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Abstract

The research undertaken for this thesis uses a technique known as coorientation to measure the contrasting interpretations of the inner city environment (in Guildford, Surrey) by members and non-members of the Friary Ward Residents' Association (FWRA), Guildford Borough councillors and officers. A coorientation model allows one to move beyond the simple comparison of environmental perceptions to understand the social process in which environmental cognitions and perceptions are formed.

Three data collection techniques are used: an interview survey carried out amongst one hundred and eighty-five residents, councillors and officers in 1975-76; action research in the form of membership of the FWRA committee between 1976 and 1979; and a desk-top examination of Council and consultants' planning reports.

Detailed attention is given to the social, economic, physical and political context of planning, including a critical analysis of some of the important sources of political and economic influence on the Council, and the major policy orientations which are instrumental in determining the Council's relations with participatory groups. This informs the three major research questions. Do inner city residents, councillors and officers live in conflicting social worlds which touch but rarely interpenetrate each other? If each of these urban groups constructs different interpretations of the environment, what participatory means are available to these groups to communicate their different views of the world? Finally, how successful is FWRA in achieving its aim of neighbourhood improvements through participatory activity in a political context which seeks to control, through various urban management strategies, the extension of participatory practises and ideals?
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"People have many different perspectives on their environment and on community life but only now are we beginning to see these articulated. It is not all that many years ago since people trusted local or central government to analyse their problems and prescribe the solutions. Those were the days when people accepted that new and exciting developments were bound to be better and when change seemed to be welcomed. We then moved into a period when unique prescribed solutions gave way to the presentation of alternatives so that the public could express views before final decisions were taken. Today we face a different situation. Community groups, voluntary organisations of many kinds, and indeed individuals, now demand a say in the definition of problems and a role in determining and then implementing solutions. It is quite clear that a number of people believe that the traditional professionals are not able adequately to communicate with people in a way that will help them solve their problems or make their wishes known to those who take the decisions."

Wilfred Burns *

* quoted in C. Ward "Where we live now - and the professions" Town and Country Planning, 1979, 48, 1, p. 8
INTRODUCTION

This thesis seeks to show that people do indeed have, in Wilfred Burns' words, "many different perspectives on their environment"; but more than this, people have different perspectives on how they think politicians and professional planners see the environment. Burns suggests a three stage progression; starting from a time when people were prepared to be the passive recipients of plans which were created in response to the environmental problems as perceived by the planners; moving to the presentation of environmental choices in which the public were expected to select their preferred future, although the 'problems' were still being defined by the planners; and finally to the situation, supposedly current, where the public are demanding to be involved in defining the problems and helping to construct the solutions.

It is a little naive to suggest that the public 'trusted' local and central government to produce environmental solutions which they welcomed and accepted as better. The question is, better than what? Historically, large scale State intervention in the interest of public welfare is a recent phenomenon, and in the early days the general public were not expected to criticise this novel governmental benevolence. As Marsh expresses it, ".... even as recent as the early 1960's the Town Hall was seen as a forbidding place from which rate demands and instructions to do or not to do were despatched; a place representing an authority which was seldom challenged or questioned and which created, within the author's experience, a sense of awe sufficient to overpower initiative in many and which exuded the notion that the Town Hall knew best." (Marsh, 1979, p.31).

But as social thinking has changed over the years to one of not only accepting but also of expecting considerable State intervention in planning and housing, the public have become more critical of what is done in their name. If the public were so satisfied with the solutions and the bright new future which Burns describes, then would there have been any need to move on to the second and third stages in Burns' analysis of public/planner relations? It is surely because the changes proposed by the decision-makers were not always welcomed that the public started to demand a greater say in environmental change.
It seems to be a commonly held assumption that the demand for public participation is a response to the 'off the peg' solutions which planners and politicians provide for urban problems. It is suggested here that the dissatisfaction is more subtle. The demand for participation is a response to the way urban problems are being defined by planners and politicians. Even more than it being simply a question of the public defining urban problems in a different way to public officials, the public themselves perceive there to be little congruency between the way they see the environment and the way they think politicians and planners see the environment. In short, there is little faith by the public in the ability of public officials to empathise with the public's perspective on the urban environment. The difference is important.

A consensualist approach to social change maintains that problems are malfunctions which can be cured by adjustments and rearrangements within the prevailing system (ODP Information and Intelligence Unit, 1974). The strategy to cure such problems are management or administration-oriented. One such strategy might be to improve communications between the public and the planners, as disagreement is viewed solely as the product of some misunderstanding. Indeed Burns seems to be stating quite baldly: if only better communication existed, planners could help the public solve their problems, and moreover they could make the public's wishes known to the decision-makers.

An alternative perspective informs us that there are fundamental differences in the way the public and the decision-makers see the environment and define not the solutions, but the problems. This suggests that a conflict model of social change is more appropriate. Such a model does not assume that the problems are perceived equally by all sections of society and that there is one social reality. But rather, problems are the product of value and interest differences between different sections of society. Instead of participation being seen as a vehicle for improving communication between these sections of society, this model poses questions concerning inequalities in the control and distribution of power.
These points set the context for the main questions which are discussed in this thesis. Is there a reciprocal level of understanding of urban problems between residents and decision-makers? That is, do decision-makers define the urban problems of the inner city in the same way as they are defined and experienced by residents of that area? To take this one step further and emphasise the essentially social nature of the relationship: do decision-makers think that there is a degree of similarity between the way they view the inner-city environment and the way they think residents view that same environment? Likewise, do residents believe there is any congruency between their construal of the world and the way they believe planners and politicians construe the world? A consensualist approach would suggest that if there are differences in the environmental cognitions of urban groups, and if one group has little faith in another group understanding their problems, then participation is to be seen as a vehicle for improving the nature and extent of communication between groups. On the other hand, if the differences in environmental cognitions and perceptions are fuelled by a belief that the social reality possessed by groups is founded upon conflicting value interpretations, then participation becomes an ideological issue: a belief that a participatory approach to decision-making is more just, democratic and efficacious.

Unlike many studies which presuppose that urban groups live in separate worlds - worlds which touch but rarely interpenetrate - this study takes an essentially social view of man. It recognises that individuals and groups operate not in isolation but in relation to others with whom they may not physically interact but who are significant in terms of influencing their construal of the world and the part they as individuals and groups have of influencing the quality of the built environment and the distribution of resources. Necessarily such an approach must move away from a communications framework and turn to the political context in which the world is perceived and experienced, and action undertaken. The questions which now emerge are: What are the inter-group relations in participation? What is the function of participation? How far do those in power allow minority groups to influence urban decision-making?
What are the issues over which they allow influence, and why? These questions are all central to the thesis and are variously considered in the chapters which follow.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE INNER-CITY

To many, the idea of studying inner-city problems in Guildford must seem as plausible as studying poverty in Hampstead Garden Suburb. Studies of public participation in planning and the conflicts between planners and planned have invariably focused on the inner-city problems of large metropolitan areas (Dennis, 1970, 1972; Hampton, 1970; Davies, 1972; Ferris, 1972; Lambert, 1975; Newton, 1976; Waters, 1976; McKean, 1977). Quiet, comfortable Guildford nestled in the heart of stockbroker Surrey must seem far removed from the grime and bulldozers of the big city, and not the sort of place many would consider using as a case study in urban renewal and planning conflict.

Although the magnitude and severity of the problems faced in the town are not comparable to those found in the large metropolitan areas, considerable social and environmental changes are nevertheless taking place. The incursion of offices into residential areas, property speculation, pollution, blighting, a deteriorating environment, derelict houses and the sacrifice of residential property to road improvements are all features of the Guildford townscape. Furthermore, the role the public have to play in directing change and making it congruent with their aspirations and wishes is no less an issue in Guildford than it is in Lambeth. The residents interviewed for this study felt as angry as their counterparts in Rye Hill, Newcastle, with regard to the way the area has, in their eyes, deteriorated. Streets knocked down and familiar sights which constitute home and place destroyed in the name of 'progress'; but progress for whom?

The fundamental differences in outlook between planners and planned is as apparent in Guildford as it is in Sunderland, and it is intended through this study to show that inner-city problems are not the preserve of metropolitan areas. The issues which will be examined are the differential perceptions of
urban groups; the ability of urban residents, planners and politicians to empathise with each other, and co-orientate themselves on to the environmental problems that each group considers to be crucial in an inner-town area; the communication process between planners and planned; the unequal distribution of power and influence between the country and the city; and the role and success of public participation in highlighting and resolving conflict both in the cognition and perception of environmental problems and between the interests of various urban groups (residential, governmental, commercial).

One may go to any town in Britain and find the same processes at work as are highlighted here. There are always difficulties in generalising from a single case-study, but what should emerge from this study is the identification of a process which merits attention alongside what McKay and Cox (1979, p. 250-51) characterise as radical and liberal critiques of inner-city problems. The radical critique is exemplified by the work of the Community Development Project teams (op.cit.), and writers such as Cockburn (1977) and Castells (1977; 1978). Largely the product of Marxist urban sociologists, the essence of the approach lies in an analysis of the role of capital investment in urban areas, and the relationship between capital and the State. The liberal critique is probably more familiar to British researchers, and focuses on the argument that the economic base of many cities, and in particular inner-city areas, is gradually being eroded (Lomas, 1974; DOE, 1977). The tenor of this approach is that the population and employment dispersal policies of governments to New Towns and regional growth poles have compounded housing and job shortages in the inner city. Industrial reinvestment along with central and local government commitment to the inner-city is seen as the strategy by which one remedies the situation as opposed to the fundamental structural changes in society as a whole which Marxists advocate.

