degree after the relocation? Although the question was asked whether place contributes to the maintenance of the four principles, a differentiation between W3 and W4 was not expected as there was no change in place and the time difference was only 18 months. Had the scale been used at the pre-relocation periods, a comparison between old and New Arkwright and over a longer period may have produced a measurable change. However, when looking at the means for each principle, in each case the mean is above the midpoint, hence, since only place related items were used in the scale, it can be concluded that place contributes to the maintenance of the four principles.

Research Question 4. Are there five distinct aspects of place attachment?

The concept that there are 5 aspects of place attachment emerged from the interview data and also has a base in Fuhrer & Kaiser’s (1992) theory, although the latter has a narrower focus (the home) than the concept of place attachment being studied here. A scale was devised for W4 to find out whether these aspects are distinct. The factor analysis and the low intercorrelation between the aspects supports their existence as distinct entities.

This quantitative support for the 5 aspects of place attachment is of importance as the basis for further theoretical development; in addition it has applied value. For future relocations, it would be of much practical use to concentrate on helping to create a sense of security for relocatees, to facilitate their appropriation of the new environment, to foster as much autonomy as feasible, to include stimulation needs in the design and to be aware of the need for place congruence.

Research Question 5. To what extent do each of the identity principles and each of the aspects of place attachment explain levels of place attachment after the relocation? To answer question 5, Multiple
Regression Analysis was carried out to determine the best predictors of each of the target variables (personal attachment, social attachment and behavioural attachment). Multiple regression analysis calculates the combined effect of a string of variables and hence is a more sophisticated analysis than Pearson’s Correlations. The findings will be discussed under the heading of each dependent variable.

1. Personal attachment. The identity principle ‘continuity of the self in old Arkwright’ is the strongest predictor. The negative relationship indicates that participants who yearn for the old life style are less likely to form a personal attachment to New Arkwright, thus continuity of the self in old Arkwright is an inhibitor to forming personal attachment. This finding has face validity. Self esteem, in contrast, is a facilitator of personal attachment. The zero order correlations between the identity principles and the aspects of place attachment are in most cases significant.

2. Social attachment. It is not surprising that ‘continuity of self in old Arkwright’ is the strongest predictor of social attachment since the items of both scales have the same focus and are highly correlated. Two other identity principles, self esteem and self efficacy are found to be facilitators of social attachment. The aspect place congruence is seen as an inhibitor, confirming the negative correlation as discussed previously.

3. Behavioural attachment. The highest predictor of participants forming behavioural attachment is stimulation. Examples of the stimulation items are: ‘my new home has given me more possibilities to do what I want to do’ and ‘I have felt more energetic since moving here’, hence stimulation can be seen as a predictor for behavioural place attachment. Of the identity principles, it is distinctiveness which predicts behavioural attachment. An example item is ‘I quickly managed to organise myself in the new place’, which could be seen as a distinctiveness item and thus it can be seen to enhance behavioural attachment.

In summary, the strongest findings were:

i) the change in psychological sense of community, which showed a decrease between waves 1/2 and waves 3/4, with the retrospective sense of belonging sub-scale (assessed at waves 3 and 4) showing a considerably higher measure than that taken at the time;

ii) that place contributes to self-evaluation in ways which correspond to the four principles of identity;

iii) that there is good support from these data for the five aspects of place attachment.
The methodological lessons from this analysis are that careful planning and piloting are needed when using scales in longitudinal studies to ensure that any changes in the wording necessitated by the changing context do not alter the meaning or role of the item in the research tool.

Chapter Eleven

Discussion

11.1 Introduction
The research presented here is framed within the transactional paradigm (Altman & Rogoff, 1987; Winkel, 1987), which assumes that the process of change involves a dynamic confluence of spatial, cultural and temporal aspects (Altman & Rogoff, 1987) and that individuals and groups influence and are influenced by their environment in a way which cannot be described adequately in terms of a direction of causality.

The transactional paradigm was considered appropriate for this work since it locates the psychological and social levels of analysis within the entire context of space, culture and time. Saegert & Winkel (1990) suggest that research needs to be contextualised if any progress is to be made in unravelling the complexities of human behaviour. This is a fundamental departure from traditional paradigms in psychology which view these complexities as problematic. Transactionalists, however, “embrace these limits as an accurate reflection of the complexity of human behaviour” (Altman & Rogoff, 1987, p. 513).

This research adopted a constructivist position in that it saw the ‘reality’ experienced by the participants as being shaped by the meanings they attribute to their social, physical and cultural environment. Within social constructivism this research adopted the ‘weak’ constructivist position, which allows for consideration of competing accounts of a situation. It also claims that attention to detail and repeated self questioning will allow the researcher to produce useful results which are capable of verification.

In this chapter, the main points emerging from the study are presented and the methodological and policy implications are discussed. Following the discussion there are recommendations for further analysis of the Arkwright data and directions for future empirical work.

11.2 The empirical findings and theoretical issues raised
This discussion examines insights gained from the data collected in connection with the Arkwright relocation and the contribution which this has made to the theoretical concepts discussed in the literature
review. This research differs from that undertaken for many PhD theses in that the objective of the whole study was not to test or develop a particular psychological theory, but to explore an event which was likely to have a significant psychological impact on the lives of the people involved. The primary aim was to use theoretical concepts to help gain an understanding (Chapters 7 and 9) but also to use the data to support and develop some existing theories (Chapter 8). As Kurt Lewin (1951) stated, “there is nothing so practical as a good theory” (p. 169). This research has involved the use of many different ‘good theories’ to help in the practical task of interpreting and understanding better what was occurring in the multi-faceted, and often confusing, relocation project of an entire community. It was felt that the subject matter and the data from this study were too intrinsically interesting and too fertile to limit this thesis to one theory.

Whilst it might be expected that the relocation would constitute a disruption for the residents, the sheer variety of ways in which this disruption revealed itself could not necessarily have been predicted. The wide range of theories and perspectives used in Chapter 7 to make sense of participants’ perceptions is an indicator of this. These include: Lee’s (1967) socio-spatial schemata; Archea’s (1977) visual access and visual exposure model; the concept of privacy regulation mechanisms and privacy as the currently desired level of interaction (Altman, 1975); Newell’s (1998) theory on privacy and changing cultures; places as sources of social memories (Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Milligan, 1998); social conformity (Asch, 1952); the guidance from others on how to interpret and behave in ambiguous situations (Sherif, 1966a); passive interactions (Festinger, et al., 1950); Hillier’s (1988) concept of the connectedness or isolation of different physical layouts of housing; and, changes from collective to individual functioning (McRobbie, 1991; Martin, 1981).

The first aim of this work was to describe the socio-psychological and behavioural effects of the spatial change, bearing in mind that the influence of place on person is neither one-way nor deterministic. The analysis of the interview data gave rise to a number of important issues. To begin with, the findings offer an interesting extension of Festinger, Schachter & Back’s (1950) conclusion that friendship patterns formed in new housing will depend on ‘physical and functional distance’. The Arkwright data show that, even with established neighbourhood friendships, the patterns of contact are altered by a change in physical and functional distance. It would have been fascinating to examine sociometric data about contacts between people before and after the move. This was seriously considered at T2 but it was decided that in terms of the project and research schedules and the time available for data collection between data waves it would have proved too difficult to add yet another perspective. In addition, it was not obvious in the early stages of the relocation project that the degree of interaction amongst the Arkwright residents would change so significantly nor that it would prove to be such an important factor in the T4 and T5 interviews.
As described in Chapter 2, Mayo (1979) claims that there is more neighbourhood contact on cul de sacs than on straight or curved streets. Whilst there is no quantitative data on the frequency of interactions in the old and the new village, the interview data strongly suggest that the opposite is the case, at least when comparing the amount of interaction on the straight streets in old Arkwright with that in the cul de sacs of New Arkwright. Mayo, however, is referring to what Festinger, Schachter & Back (1950) would term ‘passive contacts’, and their prediction of increased frequency of interactions in cul de sacs can perhaps be explained in terms of the greater number of encounters likely amongst a particular number of individuals if there is only one entrance or exit to the area. Since a smaller number of individuals are encountered and with relatively greater frequency than in a through road, it can be assumed that greater friendliness might ensue. When comparing old and New Arkwright, it should be noted that not only has the spatial layout changed but also the density of people per acre has decreased, the topography is different and people’s familiar patterns of interaction have been disrupted. It is unsurprising, therefore, that less interaction occurred, although the degree of the reduction, as described by the participants, was unexpected. This reduction over time and the multi-faceted changing circumstances do not, therefore, contradict Mayo’s finding which relates to a synchronic comparison of interaction in cul de sac and street layouts but the changes point to the importance of taking into account the entire context of the situations under study. The villagers’ views, however, would seem to favour Hillier’s (1988) argument that the spatial layout of housing should encourage people to enter and pass through rather than forming enclosures. The grid layout of old Arkwright provided extremely high connectivity, a marked contrast with the labyrinthine layout of New Arkwright.

The conclusions from the interview data about social contact and the change in the sense of community are supported by the findings from the quantitative data which show a significant reduction in the psychological sense of community after the relocation.

The curvilinear design of New Arkwright created some difficulties and obstacles for the residents in terms of wayfinding and in terms of the perceived ease of visiting others. Lee’s (1967) model of socio-spatial schemata helped explain some of the anxieties expressed by participants and the reluctance of a number of residents to venture out of their homes. Lee points to the importance of spatial cognition to normal functioning, the need for detailed knowledge of the local geography and the ability to navigate to avoid feelings of helplessness and a sense of being lost. In addition, the lack of meeting points denied participants the motivation to work towards achieving control over their new environment.

Archea’s (1973; 1977) work on visual access and visual exposure addresses the loss people felt when their visual access was curtailed. Old Arkwright provided easy access and exposure. In contrast, the curved street layout and high fences of the new village limit access and exposure. Further old Arkwright was in an elevated position whereas New Arkwright nestles in a depression. An additional feature
which provided access and exposure in the old village was the right of way along the backs of the terraces. The design of the new village limited opportunities for gathering information and for synchronisation of behaviours in the new socio-spatial setting. ‘I hear nothing now, ... I see nothing now ... and I know nothing now’ (Chapter 7) is a compelling summing up of how this participant experienced her new surroundings. The restriction imposed on hearing, seeing and knowing by the architectural design was experienced as social isolation, especially by those participants who could or would not venture out.

Closely connected to visual access and exposure is privacy (Altman, 1975; Newell, 1998). Participants’ accounts suggest that previously learned privacy mechanisms are context specific and can become inappropriate when the structural setting changes. Passive encounters had become rare in New Arkwright and people needed actively to seek social interaction, yet making a formal arrangement to meet someone was not part of the old Arkwrightian behaviour pattern and presented difficulties for many.

Linked to visual access and privacy concepts are social-psychological theories of conformity (Asch, 1952) and taking the lead from others when in doubt (Sherif, 1966a). It was easy in old Arkwright to synchronize behaviour with others due to the availability of visual access and exposure but this informational support was not available in New Arkwright. This contributed to the marked increase in individual functioning as participants withdrew into their private domains and focussed their attention on their gardens and properties, developing their individual selves and thereby reducing the salience of their previously important collective selves.