There has been only a limited attempt on my part to identify the 'true' problems of Friary Ward, the inner-town area in Guildford which I have studied over the last five years (Figure 1.1). This means that very little analysis is presented here of the inner-town problems which might be categorised under either a radical or a liberal heading. The approach adopted in this thesis is distinctly phenomenological. As Luckmann has recently written, the
Figure 1.1 Map of Friary Ward and Inner Guildford
phenomenological perspective "is 'egological' (i.e. taking the individual human being as the centre of a system of coordinates on which the experience of the world is mapped) and 'reflexive': It reinstates human experience in its place as the primary datum about the world and it describes this experience by turning and returning to the intentional features of experience." (Luckmann, 1978, p.8). My concern is with how the environment is perceived, experienced and understood by various groups in society and whether these groups believe other groups which are significant to their lives share the same experiential world as they do; how much are their interpretations of reality reciprocated; and the relationship between the different groups' interpretation of reality and social and political action.

RESEARCH AND THE RESEARCHER

Academic Background

To any piece of research one brings a clutch of academic-cultural baggage that gives the work its own hallmark of identity. I read Geography at Liverpool University for my first degree and this equipped me with a geographer's analytical outlook on the world, and reflects a long-standing personal interest in environmental problems and planning. In my final undergraduate year, I completed a dissertation on distance estimation which combined the geographer's concern for space with the psychologist's interest in perception. This became the point of departure for an increasing interest in the issues of environmental psychology. After graduation I moved to the Education Centre at the New University of Ulster where I began researching into children's perception of their environment. After nine months I moved to the Psychology Department at the University of Surrey where I began the present research on public participation in planning. The research adopts a psychological approach to participatory politics reflecting continuing interest in how man perceives, interprets, reconstructs and acts on the world in which he finds himself.

Each of these personal history elements have informed my approach and perspectives on the issues studied in this thesis. The research strategy and the final form of the thesis have also been affected to a considerable extent
by critical thinking concerning the nature of community research, the relationship between the researcher and the researched, and the research design process.

**The Temporal Parameters of Research**

It is worthwhile reminding ourselves that the temporal parameters of community research are different from laboratory research, and this will affect the nature of the written thesis. Laboratory research is framed within distinct temporal parameters: it has an absolute beginning and an absolute end. The historical context for the researcher is the time-span of the project and its place in the historical development of the discipline. For the subjects studied though, there is no real historical context. By contrast, in community research while the historical context for the researcher may be the same, for those studied it is of a completely different order. The Friary Ward Residents' Association (hereafter FWRA) which I have studied was in existence long before I entered the area, as indeed was the urban community and will no doubt be in existence long after I have left. My research will have caught the activities of the urban community and the Residents' Association at one point during their historical development.

This raises questions concerning the relationship between the researcher and the researched. In laboratory research, the researcher can be conceptualised as the host. His subjects would not be doing the sort of activities he asks them to do had he not existed. In community research, the researcher is a guest of the community. The community's activities are going on regardless of his existence.

**Relationships: The Researcher and the Researched**

In the initial stages of my research in Friary Ward I became more and more aware of the role conflicts of being a researcher and a resident. The Friary Ward Residents' Association, under the Chairmanship of a young polytechnic lecturer, had been very welcoming and helpful. I was allowed to attend the
General Meetings and committee meetings, in which it was difficult not to be conspicuous taking notes. It was not long before I moved into Friary Ward myself and attended FWRA meetings legitimately as a resident. I increasingly saw myself as only taking from the community and not giving anything in return. This worried me. Apart from the fact that it is in my nature to be active rather than passive, I saw that a researcher might have a valuable role to play in an urban community through certain skills or expertise which he/she possesses as a researcher; illustrating the view that, "Inside almost every social researcher is an 'action-man' trying to get out" (Smith and Topping, 1979, p.196). Nevertheless, I made a definite decision not to participate in the life of the FWRA in any facilitatory or contributory way until after I had completed interviewing residents, councillors and officers, lest I be accused of biasing the interviews. Furthermore, I decided that when I did participate, my contribution would be of a special kind; I did not see myself as a community worker, but as a researcher and therefore my contribution should be of the sort that a researcher is equipped to make.

The importance of an action research methodology in providing information and informing the analysis, should not be over-stressed at the expense of the action research philosophy which has guided the research as a whole. Examples of the ways in which action research methods have benefited both the research and the community which I have studied are found in Chapters 3, 8 and 9. Being actively involved in the Residents' Association at a committee level was undoubtedly crucial in providing not only first-hand experience of residents/Council interaction, but also data of a quality which is incomparable to the type of data one collects by surveys and other methods. But it is the philosophy of action research and the relationship between researcher and researched it assumes that might be considered to be even more important and profound, simply for the way in which it has structured my attitudes and approach to community research. (I)

In the process by which the researcher collects information he moves through a number of stages which increasingly serve to distance him from the individuals and the communities he is studying. First of all, hypotheses about communities and the activities of environmental voluntary groups are formulated. As in many other areas of social research these can be derived
in a number of ways: a literature search; talking to experts in the field; intuition and hunches; the carrying out of some form of preliminary survey, e.g. a pilot questionnaire survey, in-depth interviews. The decisions the social scientist then takes as to how he will test his hypotheses are crucial, because they will have an important influence on everything else that follows. If a survey approach is to be used the questionnaire design will greatly influence subsequent statistical analysis. Consequently which questions are asked and the form in which information is collected will be determined not by their meaningfulness to the respondents but by the way the information is to be subsequently treated statistically. For this reason, once the questionnaire is designed, we are talking to processed people, that is people who are answering our questions in our terms (Hudson, 1966, p.14; Rowan, 1974, p.94). There are a number of other reasons, summarised elsewhere, why a 'traditional' research strategy not only serves to distance the researcher from the researched, but also makes the relationship authoritarian (Argyris, 1970; Uzzell, 1979). It has also been suggested that with the rise of political participation and consciousness and the decentralisation of power to the community level, community groups are no longer so readily willing to accept academic outsiders coming into their lives and environment with their 'scientific tools' which are seen as part of the "configuration of power which built and maintained the ghetto", (Goering and Cummins, 1970, p.51). Whether or not this is an accurate observation and fair evaluation, it does raise questions concerning the political stance and implications of community research (Leach, 1974; Gray, 1975; Lea, 1975).

Action and intervention research are two approaches which I have used in an attempt to resolve the role strain which I have felt as a result of the conflicts identified earlier. It should be emphasised that action and intervention research are not just alternative ways of doing the same thing, of collecting data. The premises and relationships upon which the methods are based are very different from conventional social research techniques.

Action research has had a relatively limited impact on the social science community (Sanford, 1970) despite the fact that it has had a number of influential advocates, not the least of whom was Kurt Lewin. Lewin believed that in order to gain insight into a process one must create change and then
observe its variable effects and new dynamics (Marrow, 1969, p.235). Four categories of action research have been identified: diagnostic, participant, empirical, experimental, (ibid, p.198), but what characterises each and differentiates them from other types of applied social research is "the immediacy of the researcher's involvement in the action process" (Rapoport, 1972, p.23). Crucial is the idea that the researcher moves from the role of being solely a chronicler of social activity, to that of an agent of social change. Doing the research is integral to taking action, because action is part of the research and research part of the action. For this reason action research has been seen to be a useful methodology in Government-sponsored research which has direct implications for public policy (Lovett, 1975). Action research has many applications, and a number of different strategies and field examples have been undertaken in Britain (Carney and Taylor, 1974), the United States (Sanford, op.cit), and West Germany (Haag et al, 1973).

In intervention research, the researcher acts as a facilitator or resource, providing information which helps those making decisions to come to an informed choice over alternative courses of action. The researcher becomes part of the decision-making machinery. Research findings are in the form of shared experience which creates a knowledge which may not be so readily communicable in conventional academic terms. In intervention research, unlike participant observation, the researcher acts as a fully participating member of the group, and so the relationship is more honest and open. As Rowan states, the participant observer "can often remain unchanged and unchallenged by his experience which thus becomes of one-way benefit to him and his sponsor" (op.cit, p.93). The sort of role I am suggesting here has the flexibility to accommodate changes in the perceptions, constructs and values of the researcher, which undoubtedly do take place in the development of a research project.

The result of using techniques such as action and intervention research is that one can become actively involved in and help shape the future of voluntary and community groups. One might be able to help them towards an effectiveness they might not otherwise have achieved, or which could have taken much longer. At the same time, by being actively involved with community groups, the researcher may well gain an understanding of the
research problem which might never have emerged had more conventional research practises been adopted. It is a two-way interaction with mutual benefits.

The Research Design Process

A questionnaire was designed, piloted, revised and used to interview residents, local authority elected members and officers. This is discussed in detail in Chapter 3. However, apposite to this chapter is the point that in some cases the responses were analysed and written up, but it was decided eventually not to include them in the final thesis. Although the results were informative they did not fit comfortably within the thesis as it has been written. To some, such a statement might seem to conflict with what is commonly taken as the convention and routes of scientific (experimental) research: i.e. problem identification; the theoretical framework for its analysis; the formulation of hypotheses; the collection of data; analysis and conclusions. While such a straightforward procedure could be adopted in community research, an alternative model was seen to be more appropriate at least in the formative stages of the research.