The second aim of this work was to explore the meanings which these adjustments held for the participants over time and how these meanings may influence identity. Places are important sources of identity (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Bonaiuto, et al., 1996; Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Twigger-Ross, et al., in preparation) because they embody social symbols and are invested with social meanings. Places become elements of identity since they support and maintain distinctiveness, self esteem, self efficacy and the continuity of the self (Breakwell, 1996). This second aim involved an examination of the degree to which the participants’ identity processes were affected by changes in the spatial environment. More specifically, it questioned whether the spatial change involved in the relocation threatened or enhanced the four principles of identity and whether it made these principles differentially salient over time. Each principle is considered below.

**The principle of distinctiveness.** The Arkwright residents, when in old Arkwright, showed a marked aversion to and depreciation of individual distinctiveness. The emphasis was on ‘being the same’ and this was clearly positively evaluated by many residents. There was evidence that the villagers felt their
village and village community to be distinctive and this was evaluated positively by them. Following
the relocation of the village, the trend was for the focus on the uniqueness of the community to be
relegated to the past and there was an increasing salience of individual distinctiveness, although not all
residents evaluated this positively. It is of interest that none of the participants referred to community
distinctiveness at T4 and T5. Vignoles, et al. (in press) discuss the proposition made by other writers
that distinctiveness is culturally dependent. They propose that although the manner in which
distinctiveness is manifest varies between cultures, there is evidence for an underlying, positively
evaluated distinctiveness principle. This extends Breakwell’s theory that identity principles may be
culturally dependent (Breakwell, 1986). Whilst the finding that the Arkwright villagers positively
evaluated distinctiveness at the collective level can be seen as supporting Vignoles and colleagues, the
clear negative evaluation of individual distinctiveness amongst the villagers when in old Arkwright does
highlight the complexity of the question of ‘distinctiveness’. The sameness, the undifferentiated group
salience (Yuki & Brewer, 1999) had already diminished in part when the mining industry collapsed.
The relocation of the villagers into a different spatial environment and demolition of old Arkwright
further increased this decline of the undifferentiated collective group representation. This changing
social context facilitated priority to the individual distinctiveness motivation for villagers. This study
thus provides clear evidence for a culturally determined negative evaluation of overt individual
distinctiveness (without recourse to examples from exotic and distant cultures). It also provides an
account of how this negative evaluation changed when the socio-spatial environment changed.

Self-esteem. As was noted in Chapter 8, participants focussed on collective self esteem at T1 and T2 but
there was no mention of such collective self esteem post-relocation. The relocation process appeared to
lower self esteem between T1 and T3 through two mechanisms: people’s inability to deal with the
project staff effectively and attain their goals, and the apparent deterioration in the appearance of the
village as people no longer maintained their soon-to-be-demolished properties or the village. The
feeling that others had a low opinion of the villagers (as the villagers interpreted the poor brickwork or
lack of landscaping along the Dell and the Lake) was still salient at T4, although villagers’ self esteem
gradually increased once the relocation was complete and they felt that they had gained something
positive which reflected upon themselves. As was found with the distinctiveness principle, self esteem
also underwent a change in emphasis from collective self-esteem, evident at the early stages of the
project, to individual self-esteem during and after the relocation.

Self efficacy. Whilst the distinction between self-esteem and self-efficacy is conceptually clear in the
writings of Breakwell (1992) and others, in terms of classifying the quotations from the participants to
this study, it was often extremely difficult to categorise them unambiguously. Participants rarely gave
explicit examples of either self esteem or self efficacy. For this reason, the findings on self-efficacy
were not as clear as for the other three identity principles. The findings do, however, point to one
important issue, i.e. they show that efficacy is not automatically transferred to a new context. Participants who had been efficacious in old Arkwright but who could not cope with all the different demands at once (e.g. unpacking belongings, building fitted units, gardening, new household equipment) and who therefore did not feel efficacious in New Arkwright, felt alienated and seemed less able to create an emotional bond with their new home. In addition, being able to act efficaciously in the new environment also increased self esteem and distinctiveness although the reverse was also the case. It was particularly difficult for some elderly people who felt they had neither the physical nor the mental energy to ‘start again’, yet not starting again meant that they could not appropriate their new home with a concomitant decline in all principles of identity.

**Continuity of the self.** As might be expected, references to continuity and discontinuity were most frequent in the two interviews around the time of the relocation (T3 and T4) but in contrast to the previous principles, continuity was a recurring topic in all the interviews. It will be recalled that residents’ comments on continuity and discontinuity were classified into three groups: those concerned with collective continuity, those concerned with spatial continuity, and those relating the continuity of the self through possessions. Interestingly, continuity through possessions was not acknowledged as important by many of the Arkwright residents, their preference being to have everything new for the new house. This could suggest that, for those participants, their identity was not felt to be partially enshrined in their possessions. This interpretation would be in contrast to the findings of other authors (e.g. Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981; Belk, 1992) who state that possessions enhance our feeling of being in control and allow us to communicate our identity to ourselves and others. It could, however, be interpreted that those participants intentionally wanted to shed the identity reflected in the old belongings and begin afresh. This may certainly have been the case for some. A third possibility lies in people’s perception that a newly built house has to have new furniture, etc., that it would be inappropriate to furnish it with old belongings. This was often the reason given when participants were asked at T2 and T3 as to why they were not taking their present belongings with them.

For a number of participants, their need for continuity with the previous life style was not salient until after the relocation and people began to talk nostalgically about the old village. Milligan (1998) suggests that nostalgia is a means of creating subjective continuity, providing the link with the past. Since the demolition of old Arkwright removed all place-dependent mnemonic devices of people’s personal and collective past, therefore denying a physical link with the past, photographs were often used to retain the image of site-specific memories.