Hypotheses were not constructed in the same way as an experimental social scientist constructs hypotheses. Hypotheses were constructed in the form of questions such as those outlined earlier in this chapter. The methodological route by which I came to the conclusions of this thesis did not take advantage of the 'straight-line' Baconian (Harvey, 1969) experimental paradigm which I believed to be the essence of scientific research when I began the study. The research strategy more closely follows an 'a priori' model (ibid) and is consequently subject to revision and change. Clarke summarises the position well:

"Thus, whilst rigour in research method is the aim, it can only be attained after the project has been defined in fairly concise terms, and questions relating to data availability have been settled. Until then the research worker's time will be structured in a haphazard way, and even after these questions have been settled, the course of events whereby a research design is perfected and applied successfully will take a 'cobweb' rather than a 'straight-line' course" (Clarke, 1976, p.3).
A 'cobweb' strategy has been necessarily adopted in the course of collecting data for this thesis. Different 'types' of data have been used to provide appropriate evidence for the support or negation of certain hypotheses and ideas. Furthermore, it is for the reasons specified above that some of the findings from the questionnaire survey have not been ultimately used in this thesis. Given the questions I was interested in answering, some data was deemed in this particular context not to be essential to the hypotheses being tested. The research design was not constructed at the outset pristine, complete and unalterable. It has been developed and modified over time as the crucial research questions and issues became more apparent. Many researchers give the impression that the thesis is similar to the research report: it is a non-problematic documentary account of a piece of research. By the time one comes to write the thesis all the problems have been solved and the thesis simply becomes written proof that the research has been completed. A second perspective which I adopt here, and which is a logical consequence of the statement by Clarke above, is that the thesis is the final stage in the formulation of a research design in which "the research design is perfected and applied successfully." This thesis is still part of a research design by which one is continually evaluating and rejecting data. Therefore, to exclude data which has been analysed and even written up is as much a rational action as to include it.

THE ORGANISATION OF THE THESIS

Chapter 2 examines the important theoretical and conceptual issues which are central to this thesis: contemporary theories of democracy; ideology; the prevailing trends in political psychology; functional and genetic models of social influence and social change. Each of these issues is related to public participation and the role of groups in the participatory process.

Chapter 3 can be divided into three sections. In the context of this chapter (Chapter 1), the first section examines the three major questions which this thesis attempts to answer. The second section describes the chronology and logistics of the research project since 1974. This includes the development of the questionnaire; the demographic characteristics of the sample population interviewed; and the methods of data analysis. Chapter 3 is
concluded with a discussion of the methodology of coorientation which is the technique used to tap into the social reality of the urban groups examined (Guildford Borough councillors and officers; members and non-members of the Friary Ward Residents' Association).

Chapter 4 examines the socio-spatial context of Guildford in which this thesis is set. Friary Ward is then examined in detail in terms of the main socio-economic characteristics of its inhabitants and the quality of the environment in which they live.

Chapter 5 provides a planning history of Friary Ward since 1945. Reports produced by planning consultants and local authority planning, environmental health and housing officers are analysed for the insight they provide into how the Ward has 'officially' been seen over the last forty years. The changing position of the local authority to urban renewal and an economic analysis of improvement grant policy provide an interesting and original perspective on Guildford Borough Council's attitude towards the Ward.

An examination of the local government electoral system (Chapter 6) not only provides important contextual information on the functioning of democracy at the local level, but the findings also lend persuasive support to the argument that participatory democracy should be extended. The main issues discussed include: the decline in the quality of 'localness' in local government; the disparity in representation between urban and rural areas; and the electorates' knowledge and use of their councillors.

After examining the communication channels between local authority officers and councillors, and the residents of Friary Ward, the remainder of Chapter 7 is devoted to an analysis of the coorientational data collected in the interview survey in 1975/76. The environmental cognitions and perceptions of councillors, officers and residents of the Ward are contrasted with each other and conclusions drawn as to the different social realities held by these three groups.

Chapter 8 assesses the actual nature of local government, posing the question: is local government a neutral, independent arbiter in urban conflicts, or does it represent or reflect a specific ideology of its own? If the latter is the case, then this raises particular problems as far as the
Chapter 9 examines three assumptions which are commonly made by politicians and writers concerning the objectives of participation, and tests whether such assumptions can be supported by the evidence from Guildford. An examination of intergroup relations in participation inform the analysis of both the function of participation and the success of the Friary Ward Residents' Association in achieving their aims. Coorientation data is again reintroduced, and the success of FWRA in initiating action over particular problems is assessed in relation to the coorientational awareness of those problems by councillors.

The final chapter attempts to summarise the most important findings and draw conclusions in the context of the theoretical discussion in Chapter 2.

Footnote:

(1) In this thesis, 'action research' should be regarded as much an orientation as a methodology. Reepoort, in a paper presented to an SSRC Conference on Action Research (1970, University of York) defines the aim of action research as "to contribute both to the practical concerns of people in an immediate problematic situation and to the goals of social science by joint collaboration within a mutually acceptable ethical framework." This is a generally accepted definition of action research, although it is possible to find alternative interpretations (cf. Lambert, Paris and Blackaby, 1978, pp. 26-7). My involvement at an 'action' level varied from being instrumental in initiating surveys, feeding back information into the decision-making system and assisting FWRA in formulating arguments to present to the local authority, to playing the sort of passive role which is most often associated with participant observation. The ways in which this action informed the research and aided the Residents' Association is described at various points throughout the thesis. This interpretation of action research should be borne in mind when also reading the discussion of this approach on pages 86-87 and 361-363.
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INTRODUCTION

Having outlined the major orientation of this thesis in Chapter I, the principal aim of this chapter is to draw out the essential conceptual themes which inform this study of participation and change. The study of public participation in planning is necessarily interdisciplinary. Given my academic background and personal experience of involvement with a Residents' Association seeking more participation in planning, the approach I have adopted is grounded in social psychology, urban planning and political science. In this chapter a number of themes are discussed which have a recurring importance throughout the thesis and which provide a backdrop to the analysis and discussion of the empirical data. The themes selected are: contemporary theories of democracy; ideology; political psychology; social influence and change.

CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF DEMOCRACY

Carole Pateman (1970) usefully divides theories of democracy into two groups: classical and contemporary theories. In this chapter the essence of contemporary theories of democracy will be extracted in order to assess the view of political society which each theory assumes. Participation has an obvious although variable place within contemporary theories of democracy. An assessment will provide an institutional framework with which to view not only later chapters on participation but also the comments made in this chapter on social change and influence. Contemporary theories of democracy can be divided into three groups: elitist; pluralist and radical democrat.

Elitist Theories of Democracy

There are many varieties of elitist theory (Mosca, 1939; Schumpeter, 1943; Michels, 1958; Almond and Verba, 1965), but they all have certain essential features in common. Each believes that decision-making is best carried out by an elite group. This will not only ensure that society remains stable but that democracy will be strengthened. Schumpeter, for example, sees democracy "as a political method, that is to say, a certain type of institutional arrangement for arriving at political-legislative and
administrative decisions and hence incapable of being an end in itself" (1943, p.242). Conceptualizing democracy as a means, élitists have an overriding concern that decision-making should be efficient. Consequently participation is seen to lead to inefficiency, and a weakening of democracy.

The élitist position makes a number of assumptions about society. The mass of society are politically naive, incompetent and capable of understanding only the simplest of political ideas and issues. Furthermore, the majority of society are content to take a passive and apathetic role in the political process and thereby knowingly or unknowingly are able to be manipulated and indoctrinated. As for the minority who become active, but who do not form part of the decision-making élite, they are considered volatile, irrational, disruptive and basically subversive to government. Active minorities are defined as existing outside the legitimate political process (Hindess, 1971).

Lipset's characterisation of those people to whom popular political participation appeals provides an extreme(and inaccurate) example of this viewpoint. He maintains that participation appeals "to the disgruntled, the psychologically homeless, to the personal failures, the socially isolated, the economically insecure, the uneducated, unsophisticated and authoritarian persons at every level of society." (Lipset, 1960, p.175). Such a view cannot even be said to be culture-bound, as studies by Caplan (1970) on black rioters, and Rudé (1964) on the mob in the French Revolution show that such groups are both culturally integrated into the community and better educated than non-participating community members. In Britain, participants at Structure Plan public meetings have been shown to be characteristically "male, middle-aged, middle-class, well-educated, group orientated and geographically mobile." (Stringer and Ewens, 1974, p.6)

The psychological attributes of participators and non-participators are important elements of contemporary theories of democracy, as many élitists have tried to establish a scientific rationale for their views. Their arguments are supposedly "grounded in the facts of present-day political attitudes and behaviour as revealed by sociological investigation" (Pateman, 1970, p.14). Berelson's Voting (1954) and Almond and Verba's The Civic Culture (1965)
Elitist theories do not presume that those in power should be unresponsive to public demands. However, it is assumed that since sociological investigations have revealed the public to be basically ignorant, apathetic and disinterested in politics, their involvement in political affairs should be limited to the periodic election of representatives. Thus democracy becomes not a question of what the government should do, but rather who should make the decisions. Government policy and decision-making is to be left entirely to the elite group. Citizen responsibility stops at the ballot-box. In democratic elitism the government is considered the sole guarantor of social order, and consequently society is characterised by authoritarian and hierarchical institutional structures.

Pluralist Theories of Democracy

To many writers, principally Dahl (1961) the elitist view is unrealistic as power in society is divided and diffuse. The pluralists see political power in terms of competing groups or multiple centres of power as Dahl terms it. These groups are able to present their cause to the political authorities who are considered to be responsive to such pressure. The obvious question which arises here is, who is the political authority?

Pluralism has been heralded as a more appropriate rationale, with which to analyse the power structure. Pluralism, it is argued, not only recognises the existence of conflict and competition, but is its reflection. Indeed many elitists have criticised pluralism because it creates social, political and economic cleavage. Paradoxically, this is not the case. Pluralism has to resort to notions of consensus if it is to provide a reasonably coherent theory of the State. This is because the political system should both reflect and represent the divisions and cleavages in society and at the same time resolve those cleavages. If one is to see the State as the impartial adjudicator of group claims, then the notion of consensus is essential. If, however, one sees government as an interest group in its own right, then one does not have to rely so heavily on the notion of consensus.
Democracy pluralism, it is argued, has a number of advantages. It is an effective means of establishing checks on power. It is a means by which one can create a mixed government. By creating numerous power centres, it extends the possibilities of popular political participation. Finally, and this has been the chief argument in recent pluralist theory, it is a political means through which all group interests in society can be represented and reconciled. Lively (1978) lists six salient features of the contemporary pluralist position: Society is the arena of diverse and conflicting interests; all interests have some claim to be heard and taken into account in the formulation of public policy; each individual's group affiliations and interests are likely to outweigh those interests he may hold in common with the rest of society; State intervention will be increasingly necessary in apolitical arenas in order to contain conflict; consequently intervention is geared to accommodation and conciliation; and the proper task of government (reconciling the claims of competing groups) will be most successfully achieved if all groups possess some effective means of pressurising that government. If groups do possess such influence and politicians are sensitive to pressures of intense minorities, then power will be sufficiently diffuse to allow an equitable representation of interests.

The "Radical Democrats"

There is a third theory of democracy which is not accounted for by either democratic elitism or pluralism. It is embodied in the writings of those whom Plant calls "radical democrats" (1974, p.69), and whose chief advocate is Bachrach (1967). Their ideas, however, go back to the classical liberal-democratic theories propounded by Rousseau and John Stuart Mill. The "radical democrats' main argument is that the major social and political institutions and organisations should be made open to popular participation." As Bachrach writes, "The public interest is measured by the soundness of the decisions reached in the light of the needs of the community and by the scope of public participation in reaching them." (ibid, p.3).

How can one reconcile the notion of popular participation as proposed by the radical democrats, with the accusation of widespread political apathy,
disinterest and ignorance put forward by the democratic elitists? Not only do the elitists maintain that such apathy is functional to the system, but they base their theories on supporting empirical evidence. Paradoxically, rather than reject the evidence of empirical studies such as that carried out by Berelson, Bachrach and his followers have simply questioned the conclusions the elitists have reached and they argue that apathy and inactivity are not part of the human persona, but rather social and political structures are so unresponsive to the needs, demands and wishes of ordinary people that apathy, passivity and disinterest have become the norm. The political prescription for the radical democrats is one of creating participatory organisations and institutions to reactivate their interest and develop the participatory spirit within man.

There is a strong educational component to this philosophy in which one teaches the public to become active citizens. A basic tenet of participatory democracy as conceived by Mill is that the participation educates those who participate. Participation teaches the individual to differentiate between his own private wishes and needs and those of the community. Ultimately the participating citizen will become aware that he is responsible not only to himself but to society as a whole. Such goals can only be achieved by the active participation of the individual, and the individual will only learn how to participate responsibly by participating. The essence of this sentiment is best expressed by Mill himself: "We do not learn to read or write, to ride or swim, by being merely told how to do it, but by doing it, so it is only by practising popular government on a limited scale, that the people will ever learn how to exercise it on a larger." (1963, p. 186).

**IDEOLOGY**

The examination of group ideology is central to a political psychology of intergroup behaviour. The ideology of an urban group is inseparable from the ideologies of the other groups with whom it interacts, and the social context in which that ideology is both formed and operationalised (cf. Chapters 7, 8, 9).
Ideology as a concept is surrounded by some confusion. Davies (1972) discusses the ideology of planning, while Foley (1960) suggests there may in fact be three ideologies in planning. Bailey argues that the concept of ideology is useful as it serves to 'demyystify' belief systems (1975, p. 28) while in a Marxist analysis such as given by Miliband, "the whole point of ideology is its obscurantist purpose - its masking of something real" (Lambert et al., 1978, p.13). The reader is referred to Bailey's discussion of ideology (op.cit, pp. 24-35) as it not only attempts to identify its component parts, but is also set within the context of urban planning.

Berger and Luckmann's definition of ideology is useful for a number of reasons. They maintain that "when a particular definition of reality comes to be attached to a concrete power interest, it may be called an ideology." (1967, p.141). Ideologies, like reality, are socially constructed. In a process of reification, or objectification as the authors term it, human groups create social organisations, groups and categories which come to exist on their own, objectified. Once objectified they become subjectively interpreted or reinterpreted by groups which shape their view of the world, and affect their intergroup relations. Discussions of ideology are often framed within the context of power in society. As Berger and Luckman write: "The distinctiveness of ideology is rather that the same overall universe is interpreted in different ways, depending upon concrete vested interests within the society in question." (ibid). In this thesis the relationship between the realities groups have of the same overall universe' and their ideologies and interests is examined. The extent to which these elements relate to the demand for public participation forms an integral part of the analysis.

A number of writers (e.g. Shils, 1955; Abrams, 1964) and certainly many politicians at both a local and national level, would argue that there is no such thing as ideology in local government, and no place for it either. Timothy Raison wrote, in a book edited jointly by him and David Howell, MP for Guildford, "that British Conservatives "plunge straight into the facts, and though they may emerge at the end with a policy, they are generally content to leave the principles for another day" (Raison, 1961, p.125).

As will be pointed out elsewhere, many local councillors give the impression of believing that local councils are apolitical. At a meeting early in 1979
of the Policy and Resources Committee of Guildford Borough Council, a Liberal Councillor stood up after a motion had been carried and said that he was pleased to see this happen as it was part of Liberal policy. He sat down to jeers and cries of 'shame' and even calls of 'no politics'. Local Government is seen as a matter of 'common sense'; there are no political differences in the way one can lay pavements.

On a Council where one party holds an overwhelming majority (as in Guildford) there is some justification for examining that Council's ideology. There is considerable intellectual support for believing that local councils should be seen as interest groups like any other groups competing for influence in local politics. Such a proposition was put forward as long ago as 1908 when Arthur Bentley (1967), probably the first group theorist, suggested that governments were like any other group "participating in the struggle between groups out of which policy emerged." (Kimber and Richardson, 1974, p.5). Truman too describes government institutions as centres of interest-based power (Truman, 1971, p.506). To be interest-based they must be ideologically based. Although ideologies have most often been associated with institutions or associations seeking change, this need not be the case. One needs an ideology to maintain stability as much as to initiate change. The dichotomy between change and stability is an uneasy one. In Dearlove's very rich book on the workings of local government and its interaction with outside bodies, he came to the conclusion that if we only see ideology in terms of change, our attention will be "directed away from the beliefs of men in those parties which are more concerned with maintaining existing social relations and the existing scope of government." (Dearlove, 1973, p.209).

**POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**A Brief History**

The interest by political scientists in the psychological aspects of politics considerably pre-dates that of psychologists themselves. In the eighteenth century, Rousseau recognised the impact that social and political
institutions have on men's personalities. One of the most important consequences of participatory democracy for Rousseau was that it has educative effects for the individual. Apart from developing responsible individual, social and political action, the individual learns through participation to distinguish "between his own impulses and desires, he learns to become a public as well as a private citizen." (Pateman, 1970, p.25). The psychological development of the individual, for Rousseau, was as important a consequence of participation as more equitable decision-making. Mill, too, saw that political institutions had an important educative effect to perform. "Wherever the sphere of action of human beings is artificially circumscribed, their sentiments are narrowed and dwarfed......" (Mill, 1910, pp.203-4). Both Rousseau and Mill thus pointed quite specifically to "the interrelationship and connection between individuals, their qualities and psychological characteristics, and types of institutions." (Pateman, op.cit., p.29).

It was only, however, with the beginning of the twentieth century that the interrelationship between the psychological characteristics of individuals and their political involvement came in for close empirical scrutiny. Whereas psychological characteristics had been used as elements in speculating on the relationship between man and social and political institutions, psychological categories were now to be used as an intrinsic part of the study (Wallas, 1948; Merriam, 1925). It was particularly Harold Lasswell, however, who initiated the systematic empirical study of the relationship between human behaviour and politics. His classification of personality types as revealed in the career of political activists (1930) started a tradition of reductionist political psychology which exists down to the present day. But Lasswell himself later came to recognise the importance of groups in reaching an understanding of political behaviour (1936).

The interest psychologists have shown in politics goes back about thirty years (Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet, 1948; Eysenck, 1954) although it is sad to report that the approach by psychologists to political issues has changed little since then with an "emphasis on extensive descriptive information." (Stringer, 1975).
A recent reviewer (Sears, 1969) of work on political behaviour points out that the 'electoral and public opinion process' has received considerably more systematic attention than other aspects. Voting behaviour and partisanship are seen to dominate the field; the former being studies primarily in terms of information processing through the mass media, the latter in terms of socialization and attitude change. The Handbook of Political Psychology (Knutson, 1973) also provides a narrow perspective. The "basic psychological constructs" singled out for attention are personality, attitudes and beliefs. Other contributions deal with socialization, authoritarianism and alienation, leadership and aggression. The impoverishment in both subject area and approach is reinforced by the fact that nearly two-fifths of the volume is taken up by methodological material, none of which is distinctive to political psychology. A number of books have been published over the last ten years that would satisfy any demand for more of the same (cf. Abcarian and Soule, 1971; Lane, 1972; Renshon, 1974), although Lane's earlier publication (1959) takes a wider viewpoint than many similar publications and in particular one section is devoted to social groups in political life.

Greenstein takes an overview of the study of political psychology, and suggests one reason why political psychology has both failed to breed its own concepts and approaches, and remain at an individualistic explanatory level.

"Most efforts at the formal application of the diverse theories and methodologies of psychology (and psychiatry) to politics seem to the close political observer (and the political actor) to be insensitive to "political realities" including their psychological components. By the same token, the common-sense psychological political explanations by non-psychologists tend to lack vigour and theoretical grounding. In short, there is a gap in the extant literature between political psychology and political psychology." (Greenstein, 1973, p.447).