The changes in behaviour patterns described in Chapter 7 resulted in perceived collective discontinuities which some residents continued to find disturbing, even at Time 5. They had lost the ‘weak ties’ to which Granovetter (1982) refers. It is interesting to note that the need for this collective continuity was
in general not salient until after the relocation; until then, the continuity of the village community was, it must be assumed, simply taken for granted.

To summarise the findings on continuity, aspects of continuity were evident at all 5 Time phases. If the salience of an aspect of continuity in the interviews is taken as an indication of the perceived level of threat to a related aspect of the person’s identity, then it was the anticipated loss of the village as a physical structure, representing episodes in participants’ lives, which was the primary cause of concern during T1 and T2. The finding that this topic was seldom mentioned at Times 4 and 5 is surprising, considering the findings from the Channel Tunnel study on how disorienting those residents had found not being able to locate long-familiar pieces of their environment. For Arkwrightians, it was mostly the loss of continuity of the social group which became the focus at the post-move phases.

It was suggested in Chapter 8 that the data differentiated between participants who perceived themselves as ‘static selves’, located in a past time frame and others who perceived themselves as ‘developing selves’, located in a future time frame. For some, old Arkwright was seen as being part of themselves whilst for others, the enforced relocation represented a welcome new beginning in their lives with little disruption to their identity structure. This difference in response illustrates the dynamic nature of the relationship between place and identity, with place embodying social symbols and being invested with social meanings and importance.

With each identity principle, it must be borne in mind that the interview data did not allow any clear distinction to be made between topics which were simply not salient for the villagers and topics whose expression was suppressed by a social norm about, for example, not boasting. Hence, the strongest claim that can be made is that participants did not give any evidence of positively valuing self-efficacy at Times 1 and 2. Whether this is because they subscribed to a social norm of not boasting of their self-efficacy, or because self-efficacy was not a salient issue to them, or because they did not feel self-efficacious, cannot be stated with certainty. However, in the case of distinctiveness, since a number of interviewees expressed clear statements approving of the lack of individual distinctiveness in old Arkwright, this problem of interpretation does not arise and thus it can be claimed with more certainty that the relocation saw a change in emphasis from collective distinctiveness (and a deprecation of individual distinctiveness) at the early stages of the relocation to the emphasis on individual distinctiveness in New Arkwright which is more typical of current British society.

The exploration of Breakwell’s theory brought to light some other important theoretical points. Firstly, the evidence presented here suggests that place is an integral part of identity and plays an important role in maintaining and/or enhancing the four principles of identity. As such, place is an important link to identity since it organizes both the past experiences of individuals over time and their subjective
interpretations. Results of the multiple regression analysis show that the principle of self esteem is a predictor of personal place attachment but that the principle of continuity, which represented continuity with old Arkwright, predicts a negative relationship with personal attachment to New Arkwright. Social attachment is strongly predicted by the principle of continuity but the fact that it is negatively predicted by self esteem, efficacy and place congruence indicates nevertheless the relationship between attachment and identity.

Secondly, the data supports Breakwell’s suggestion that the four principles are culturally dependent and time dependent. Breakwell raises the question of the relative salience of the four principles in controlling identity processes, suggesting that “in all probability the salience-hierarchy will be situation-specific and temporally relative” (1988, p. 195). The data discussed in Chapter 8 show that, indeed, the relative salience of each identity principle can change considerably over time during a situation of major change for the individual. A related point is Breakwell’s (1988) observation that the identity principles may be culturally and historically specific: that is, there may be broad changes over time in “what society regards as acceptable endstates for identity; when society changes, they will change” (p. 196). The Arkwright example is a fascinating confirmation of this, in that the relocation triggered a relatively sudden cultural change (one which, as already discussed, may have been latent for some time) and in particular, the change in evaluation of the identity principle of distinctiveness was clear.

Thirdly, as discussed in Chapter 3, Breakwell considers that being in a new place may result in closely related changes to identity and to the evaluation of the previous place: either ‘dislocation’ from previous identity/location evaluations, now irrelevant, or a more positive evaluation of the previous place (Breakwell, 1996). This is evident from the interviews and can be clearly seen from the survey data when participants rated the psychological sense of community significantly higher retrospectively than they had done previously. It is also possible, according to IPT, for the new place to be perceived as a threat to identity if it presents new content or causes a change in the evaluations composing the previous identity. The Arkwright data demonstrate examples of all three of the reactions to a new place described by Breakwell, dislocation, re-evaluation of the past place in a positive direction, and the new place as threat to identity.

It is suggested that a further factor must be taken into account when applying IPT in certain cultural contexts, namely the operation of the principles along a dimension from the individual to the collective level. This new factor clearly emerges as important from the Arkwright data. Thus, Breakwell’s theory has been supported and, at the same time, extended by the findings from this study of the relocation of Arkwright.
The findings of this thesis also support Timotijevic (submitted) and Thoits (1991) who claim that reactions to threats from the environment cannot be understood without taking into account how identity will make particular aspects of the environment differentially salient. Twigger-Ross & Uzzell (1996) concluded that attachment to a local area was used by people to help maintain their identity, with differences between people in their degree of attachment corresponding to a difference in their reference to distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy and self-esteem when discussing the locale. Thus, this thesis supports the findings of all three studies which point to the role of place in forming and supporting identity.

The third aim of this work was to find factors which, when present, are likely to facilitate place attachment but when absent are likely to inhibit place attachment. These factors began to emerge at T2 and were confirmed in later time phases. They were named ‘aspects of attachment to place’ and comprise a sense of security; a sense of autonomy; the desire and ability to engage in appropriation; an optimal level of internal and external stimulation; and place congruence. It was suggested that these aspects not only lead to place attachment but were also found to be necessary to maintain it.

As described in Chapter 9, Fuhrer & Kaiser’s (1992) work moved the theory of place attachment forward by presenting emotional needs as facilitators of place attachment and stated that places are experienced in terms of these emotions. In the Arkwright context, Fuhrer & Kaiser’s (1992) emotional needs (security, autonomy and arousal) were amended and extended. Arousal was changed to internal and external stimulation (i.e. stimulation within and outside the home) as this was more appropriate for the Arkwright context. One important addition was made, that of the desire and ability to engage in appropriation. This aspect and the aspect of place congruence is inherent in Fuhrer & Kaiser’s interpersonal processes: place as carrier of identity (the self receiving information) and place as facilitator of social processes (others receiving information about the self). The personalisation of the new property through the act of ‘doing’, the newly accumulated meanings and memories relating to the place reflect identity to the self and communicate aspects of the self to others. Thus, place provides a clear link with identity and the relationship is dynamic.

Place congruence was also found to be an important aspect of place attachment. Place congruence can be an immediate feeling when entering a place or it can be achieved through appropriation of a place. The lack of 3-D models of the new property and village made it difficult for participants to form an anticipatory sense of congruence. There was evidence of a dynamic relationship between appropriation and congruence, in that perceived congruence resulted in active appropriation which, in turn increased place congruence.
The need for and loss of external stimulation may be particularly relevant to the Arkwright context. The lack of communal facilities, the labyrinthine street layout and the need for new socio-spatial schemata all contributed to the much reported ‘ghost’ town effect. For a community with a highly salient collective identity this change presented difficulties in that the group’s invisibility resulted in feelings of isolation. By T5 most participants had forged an emotional bond to their home but not necessarily to the village.

Also important to forming an emotional bond to place was a sense of security. Both physical and psychological insecurity were evident in the interviews. Physical security was perceived as higher in New Arkwright because of lockable windows, burglar alarms and the increased use of private telephones. Psychological security, however, was reduced because participants could no longer depend on others seeing or hearing when they might need help. Thus, the relationship between security and place attachment is strongly mediated by the meanings which the various aspects of security have for the person involved.

The sense of lack of control over the relocation process resulted in much anger and frustration. This lack of autonomy made it difficult for participants to form an anticipatory attachment to their new property. The project management style also focused on individual problem solving which may have contributed to the change from collective to individual functioning. In New Arkwright, autonomy issues were no longer salient, indicating that this aspect of place attachment becomes salient only when it is threatened.

These five aspects of place attachment were also supported by the quantitative data, which showed evidence of the aspects of place attachment as distinct entities. There was also evidence that place contributes to self evaluation in ways which correspond to the four principles of identity.

Although this work has made a contribution by expanding Fuhrer & Kaiser’s work on the process of place attachment, further research is needed to establish whether these five aspects of place attachment are apparent in other research contexts.

The analysis of the quantitative data as described in Chapter 10 showed that the participants’ psychological sense of community changed significantly across the four data waves. This finding supports the interview data which found a decline in the sense of belonging between all waves except W1/W2 and this may have been a contributory factor in the transition from collective to individual functioning.

Surprisingly, there was no significant difference found between the data waves for the three sub-scales measuring attachment to place. It was suggested that the emotional bond to place, like any emotion, is
embedded in a value system and that the meaning of the temporary change between W1 and W4 would have been re-evaluated at pre- or post-relocation waves as not relating to the ‘real me’ and thus the responses to the items would reflect the core value system which would not change over time. Future longitudinal research should specifically stress the momentary state in order to capture these emotive changes over time.

11.3 Methodological limitations
This study did not follow either the idiographic or the nomothetic approaches normally adopted in qualitative and quantitative studies, although it could perhaps be described as an idiographic study of many. This approach presented a number of difficulties.

11.3.1 Problems with data collection. Problems with data collection arose not only because of logistical difficulties (e.g. the distance between the researcher’s base and Arkwright) but also because of the initial unwillingness of villagers to take part in the study. T1 and W1 were characterized by rejection of the researcher by many of the villagers involved in the project. It was only through the researcher establishing a relationship with participants that trust was developed and they began to talk freely. It should be emphasized that participation in a single research interview does not require the development of the same level of relationship which is, however, of crucial importance for the success of a longitudinal qualitative study of this kind. It was necessary for the researcher to be able to convey to her participants her genuine interest in and concern about their experiences. Acceptance of the researcher improved during T2 and did not present a problem for the remainder of the study.

A further problem, especially at T1, was that frequently friends or relatives of the participant would join the interview, having seen the researcher enter a particular house. This could be viewed as advantageous since, as in focus groups, ideas would be generated by the group but it was also of concern since dominant opinions of others could influence the interviewee. This happened less during the T2 data collection as strategies were developed by the researcher to gain private interviews. When transcribing the ‘group’ interviews, only the words of the participant were transcribed, although the presence of others was noted. Sometimes it was possible, at a later point, to check with the participants whether they now agreed with their previous statements which may have been influenced by others but it is impossible to say whether even a revised opinion was purely that of the participant. This is a methodological problem which would only occur in such a close community and prior to the outsider (the researcher) earning the trust of the villagers. This was therefore much less of a problem after T1.

Another critique of the methodology is the possibility that participants mentioned a subject, such as ‘security’, only because the researcher had raised the subject during the interview. Interviews were generally lengthy, however, and participants often strayed widely from the subject of the questions
which they had been asked. Subjects which did not interest them tended to receive either a very brief reply or one which quickly moved on to a topic which the participant wished to discuss. The researcher deliberately allowed this to occur, within her time constraints, in order to be sure that she was eliciting all the topics which were of concern to the interviewees. Hence, if a participant did not respond to the topic ‘security’ phenomenologically, it would not be included in the qualitative analysis since only a deeper level of understanding would be noted.