Apart from the limited theoretical and substantive development, there are a number of issues and approaches which are also conspicuous by their absence. When political psychologists have focussed on political organisations, it has been on national or international political parties and
beliefs (Republican; Democrat; Conservative; Liberal). In the few instances where local politics are studied, it is still the local branch of a national organisation. Community groups and organisations, e.g. Trade Unions, environmental pressure groups, Parish Councils, have rarely been studied from the perspective of political psychology. Many political issues which have an important psychological component have likewise been ignored by political psychologists from both disciplines. Authoritarianism (Adorno, 1950) and more recently the growing interest in the psychology of fascism (Dicks, 1972; Hughes, 1975; Billig, 1978) provide notable exceptions. Concepts such as 'representation', 'the public interest', 'accountability' and even the psychological benefits and consequences of participation have rarely, if at all, been examined. For example, none of these issues appear in Knutson's "Handbook of Political Psychology". Yet representation, for example, can be treated as a psychological concept as much as a metaphysical (Pitkin, 1967), bureaucratic (Niskanen, 1971), or purely political one (Hill, 1974). Indeed social psychology would seem to have great potential in providing both substantive and conceptual perspectives on the problem of representation. Pitkin, who has written one of the major works on the concept of representation, can find no representation theorist who defines representation in terms of activity or behavioural norms (op. cit., p. 112).

It is almost as if political psychology should be concerned only with extremes. On the one hand there is an implicit assumption that 'the status quo' of political behaviour and institutions and their relationships is a more appropriate object of study than process and change (Stringer, 1975). While, on the other hand, of the two sections in Psychology and Social Issues devoted to protest and activism, riots and demonstrations are given such prominence that the uninformed observer might be excused for thinking that these were the only forms of non-institutionalised political expression (Hamsher and Sigal, 1973).

Reductionism

The reductionist stance referred to above is typified by the work of Milbrath (1965; and Goel, 1977). "The major concern of the book is to
explain individual human behaviour as it relates to the political system. Therefore, the human organism, rather than groups or the political system, is usually taken as the unit of analysis." (op.cit., 1977, p.3). Behaviourist theories are the meat of Milbrath’s approach. 'Learning theory' is used to explain individual political behaviour but unfortunately he confuses it with exchange theory.

S-R theory is also seen to be useful in explaining political action, as "All action is a response to a stimulus of some sort ...." (op.cit., 1965, p. 10). Twelve years later, Milbrath and Goel are writing: "The strength of more strictly political predispositions, such as beliefs and attitudes, is largely a function of a learning mechanism called reinforcement." (op.cit., 1977, p.27). Milbrath goes on to discuss the importance of primary and secondary reinforcement and considers that Pavlov's trusty hound can give us an insight into political behaviour. At no time does he try to explain how one might use reinforcement theory to explain political acts. It is difficult to imagine democracy as we generally conceptualise it (with conflict, debate and negotiation) if one tries to account for voting behaviour in such terms. Presumably, if the voter's favoured candidate is not elected, his action would not be positively reinforced. From this, he would at the next election learn to vote for the 'right' candidate. Eventually, when everyone had learnt the right behaviour, everybody would be voting for one man. The authors' further maintain that:

"The decision of an organism about its next act may be seen as a function of the interaction between the stimuli coming from the environment and the particular pattern of predisposition possessed by the organism at any given point in time. At any moment, several predispositions may be competing to take command of the organism, and several stimuli are available in the environment with the potentiality of interacting with those predispositions." (ibid, p.25).

Policy formulation would be difficult if decision-makers were continually at risk from "several predispositions .... competing to take command of the organism." The arbitrariness of such actions would make planning difficult if not an impossibility. The only way either individuals or groups could change would be if they received different social or biological stimuli or reinforcements.
Personality traits, such as motivations and drive reductions, are also seen to account for various forms of political behaviour. Milbrath talks of people behaving politically to satisfy expressive needs and "As these needs are satisfied by engaging in the action, his drive reduces, and the behaviour ceases until a new need for expressive consumption arises." (op.cit., 1965, p.12). The authors' maintain that it is only after Maslow's (1943) needs have been satisfied routinely that the "organism" can turn to social and political behaviour (op.cit., 1977, p.27). But how many of Maslow's needs can be satisfied outside social and political behaviour? Again it becomes very difficult to explain an individual's involvement in an organisation like a residents' association if it is to be interpreted solely in terms of stop-go satisfaction of needs and drives. While it may be a suitable rationale for explaining the motivations of pressure groups, it is less successful in accounting for the behaviour of those who participate because they believe participation is a more efficacious and just system of democracy. Furthermore, different people join groups for different reasons and different causes (Chapter 9). Many do not leave as soon as their particular problem is resolved. By discussing and learning of the problems of others, they take on new interests and concerns.

Intergroup Behaviour

Group behaviour too has been analysed using individualistic frames of reference (Gurr, 1970; Berkowitz, 1972). Crawford and Nadditch (1970) try to explain riot behaviour by linking frustration/aggression theory to feelings of relative deprivation. This is operationalised by using Rotter's scale of internal/external locus of control (1966) to form a typology of the (supposedly) four basic stages of social change. Stage I consists of low feelings of relative deprivation and low external control. Stage II consists of high feelings of relative deprivation and again low external control: such a condition can lead to instability and emotional mass action. Stage III represents high feelings of deprivation but also an increasing belief in one's personal ability to control change. Finally, Stage IV consists of low levels of relative deprivation and high internal control. At this stage relative
deprivation disappears and groups exist in a steady state of "content activism".

Crawford and Nadditch's model, however, begs more questions than it answers. For example, it is never postulated how individuals pass from one stage to another. What are the forces involved that lead to more efficacious feelings? Do all the individuals feel the same degree of relative deprivation at the same time and relative to the same person(s)? Billig highlights the most important criticism when he writes that by interpreting political action in terms of individual emotional states, it devalues the ideological component of political action and ignores the intergroup context (1976).

It is paradoxical that what often passes for social science is particularly unsocial. The reductionist perspectives used to describe political activity above are one of many examples that use an individualistic stance to explain social phenonena. However, in this thesis a coorientation model is used which starts with the premise that "a person's behaviour is not based simply upon his own private cognitive construction of his world; it is also a function of his perception of the orientation held by others around him, and his orientation to them." It is also assumed that " ........ under certain conditions of interaction, the actual cognitions and perceptions of others will also affect his behaviour." (McLeod & Chaffee, 1973, p.470). Unlike many studies of behaviour and attitude change which are carried out at an intrapersonal (e.g. attitudes, personality traits, motives) or macro-social level of analysis (age, sex, class), the coorientation model adopts an interpersonal approach to the communication process. As Chaffee and McLeod maintain (1973, p.237), by ignoring the interpersonal approach many studies implicitly assume that most of the variance in communication behaviour is explainable at the individual or macro-social level. In an interpersonal analysis, the focus of attention is on the small social system. This is likely to be a much more meaningful frame of reference. Such a social system can be a two-person dyad, an organised group or a small community. A truly social approach to political action and participation is discussed by Stringer in the context of women's political role (1975).
Another notable failing of many studies in political psychology is the disproportionate amount of attention which is given to political activity, while the context in which such activity takes place is largely ignored. In this thesis the importance is recognised of examining not only the attitudes and activities of the individual members of urban groups, but also urban groups as bodies, their ideology and the socio-political context in which they operate.

Discussion

Despite having a long history, political psychology has remained a largely undeveloped field of study. There are a number of reasons for this. The study of political behaviour and experience has always been a fringe interest in psychology. Political psychology has largely remained the interest of political scientists rather than psychologists, and as Stringer writes, "Little has been done to apply contemporary social psychological theory to politics in any critical sense." (op.cit., p.1). The approach to intergroup behaviour in this thesis suggests one way in which political psychologists might extend their interests into real-world settings and move away from the reductionist position which has for so long dominated, if not dogged, the field. Although no attempt has been made on my part to draw extensively on the literature of intergroup behaviour, the approach here does, I believe, make an important contribution to the political psychology of intergroup behaviour.

SOCIAL INFLUENCE AND SOCIAL CHANGE

At least four summary statements can be made concerning the assumptions held in social psychology about the social influence process. The purpose of influence is to impose conformity; the object of influence is the formation or enforcement of norms (Fraser, 1978, p.201); influence presupposes the exclusive roles of source and target; and therefore information only flows from a source to a target. These assumptions underlie the majority of experiments which have been carried out in social psychology on the social influence process (cf. Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971; Secord and Backman, 1974, ch.3, 4).
Moscovici, at the beginning of *Social Influence and Social Change* (1976), highlights the struggle between the forces of conformity and the forces of innovation. In many ways this is a false dichotomy in as much as the struggle is not whether to change, but who is to change, how and with what effect. Even in a world dominated by conservatism and the preservation of the status quo, change still takes place. The question for those in power, and one should see the meaning of conservatism in these in terms is, how can change be controlled for the benefit and maintenance of the status quo?

**The Functional Model**

**Minority groups and the influence process**

The hierarchical and asymmetrical structure of influence is the basis of the functionalist model which Moscovici maintains has dominated social psychological theories of the influence process. In such a model influence occurs where there is a source (sender of influence and norms) and a larger target (receiver of influence and norms). The roles of each are strictly defined and delineated with neither the target being seen as a potential source, nor the source being seen as a potential target. With asymmetrical influence, the majority view is regarded as the norm and the product of an objective social world. By default those who do not subscribe to the majority view are seen as different and therefore deviant. Moscovici writes "........ the majority point of view carries the prestige of truth and norm, and expresses the social system as a whole. Conversely the minority point of view, or any opinion that reflects a different point of view, is branded as error or deviance." (ibid, p.12).

The two step model of innovation acceptance (Katz, 1957; Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971) illustrates that it is minorities who initiate change. In this context one may divide minorities into two basic groups. The first group would be those who are the 'legitimate' representatives of the majority. The second would be those who attempt to instigate change through their possession of certain resources (such as power, wealth or expertise, all of which are highly prized in modern industrial societies). And the third group would be those who do not possess power, wealth or expertise in the conventional sense but certain beliefs. It is with this latter category
that participatory groups are usually associated. There can be further subdivisions. For example, 'cause' groups such as those which petition against the expansion of the nuclear power industry and residents' groups which do not necessarily have one particular cause (except a belief in increased participation) but seek to represent what they consider to be the true interests of their membership. One might define further types of groups within this category, as well as subdividing the first two categories of minority groups. What distinguishes the first two categories from the third is that the subjective reality which is presented to the majority (by the first two groups) takes on an objectivity by virtue of its 'legitimate' origins, and thus becomes accepted as the prevailing world view. Those who fail to accept such realities, such as the third category of minority groups are branded as deviant. As Asch writes, "Each social order confronts its members with a selected portion of physical and social data. The most decisive feature of this selectivity is that it presents conditions lacking in perceptual alternatives." (1959, p.380).

Moscovici's model

Figure 2.1 lists the main elements of Moscovici's functional model of social influence. The model may be briefly summarised by noting that the purpose of influence is to sustain or restore conformity and bring minorities into the social system. The effectiveness of directed change is dependent upon the maintenance of consensus in society as to societal goals and values, and the means of enforcing controlled change. In such a society one needs leaders, experts and a majority (politicians; technicians/professionals and a 'silent' majority). Finally, social reality for participants is not the dialectical outcome that Berger and Luckman stress (1967, p.150) but is a uniform phenomenon for individuals and groups alike. The explanatory value of such a model will become apparent in later chapters in the context of how politicians and professionals see the environment and, more importantly, how they think others see the environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source/target relationship</th>
<th>Functional Model</th>
<th>Genetic Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical/</td>
<td>Horizontal/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asymmetrical</td>
<td>Symmetrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of influence</td>
<td>Leaders, experts, 'silent' majority</td>
<td>All groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of influence</td>
<td>Minorities, deviants</td>
<td>All groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of behaviour</td>
<td>Reaction/adjustment</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of influence</td>
<td>One way</td>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of influence</td>
<td>Social control</td>
<td>Social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of social system, environment and actors</td>
<td>Predetermined and static</td>
<td>Continually redefined and fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Reality'</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction factor</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.1** Functional and Genetic Models of Social Influence (after Moscovici, 1976)
Moscovici's model

In contrast to the asymmetrical functional model of influence, Moscovici puts forward a symmetrical, genetic model, where influence can only be conceived of in terms of reciprocity (Fig. 2.1). In such a model, when a majority tries to impose its norms and values on a minority, it becomes at the same time open to influence from the minority who attempt to make their norms and values understood and acceptable. Thus, it is no longer feasible to rigidly demarcate the influencers and the influenced into sources and targets. Any group is both simultaneously a target and a source of influence. Moscovici tellingly uses a political example: "When we see a government or political party modifying its policies, adjusting the tenor of its argument in the process of applying and presenting them, it is precisely because, at the same time, different sections of the population are attempting to propose or impose other policies and arguments." (op.cit., p.68).

Another essential feature of the genetic model which makes it a more appropriate paradigm with which to view social and political influence, is that both the social system and the environment are defined by those who take part within them. Neither the environment nor the social system is considered a predetermined stage and atmosphere in which individuals and groups interact according to given roles, status and psychological resources. Rather such roles, status and psychological resources are the product of interaction and can only gain existence and meaning through interaction. Instead of there being a one-way adjustment, there is a two-way interaction between the individual and group, and between the social system and environment. The norms of society are negotiated by its members. Not all groups interact in the same way and neither do they relate to the social system nor the environment in similar modes. Consequently, the norms of society are the product of negotiation between groups rather than imposition by one group. Reciprocal influence means that there is a continuing dialectic between minority and majority groups so that ultimately society redefines itself to incorporate and accept the views of minority groups.

As society redefines itself so it undergoes development. Two developmental forces exist: that which defends and that which seeks to change norms
and values. The product of such forces is a tension or dynamism through which growth occurs. In the genetic model, the underlying dynamism is not consensus and stability but rather conflict. Conflict is the means by which change comes about. Conflict is central to the idea of society redefining itself: "....... interactions are more likely to be effective if they are geared towards an increasing recognition of existing differences." (op.cit., p.6). The recognition of 'existing differences' is contingent upon accurate communication. The coorientation model used in this thesis (Chapters 3 and 7) to elicit intergroup perceptions highlights such differences and suggests where increased interaction is necessary in order to identify conflicts and initiate change.

**Participation**

Participation can also, of course, occur within the framework of a functional model. Here, however, the nature of the participation would be quite different; for example, participation might take the form of control or incorporation by those in power (cf. Chapter 9). Within a genetic model there is the possibility of real change given the reciprocal nature of the influence process. Leaders and experts may well still exist but their status as influential is necessarily reduced to a parity with other participating groups. If it is recognised that planning decisions are governed by value positions rather than technical skills, then minority groups should have an equivalent status in the influence process. It may, however, be impossible to talk of leaders and experts and at the same time strip them of the attributes and expectations they possess under these titles. These are roles and "the concept of role is basically at variance with the participatory ideal" (Stringer, 1975, p.5). As Cole makes quite explicit, "Under a participatory system, there would no longer be one group of 'managers' and one group of 'men' ....... but one group of equal decision-makers." (Pateman 1970, p.39).

As roles are important elements in the functionalist model, it is little surprising that the individual is assumed to submit passively to social and political influence. The periodic elections of representatives ensures that the majority are not totally passive and do have some involvement in policy-making. However, Dearlove (1973) questions whether the 'Electoral Chain
of Command Model and the 'Responsible Party Model' are realistic in suggesting that the voter has a positive role to play in determining governmental policies and restraining elected members' activities. Dearlove is "... forced to conclude that they represent an idealised picture of the situation which bears little relation to the hard realities of electoral and governmental behavior in Kensington and Chelsea ..." (op. cit., p.45). As Cole wrote over fifty years ago "... having chosen his representative, the ordinary man has nothing left to do except let other people govern him." (Cole, 1920, p.114). This does not necessarily mean that elections are meaningless acts, it is just that their functions are "different and more varied than the ones we conventionally assume and teach." (Edelman, 1964, p.3).

In the genetic model, environmental groups and local authorities would engage in a continuing debate not only as to the nature and state of the urban environment but also the part that can be played by environmental groups in the debate itself and in the future planning of the environment. A model of social and political influence in which minority groups are active participants in a continuing dialogue has certain parallels with Cole's idea of functional representation which also is based on an active model of man. For Cole, a participatory system of democracy implies "... the constant participation of the ordinary man in the conduct of those parts of the structure of Society with which he is directly concerned, and which he has therefore the best chance of understanding." (Cole, 1920, p.114).

In Figure 2.1 two other components which differentiate the two models have been labelled the interaction factor and reality. In the functional model the environment is defined in terms of an objective reality. Such a definition presupposes that all sections of society not only perceive the environment in the same way, but that there is also a high degree of agreement or consensus as to the nature of the environment. In a planning context, this would suggest that not only do planners see the environment in the same way as elected members, the public and minority groups such as residents' association, but that also they agree as to its general state or condition. Reality is passed down to the public by those in power (elected representatives, planners) resulting in a predetermined and static view of the world. Environmental problems, such as those found in the inner-city, are defined by
those in power who also put forward the solutions to those problems. It is presumed by those in power that the public see the world in the same way as they do. Assuming a high degree of consensus in terms of perceptions, it is only a short step to assuming that the public will see the solutions to those problems similarly too. If the problems are defined as self-evident, then there is every reason to regard the policies and actions necessary to deal with those problems as also being self-evident. If the world is thus objectively defined, there is little room for conflict.

A Social Construction of Reality

Within the two models it is important to distinguish between the 'objective' and the 'subjective' environment. The former exists in a solipsistic sense as its existence can be validated by technical or sensory apparatus, and needs to a limited extent only a single person to determine its identity or dimensions once certain criteria have been established (Moscovici, 1976, p.32). Within the genetic model, for much of the environment to become meaningful to us, our understanding of reality demands not so much physical confirmation as social interpretation. Meaning in the environment is the product of beliefs, values and attitudes and is not amenable to the same type of validation. In such cases we turn to others for assistance with our judgments. The reality thus becomes social as it is a product of group discussion and is accepted as those around us are seen to share the same information and ideas as we do. To use Moscovici's example, to ascertain the degree of democracy in a country "presupposes a collective consultation and agreement among the members of the group" (Ibid, p.32). Thus reality for the group is the product of communication and negotiation.

While environmental problems are experienced by individuals, there is good reason to believe that the context in which these experiences should be analysed is a social one. Firstly, for environmental problems to exist, they generally must be socially recognised to exist. While not everyone may agree that a certain event or phenomenon is a problem, the communication of concern about that phenomenon is an act which can only take place in a social context. Secondly, there has to be communication and negotiation between individuals and groups to produce alternative courses of action. Agreement
may not always be the outcome, but again the negotiation can only be understood in a social context. Thirdly, action is usually beyond the capacity of a single individual. Action, to be effective, has to be social action where the groups involved engage in a concerted effort to minimise or totally remove the problem.

Berger and Luckmann (1967) argue that once an individual's subjective interpretation of reality is articulated and communicated, it becomes objectively available, in a phenomenological sense, to other individuals. In this way, the individuals "take over" the subjective reality, or the world, of the communicator. Once this world has been taken over it may or may not be modified or reinterpreted. The result of this for Berger and Luckmann is that "I not only understand the other's momentary subjective processes, but I understand the world in which he lives and that world becomes my own" (ibid. p.150).