11.3.2 Problems with analysis. The main difficulty with this work has been the scale of the research project. Although the PhD itself, undertaken part-time, has taken only 5 years, the research was actually begun more than 4 years before that. The sheer volume of data amassed during the entire period would have required many years to analyse in detail, even though much of the preliminary transcription had been carried out as data collection was still progressing. The data included 259 interviews of between one and three hours each; four sets of responses to 100 questionnaires; notes from telephone conversations; observations; general conversations between interviews; and interviews with architects, British Coal officials, local councillors and project office staff. Due to the volume of the data and in order to take full advantage of the ability, within the longitudinal design of this study, to trace the changes through the five time periods for each specific individual, it was decided to concentrate on the 22 participants who had contributed to at least four of the five data collection phases. This resulted in 104 interviews (the transcripts of approximately 200 hours of taped material) to be used as the basis for the final analysis. The 155 interviews from those participants who were excluded from the main analysis on the criteria described above were nevertheless transcribed and the material used to verify the emerging categories from the 104 selected interviews.

One important benefit of the sequence of the research adopted by the researcher is that the final coding of this material was carried out over a relatively short time period (about 8 months) at a point in time when the researcher was extremely familiar with the issues involved. Working in this concentrated manner at the end of the data collection phases meant that the coding was reasonably consistent across the body of interviews, something that would have been much more difficult to achieve over a prolonged period of time. Billig’s (1997) point that the analysis is achieved through writing, was only properly understood during the process of writing up this thesis. “There is no substitute for drafting and re-drafting, trying out ways of analysis, and then abandoning them. In short, progress can be judged by the volume of unsatisfactory drafts in the waste-paper basket. ... The final draft is only final in the sense that the analyst feels that, for reasons of deadlines, exhaustion or boredom, no further improvements are likely to be made and that the current draft contains analyses which might be of interest to readers. In this respect, all analyses - including those which are finally published - can only be provisional” (p. 47).
Since the transcription and categorisation processes are themselves immensely time-consuming, the analysis, writing/thinking and re-writing/re-thinking can easily become squashed into what feels to be an inadequate time-frame. It took the encouragement of a colleague to put this into perspective when she said: “You will never be able to do justice to the ideas nor the people involved and perhaps that’s the beauty of it. Otherwise the path of enquiry would have been closed long ago. It is the journey that matters.”

Regarding the quantitative data collection, there is little guidance in the methodology literature on the undertaking of longitudinal studies which are initially exploratory in nature and during which the conditions change, rendering some of the initial instruments of measurement inappropriate or inadequate. This was especially a problem regarding rating scales and other quantitative instruments, where the wording of the questions and even some entire question items and sections had to be changed to make sense in the prevailing situation (as described in Chapter 6). Whilst the researcher recognizes that some of the decisions made about the quantitative scales were, in retrospect, not the best options, there was little explanation in the literature about questionnaire construction when longitudinal quantitative studies are based on interview data derived from a social constructivist epistemology. This is an important gap in methodological writings.

Squire (in press) points to the importance of ‘thinking through’ the complex dialogues between self and other, and the patterns of truth and fiction involved when ‘research’ becomes the generation of plausible narrative. To do justice to the residents’ perspectives, it was necessary for the researcher to utilize her understanding of the participants, gained from previous interviews and numerous contacts with them over the 6 years of data collection for this project. The ‘data’, per se, are open to a number of interpretations and a number of different uses. It is only by applying the knowledge of the participants and through careful and extensive re-analysis of the interviews that the set of quotations and their interpretation given here have been selected.

11.3.3 Using a multi-methodological approach. Problems connected with the integration of different research methods are mentioned in the research literature (e.g. Mason, 1996). Despite this there is still not enough knowledge about the interactions between different methods. It is also not clear whether useful and valid conclusions can be drawn from data derived from different methodological approaches whether or not they are in agreement.

The researcher was, at times, more aware of questions being answered differently than would normally be the case because the researcher had carried out both the interviews and the filling in of the questionnaires for the participants. It was noted that participants’ answers were often complex and represented multiple realities. When Enid was asked, for example, whether her relationship with her
close friends had changed in any way, she replied: “Not really, you chat when you see them but you … you don’t know what’s happening in their lives, day to day” (T5.txt: 544-546). If Enid had been asked to convert the first part of her answer into a number for the questionnaire study, it may well have given a false indication of her true feelings, which are clearly that the relationship had changed, i.e. she no longer knows what is happening in her friends’ day-to-day lives. This phenomenon may occur because the meaning is negotiated (e.g. Berger & Luckmann, 1967) and constructed through verbalisation. In addition, the initial response may be how she had felt in the past or what the participant preferred to think in order to preserve an equilibrium. Another example arose in connection with the in-depth schedule for T5 which contained one numerical question for addition to the SPSS raw data file. The question was, “How satisfied are you with the way the new village is functioning?” The response range was from 1 very dissatisfied to 5 very satisfied. It was noticeable how often participants would respond with ‘satisfied’ but when asked, ‘What is it that makes you feel satisfied’, the participants description of their satisfaction would be clearly different to the rating which they had given initially. This was of great concern to the researcher but it was decided to leave the initial response in place (since it was being added to the SPSS data file where all other responses were initial responses). The concern is whether, if initial responses to a question differ from verbally constructed responses, the resultant data is truly comparable. There is no way of judging which may be the more ‘truthful’ response at that point in time. It is important to be aware of these complexities and to recognize that it may not always be possible to compare or look for support from one methodology to the other.

11.4 Transferability of findings to other contexts

It is suggested that the findings of this work can be transferred to any contextually similar study. Whilst Arkwright cannot be described as a representative British village, its historical specificity may be relevant to another mining community. Hence the context of this study has been reported in detail to allow others to judge the transferability of the conclusions. The issues addressed, however, are not only relevant to a close community like Arkwright. It is suggested that issues of identity and place attachment, including the five aspects of place attachment, are applicable to a much wider sample. Whilst the relocation of an entire community is a rare event, there are several other examples of enforced relocation to which the findings of this thesis could be applied, e.g. refurbishment of housing estates, major construction projects and contamination of inhabited areas by industry.