The contribution of coorientation

The coorientation model (cf. Chapters 3 and 7) attempts to ascertain whether, for example, the planner can understand the world in which the urban resident lives and whether he can put himself 'in the shoes of' the urban resident thereby making the resident's world his own. The result of this is that, in theory, there is an intersubjective appreciation of each other's perspective so that, not only do we understand how another person defines a situation which is shared in common, but we also ascertain whether the definition is reciprocal. Berger and Luckmann argue that it is only when one participates in each other's being and attains this degree of internalisation that one becomes a full member of society. The notion that one is not a full member of society until one participates fully in its dialectic is an important idea in developing a theory of participation. In advocating the creation and development of participatory democracy in which as many citizens as possible are actually involved in the decision-making process, the encouragement of communication between individuals and groups becomes of paramount importance in order that they may learn of and from each other. In this way individuals and groups would not only reciprocally take on the roles and attitudes of each other but they would also take on the other's social world,
thereby becoming full members of society. The consequence of a subjective interpretation of reality is that conflict rather than consensus may be the prevailing norm in society. (cf. Pateman, 1970)

Participation: continued

The genetic model of social influence would seem on a number of counts to be a more appropriate model with which to examine public participation in planning and environmental politics. It might be possible to envisage a participatory system in which minority groups act out predefined roles on the periphery of society. But because the functionalist model of social influence propounds a passive model of man who is always the target of influence and never the source, it is doubtful whether one would really be talking about participation. It will be suggested later in this chapter that the impact of psychology on politics has been limited partly because many psychological theories are insensitive to political realities. A functionalist model of social influence would seem to qualify for such a criticism not only because the influence process is necessarily reciprocal, but also because simple observation reveals that minority groups do influence those in power. Both the genetic and the functionalist models of social influence have political implications for the type of society being described. In the case of the functionalist model, society is organised on a strictly hierarchical basis—a place for each and each in its place. It advocates that not only should there be leaders and experts making decisions for the remainder of society, with the tacit, passive support of the majority, but that minority or dissenting groups have no means of influencing those in power. They are incapable of influencing those in power because firstly, they are defined as passive and secondly, they can only be targets of influence, not sources. What becomes even more intractable a problem is the question of social and political change. Change can only come about at the behest of those in power. Therefore, social change becomes social control. Minority groups become the victims of change rather than its perpetrators. It becomes very difficult to account for the success of organisations like environmental pressure groups if one adopts a functionalist model. Stated simply, while it is easy to explain
why an environmental pressure group loses its battles with the local authority, it becomes impossible to explain why they win.

Discussion

There are principally four reasons why the genetic model of influence is appropriate to this thesis. It is better able to cope theoretically with the problems posed above. It is in closer accord with the political realities of everyday life. It bears a close affinity with the type of participation which has been advocated by participation theorists since the eighteenth century. Rousseau, for example, believed that participation has a psychological effect on the participants, in that it ensures that "there is a continuing interrelationship between the working of institutions and the psychological qualities and attitudes of individuals interacting within them." (Pateman, 1970, p.22). At a relatively simple level, interdependent interrelationships in a non-hierarchical society where the initiative and means of influencing others is held by all is common to both the genetic model and the practise and rationale of participation. Finally coorientation, the principle data elicitation technique used in this thesis, seeks to tap the social reality and subjective experiences of the environment that are possessed by different sections of society.

Coorientation does not assume that a source can only be a source and not a target of influence. The coorientation model is conceptually framed to allow reciprocal communication. The vocabulary that coorientation uses is concerned with influence, effect, change, interaction, prediction, anticipation and communication. It is the same vocabulary that we should be using in our understanding of urban social systems and the enhancement of participatory practices and ideals. To express this in concrete planning terms, in Newcomb's original coorientation model (1953), it is assumed that the two people coorientating on an object or situation were basically equal on a variety of dimensions (e.g. having equal access to information or an equal power relationship). In environmental planning this is unlikely to be the case as the public will not possess the same information as planners nor have equal access and rights to communication channels. However, the
public may have different but no less valid types of information and access to different types of communication channels. It is argued later that planning decisions are based not on technical but political considerations. There are no 'right' answers as such to planning problems, but rather preferred courses of action. Considered in this light, it is perfectly possible for the public to put forward arguments which have equal standing alongside those put forward by planners, with an equal chance of influencing elected members. The fact that environmental groups such as residents' associations do manage in some cases to influence local authorities is evidence of this.

CONCLUSION

The themes discussed above will be returned to throughout the remainder of this thesis. In some cases they provide simply a backdrop to the topics under discussion, or a context in which such topics can be more fully understood. For example, although the elitist theory of democracy is rarely referred to again in this thesis, the pluralist position and the place of participation in pluralism cannot be fully understood without reference to competing theories of democracy and the socio-political relations they assume. Although the review of political psychology is neither extensive nor definitive, it should provide the reader with a clear idea of the substantive areas and approaches commonly found in political psychology, and the place of this study in such a scheme.

In other cases the themes discussed in this chapter are central to the thesis. The discussion of ideology provides an introduction to the empirical analysis of the ideological orientations of different urban groups in Chapters 8 and 9. The theme of social change and influence is to be found in every chapter. The concept of reductionism is taken up again in Chapter 9 and tested for its usefulness in explaining participatory group membership. Finally, each of the themes in this chapter has a valuable contribution to make to our social, psychological and political understanding and advancement of participation.
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

A variety of methodological and data collection strategies have been adopted in order to answer the questions posed and issues raised in Chapters 1 and 2. Data have been collected continuously for this thesis from the summer of 1975 to the summer of 1979. The reasons for this were outlined in Chapter 1. The very nature of community research demands that a process model be adopted for understanding social, environmental and political change. The attitudes and behaviour of urban groups and urban social movements cannot be understood in their attempts to influence political/planning decisions without examining change and development over time. Consequently, in order to complement the rather static picture provided by the questionnaire interview which was carried out early on in the research, primary source material and an active involvement in the Friary Ward Residents' Association over the last four years provided data over a longer consecutive period.

THREE MAJOR QUESTIONS

In Chapter 1, a number of issues were raised which are relevant to the communication and participation relationships which exist between local government and the public. From these initial issues, three major research questions emerge.

Firstly, do the residents of an inner-town ward and the elected members and officers of the local authority live in conflicting social worlds which touch, but rarely interpenetrate each other? Even among the residents themselves, do different groups of residents construe the physical environment differently from each other? A coorientation methodology is used to examine how far each urban group interpenetrates the social world of other significant urban groups.

Secondly, if each of these urban groups construct different interpretations of reality, what means are available to these groups to communicate their views of the world to each other? Especially, what facilities are available to the public to impress upon the Borough Council their perceptions and attitudes towards the environment, in order that the decisions the local authority take narrow the gap between the needs and aspirations of the residents
and the actual policy outputs of the Council? How do the elected representatives apprise themselves of the perspectives of residents?

Up to this point, the thesis is set within a consensualist framework, i.e., differences between groups are seen as resolvable by improvements in communication. If, however, the differences identified in answer to the first question reflect differences in kind, and not degree, this might suggest that a conflict model might be a more appropriate paradigm with which to assess relations between the Council and the public.

If it is apparent from the answers to the first two questions that there is not only poor reciprocal communication between the public and decision-makers, but also conflict between the aspirations and values of residents and decision-makers, then participation may be one means not only of resolving communication difficulties but also of providing a more just, democratic and efficacious political system. An assessment is made of the state of public participation in Guildford and how far it has succeeded in resolving conflicts between planners and the planned. An attempt is made to answer the sort of critical questions posed in Chapter I, such as: how far do those in power allow a minority group to influence urban decision-making? What are the issues over which they allow influence, and why?

Empirically the thesis may be divided into two parts. Census, interview data and documentary sources provide background material on the protagonists and the planning context in which they live and operate. Having set the context, coorientation data from the questionnaire interviews is used to answer the first question posed above (cf. Chapter 7). Interview data, electoral statistics and Council documents furnish information necessary to answer the second question (cf. Chapters 6, 7 and 9). The last question is answered again by data collected from the questionnaire interviews (cf. Chapter 9). However, my own active involvement with the Friary Ward Residents' Association has also provided not only detailed information on the attempts by FWRA to participate in urban planning, but the opportunity to experience at first hand the problems as well as advantages of participation 'at the front'. This experience provided data which has been variously used throughout this thesis.
Questions and Answers

I am hesitant to confer the term hypothesis-testing with its natural science connotation on to the process by which I sought answers to a number of questions which seemed to me to be crucial to the subject of public participation in planning. Hypotheses were not, and I do not believe could be, constructed as they are in experimental research. In terms of the types of questions asked and problems posed, it would be misleading to artificially set up hypotheses which could not in any valid or meaningful way be confirmed or rejected at the .05% or .01% significance level. The research questions and issues have already been identified in Chapters 1 and 2. Questions at a more specific level are raised in Chapter 9, where for example, the following questions are posed: Do participatory groups arise in response to single environmental issues? Is the demand for participation a demand for the decentralisation of decision-making or does it simply reflect a desire for improvements in governmental and planning communication? Does the origin of participating activity lie in (a) grass roots activism, (b) intellectual and academic debate, (c) government initiatives? Answers to these questions will be provided by the various types of data referred to above.