11.5 Policy implications

The policy implications of the Arkwright study regarding the village layout cannot be prescriptive, since each context is unique. There are, however, several key points which should be considered when the cohesiveness of the group is of importance. In the case of Arkwright the intention to relocate the entire community was clearly expressed by the North East Derbyshire District Council. It follows from this that the design of the new village should have concentrated on the needs of the community.
The findings of this study highlight the need for planners to ensure that public facilities are available for use at the commencement of the relocation rather than after it is completed. The complete absence, in the early stages of the relocation, and in some cases for up to two years thereafter, of facilities such as a shop, a post-office and public telephones inhibited appropriation of the new village and established new patterns of behaviour which may be difficult for some residents to overcome.

Another planning recommendation for the design of a new village is that node points, where pathways cross and people are likely to meet, should be included in the design and that public seating should be provided there. This follows Hillier’s (1988) recommendations as discussed in Chapter 7. In a context where there is a strong existing sense of community, care should be taken to ensure that the layout reflects and supports existing networks of interaction.

Accurate information about the timetable is one factor which was missing for much of the duration of the Arkwright project. People’s expectations about the time scale could have been better managed, a process common in ‘change management’ within the business world but apparently not yet incorporated universally into public policy.

There was little preparation for the impending spatial change. A three dimensional model of the village would have been helpful. Spatial cognition has been found to be highly important to normal functioning (Lee, 1967). There is much research which states that the ‘imagibility’ of two-dimensional plans is poor for people without training. A model would have enabled people to assess better the distance between houses and facilities and the contours of the land.

The whole relocation process could have been made much more positively beneficial if there had been greater genuine concern for the residents and their needs. It appears that the dismissal of the community architects left the onus for such concern with the project office staff who were not sufficiently well trained for this task.

As discussed in Chapter 10, for future relocations, it would be of practical value to focus on place attachment aspects, i.e. to create a sense of security for relocatees, to facilitate their appropriation of the new environment, to foster as much autonomy as feasible, to include stimulation needs in the design and to be aware of the need for place congruence.

11.6 Suggestions for further work
Only a small proportion of the qualitative data obtained during this study has been used for this thesis. The remainder of the data could be used to form the basis for a number of future studies. There are also some suggestions for future empirical work related to the findings of this thesis.

### 11.6.1 Further use of the qualitative data

There are two areas of the data which it was not possible to include in this thesis but which would repay further analysis.

1. **Stress and coping strategies.** There is much research (e.g. Fisher & Cooper, 1990) which states that any life transition, even when experienced as positive, could be potentially stressful. Coping strategies may be effective (resulting in adaptive outcomes) or they may be ineffective (resulting in maladaptive outcomes). Identity processes and principles could be more fully explained by examining coping strategies and their consequences. This is an important aspect of Breakwell’s ‘threat to identity’ model. The Arkwright data could contribute by helping to establish whether coping is historically (context and culture) determined as well as being determined by individuals responding to their need for distinctiveness, self esteem, self efficacy and continuity.

2. **Consultation vs Public Participation.** The principles embodied in ‘Social Architecture’ (Hatch, 1984) have been considered seriously and put into practice since the 1970s. There remain, however, many different perspectives on how the involvement of the user group can be or should be achieved, ranging from a token consultation to a full public participation. In the case of the design of New Arkwright, the community architects made design decisions and then looked for approval from the residents. Apart from the consideration of autonomy as one of the aspects of place attachment, as discussed in Chapter 9, there are a number of other questions which should be addressed. These include: did the villagers possess sufficient information to be able to make the decisions which they were asked to make; did their involvement in the process assist community development; was the process used to empower participants and to develop a sense of ownership of the new village; and, can the change from collective to individual functioning be attributed, in part, to the management of the design process?

### 11.6.2 Future empirical research

It is suggested that future empirical research within the following areas could aid further develop of the theories used in this study:

The Arkwright data analysis suggested that there are at least three different qualities of the identity state ‘continuity of the self’. The distinction between collective continuity, spatial continuity and the continuity provided by possessions may be specific to the Arkwright context. This should be explored to look at the implications not only for Identity Process Theory but also in order to further the understanding of the links between identity and place.
It was found that although conceptually the distinction between the principles is clear, when operationalized the principles of distinctiveness and efficacy overlap with self esteem. It should be noted that Vignoles, *et al.* (in press) suggest that there is a difference between the basic function of distinctiveness in giving meaning to identity and the additional function of positive distinctiveness in self esteem enhancement and that it is only the latter which overlaps with self esteem. Clarification of the principle of efficacy may result in a similar finding.

The aspects of place attachment, i.e. security, autonomy, appropriation, stimulation and congruence, need to be examined in a different context to establish whether they were specific to the Arkwright relocation or can be replicated in other situations.

Analysis of the qualitative data suggested that the more meaningful transactions are with place, the more likely it is that an emotional bond with place (place attachment) will develop and that meaning derived within this place will, through identity processes, be assimilated/accommodated into the person’s identity structure. This remains to be demonstrated empirically across different contexts and cultures.

### 11.7 Expanding theoretical boundaries
This section now takes a different perspective in that it revisits some of the theories described in Chapter 2 and summarizes the theoretical advances made in this thesis.

- The theoretical papers by Proshansky on place identity (1978), Proshansky, Fabian & Kaminoff (1983) and Proshansky & Fabian (1987) were an important milestone in that they initiated the inclusion of the spatial environment in the identity construct. These authors conceptualized ‘place identity’ “as a substructure of the person’s self-identity” (Proshansky & Fabian, 1987, p. 22). The Arkwright study, however, suggests that identity is not a distinct entity which can be separated into substructures but that identity is shaped through dynamic complex interaction with the social and spatial environment. This has been illustrated in detail in Chapters 8 and 9. The Arkwright study demonstrated that the concept of ‘place identity’ as a substructure of identity does not reflect the full impact which place has on the whole of a person’s identity. It is this more comprehensive perspective which needs to be developed.

- Chapter 8 uses Identity Process Theory (Breakwell, 1986; 1992) as a framework in order to clarify the relationship between identity and place. Breakwell sees the identity structure as resulting from a dynamic process between intra-psychic and social influences within a developmental and temporal framework. This research, however, demonstrates that a spatial framework is of equal importance in that it helps maintain and/or enhance the four principles of identity. Additionally it has been
demonstrated that place organizes past experiences over time, and their subjective interpretations, and hence plays an important role in forming and supporting a person’s identity.

- Traditionally social psychologists have focused on self esteem as the motivating basis of identity. Breakwell (1986; 1992) proposes that the principles of distinctiveness, continuity and self efficacy may be of equal importance. More recently other theorists have gathered evidence for Breakwell’s position (e.g. Deaux, 1993; Vignoles, 2000; Reicher, in press; Timotijevic, submitted). This thesis supports the inclusion of all four motivating principles. However, this study also found that in order to operationalize the principles effectively, a more detailed description of the function of each principle is necessary (as described in the previous section of this chapter).

- Principles are context specific. This was clearly demonstrated with each principle, as detailed in Chapter 8. Of particular interest is the finding that a new spatial environment needs to facilitate subjective functioning at an optimal level. If the ability to function is curtailed then a previous sense of self efficacy is not automatically transferred to the new context.

- It has been suggested that a further factor of identity must be taken into account when applying Identity Process Theory, namely the operation of the identity principles which include both personal and social elements of identity. This new factor clearly emerged as important from the Arkwright data. Not only do principles achieve priority according to the social context but also depending on whether the emphasis is on the personal or the social elements of identity. This research provides clear evidence of a culturally determined negative evaluation of overt individual distinctiveness, self esteem, self efficacy and continuity and provides an account of how this negative evaluation changed when the socio-spatial environment changed.

- Earlier writers (e.g. Fried, 1963) conceptualized place attachment as akin to the Bowlby-Ainsworth’s attachment theory. Giuliani (in preparation) suggests, however, that the phenomenon of place attachment is characterized by its dynamic relationship between place and person, whereas the Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory assumes persistence throughout different life stages, thereby conceptualizing the phenomenon as static. This study is situated in the transactional paradigm which argues that the process of change involves a dynamic confluence of spatial, cultural and temporal aspects (Altman & Rogoff, 1987). Thus, this work underlines the importance to the formation and maintenance of place attachment of the social and psychological changes which accompany, are influenced by and themselves influence the changes in the villagers’ spatial environment. This emphasizes the absolutely dynamic relationship between person, group and place.
• Festinger, Schachter & Back’s (1950) finding that friendship patterns formed in the new housing will depend on ‘physical and functional distance’ is clearly supported. The Arkwright study, however, goes beyond this finding in that it shows that established friendship patterns can disintegrate when physical and functional distances are altered. This has practical importance in terms of the planning and organisation of the refurbishment of housing estates and the resulting relocation of residents.

• As described in Chapter 9, the set of emotional needs posited by Fuhrer & Kaiser (1992) as underlying place attachment (i.e. security, autonomy and arousal) were amended and extended. An additional important aspect was found in the Arkwright context, i.e. the desire and ability to engage in appropriation of the home and the village, underlining the dynamic relationship between person and place and supporting the link between place and identity.

The five aspects of place attachment (a sense of security; a sense of autonomy; the desire and ability to engage in appropriation; an optimal level of internal and external stimulation; and place congruence) need to be tested further to establish whether they are also apparent in different research contexts. If supported in other studies this conceptualisation would be of great value as it would provide a relatively easy check list to help accelerate the formation of place attachment during future relocation processes.

• This is an unusual study in that it uses a multi-methodological approach, is longitudinal (5 time phases over a 6 year period) and is situated in the transactional paradigm. The methodological problems arising have been discussed and should stimulate debate as to whether useful and valid conclusions can be drawn from data derived from different methodological approaches; whether there are better ways of representing the ‘unspoken’ knowledge of participants’ narratives gained from numerous contacts over time; the empirical difficulties of conducting longitudinal research when the phenomena themselves are changing over time and the research design needs to be adjusted; and the empirical difficulties of carrying out research within the transactional paradigm. To locate the psychological and social levels of analysis within the entire context of space, culture and time is enormously difficult and warrants further discussion of the practical challenges and implications.

11.8 Conclusion
This work provides a detailed and eventful picture of the Arkwright relocation process. It also provides insights into the process of attachment to place and identity processes and ways in which the identity processes are related to place. The emphasis was on understanding participants’ perspectives and defining phenomena in terms of experienced meanings. Reference has been made to many different theories from a variety of psychological and social science disciplines. This was necessary to explore
which of the theories could best explain participants’ responses to their changed socio-spatial environment.

The Arkwright relocation provided an abrupt and clear incident of socio-spatial change affecting individual and collective levels of functioning. As part of the study of the relocation process it was discovered that there are five aspects of place attachment which when present play an important role in facilitating an emotional bond to place and when absent inhibit the creation of such a bond.

The evidence presented in this thesis suggests that place is an integral part of identity, that it plays an important part in maintaining and/or enhancing the four principles of identity, and that attachment to place provides an important link between place and identity since it organizes past experiences of individuals and/or groups over time and their subjective interpretations.
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