The context in which participation takes place has necessarily provided a further range of questions. For example, how do residents currently have their interests represented, and what are the channels available for questioning the decisions of local government? Such questions are partly answered by an analysis of the electoral system (Chapter 6). Perhaps most important of all are the questions raised by the data themselves. For example, in the coorientation analysis it became clear that there were important differences between the urban and rural councillors' construal of environmental problems in Friary Ward. This prompted a closer examination of the electoral system and the committee structure of Guildford Borough Council in order to ascertain whether there are any important urban/rural differences and biases. This proved to be a very fruitful line of analysis. The coorientation data further revealed that the residents believe that the Council is not a neutral arbiter
in urban conflicts, but represents, like any other group, certain interests based upon its own ideological dispositions. The questioning of residents as to whose interests they thought the Council served, along with a critical analysis of Council policy (Chapter 8) reveals that certain assumptions concerning the representative neutrality of Councils have to be challenged.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

The questionnaire, which provides the main source of data for this thesis, was the end product of extensive pre-piloting work. The 'live' planning issues in Friary Ward were discussed with the Guildford Borough Council Planning Officer responsible for the area. A close reading of the local newspaper (Surrey Daily Advertiser) was also undertaken to extract the salient issues concerning the area reaching the media. Finally, a dozen or so residents in Friary Ward were randomly selected and interviewed on their perceptions and attitudes towards the area and public participation. The interviews were informally structured and served, as did the other methods above, to inform the construction of the final questionnaire. At the same time I also wrote a number of research reports and papers, the aim of which was to develop my thinking on the subjects of community, participation and the distribution of resources in a planning context (Uzzell, 1974a; 1974b; 1974c; 1976).

Pilot Questionnaire

Having decided on the issues to be examined and the questions to be answered, a pilot questionnaire was developed and an attempt was made to justify the various questions in another research report (Uzzell, 1975). The pilot questionnaire, when printed, consisted of some twenty pages of questions and four pages requesting biographical data. It became immediately apparent on piloting the questionnaire with a small number of randomly selected residents that the questionnaire was as unwieldy as it was long. The respondents could not cope with all the questions and their threshold level of tolerance was soon reached.
Final Questionnaire

The questionnaire was revised as a result of the pilot work and reduced to thirteen pages of questions and four pages of biographical information (Appendix 3.1). The questionnaire comprised the following subject areas:

(a) A coorientation approach to the problems of Friary Ward
(b) Whose interests does Council policy serve?
(c) Evaluation of Council services
(d) Six planning issues: preferences, degree of controversy and perceived agreement
(e) A coorientation approach to environmental priorities
(f) Reasons for the membership and non-membership of FWRA
(g) Purpose and aims of Guildford Borough Council and FWRA
(h) Community networks of assistance and influence
(i) Personal contact with the local authority
(j) Knowledge of elected representatives
(k) Roles and duties of councillors and officers
(l) Attitudes towards and understanding of public participation
(m) Personal values
(n) Perception of community in and attitudes towards Friary Ward
(o) Biographical details

A number of small changes were made to the questionnaire so that it could be used for interviewing councillors and officers of the Council. These changes involved excluding those questions which were only relevant to and answerable by the residents of Friary Ward, and adding a number of questions concerning the frequency and method with which councillors and officers are in contact with the public, and sources of influence inside and outside the Council (Appendix 3.2).

The questionnaire was designed to be administered by myself. However, because of some difficulty in interviewing a number of councillors, another questionnaire was devised which could be sent by post and completed by the respondents themselves. This involved changing the wording of some of the questions to make them more self-explanatory. In each of the questionnaires
designed, there was a mixture of open-ended questions, multiple choice questions and questions requiring scaled or ranked responses. The intention of the open-ended questions was to provide a focus for discussion where the responses could be subsequently coded. For example, the interview began with a question asking respondents: "What do you consider to be the chief environmental problems of Friary Ward?" The respondents were allowed to elaborate their answers to their own chosen level. Much of the open-ended data has also been used qualitatively to provide illustrative examples of summary statistics.

THE SAMPLE

Residents

Sampling procedure

Given that changes occur in communities, and that Friary Ward, like most inner town areas, is continually undergoing planning and environmental change, it was felt that the emphasis given by residents to certain issues might change over a protracted period of time, which would make the subsequent analysis difficult. For this reason it was decided to keep the period during which interviews were to take place as short as possible, while at the same time ensuring the sample size would be large enough for statistical treatment. It was estimated that a sample size of about 140 residents would be sufficient for statistical analyses, even when divided into the two categories of members and non-members of the Ward's residents' association. A stratified, random sampling procedure was used to select resident respondents. A total of 137 residents were interviewed, representing 3.83% of the population of Friary Ward (1971 Census). The interviewing of residents took just over three months, and it is considered that this period satisfied the criteria adopted above.

Having predetermined the sample size, I attempted to ensure that each road in the Ward was represented in proportion to the size of population (Figs. 3.1, 3.2). As a major part of the study focuses on the environmental problems as perceived by residents, the possibility of spatial variation in perceptions was
Figure 3.1  Street Plan of Friary Ward (Before York Road Extension).

Figure 3.2  Street Plan of Friary Ward (After York Road Extension).
a crucial element which had to be incorporated. In order to ensure spatial representation, the number of households in each street in the Ward was calculated from the latest published version of the electoral roll (February 1975). A total of 1338 households eventually formed the population, which represented a decrease of 13.17% in households from the 1971 census. Each road was sampled in terms of the number of households within it in proportion to the total number of households in the Ward. The relationship between the number of households interviewed and the number of households per street can be expressed in terms of $y = 0.124x + 0.123 \ (r = 0.978)$, where $x$ represents the number of households in the street, and $y$ the number of households selected. Consequently, of the fifty-four households identified in Artillery Road, for example, seven were selected for interviewing. Having determined the number of households to be interviewed in each road, roughly equal proportions of FWRA members and non-members were interviewed. Although at the time of the survey only 289 households belonged to FWRA (21.6%) it was considered desirable to achieve similarity in representation for the purposes of statistical analysis. Ultimately, of the 137 residents interviewed, sixty-two were members of FWRA (45.3%) and seventy-five respondents were non-members (54.7%). The FWRA non-member residents were randomly selected from the electoral roll. In the case of FWRA members, I possessed a complete list of the current membership and members were randomly sampled from this list to fulfill the criteria of selection adopted above.

Interview preparation

Before embarking on the interviewing, I considered that it might be useful to announce my presence in the area so that residents might be more prepared should I knock on their doors. To this end I briefly described my work at a General Meeting of the Friary Ward Residents' Association. Furthermore, I contacted the local newspaper and suggested they might like to write an article on my research. I considered that this might not only make certain sections of the population more aware of my existence, but it might also legitimise the work for some of the residents.

As the interviews took a minimum of forty minutes, and an average of
one hour to complete, I thought it only fair to potential respondents to explain this while introducing myself and the nature of my visit. Not unexpectedly, some of the residents were reluctant to give up an hour or more of their time. In some cases the first contact was not interested but suggested I called at a later date when their spouse, who was more interested in the subject, would be willing to talk to me. When I received a refusal, an alternative address was selected again by the sampling procedure described above. On a number of occasions the potential respondent was not at home on my first call, and this necessitated a return visit. When repeated visits were unsuccessful an alternative respondent was selected. A response rate of about 72% was achieved. The reasons for non-response varied. Some respondents simply stated that they were uninterested either in being interviewed, or in the subject matter of the interview. A few residents said that they were too busy, while some gave no reason at all. Several residents refused initially, arguing that they were 'unqualified' to talk about planning, or that they did not know anything about the environment. However, having explained to them that I simply wished to learn their views and perceptions as residents, they readily agreed.

Demographic changes since the 1971 Census

The intention behind using the sampling frame described above was to attain not only a spatially representative sample of residents in Friary Ward, but also a socially and economically representative sample. Sixty-two members of FWRA were interviewed which accounted then for just under one-quarter of the paid-up membership of the Association. From my personal observations and my active involvement in FWRA over four years, I have no reason to believe that this sample of FWRA members was unrepresentative or significantly different from the total membership of the Association. As to the representativeness of the sample in comparison with the 1971 Census, this can be gauged from Table 3.1. However, between the 1971 Census and 1976, when the interview survey was carried out, there were undoubtedly changes in the population characteristics of the Ward.

Firstly, and probably most significantly in the context of the social, economic and political structure of inner-city areas and the growth of the
participation 'movement', the early 1970's saw a population shift back into the city centres. An increasing number of younger people, and professional people, perceived the inner city as a desirable place in which to live. Housing costs, at a time of rapid inflation in house prices, were less here than in the suburbs; transport costs were low, with social and shopping facilities close at hand. Furthermore, for those who did not want a packaged Wates home, the condition of the houses allowed greater scope for improvements to be made according to personal preferences. Because many houses did not contain standard amenities they could be bought quite cheaply and improved with government grants.

The second way in which the population now is slightly different from that in 1971 is that the Falcon Road area has been redeveloped since that date by the Council and now contains a small estate of public housing. Thus, in the tenure groupings, council tenants are now likely to be a larger proportion of the total.

Thirdly, many of the houses near the town centre have either been demolished because of their poor condition (Victoria Square) or because the site has been needed for redevelopment and road development (North Place), or they have been abandoned and left empty (Stoke Road, Martyr Road) or they have been taken over and used as offices (Woodbridge Road). This too has caused changes in the population structure.

Fourthly, excepting long-established, stable working-class enclaves, inner areas are, by the nature of the accommodation available, areas of high mobility. This is particularly true in the furnished rented sector. Since 1971, the University of Surrey has expanded and many of the flats and bedsits inhabited by students are in this area. Students generally have a higher purchasing power compared with other social groups seeking this type of accommodation (McDowell, 1978). When the 1981 Census is published it will be possible to gauge the effect of the University on this area.

These four social changes are likely to have affected every aspect of the population composition of Friary Ward. One final rider should be attached to the analysis of the figures in Tables 3.1 and 3.2. Membership of the FWRA is by household, not by individual. A member of the household
was interviewed, and in each case the person interviewed was interested in the activities of FWRA.

Demographic characteristics: members and non-members of the Friary Ward Residents' Association

For this reason, in the context of FWRA membership, the sex breakdown of the sample is not particularly informative or relevant. All that can usefully be said is that more females were interviewed than males, which is the 'correct' proportion in terms of the total Census population (Table 3.1).

FWRA members are on average older than non-members. Exactly two-thirds of FWRA members are aged thirty-five and over, while only just over a third (40%) of non-members fall into this category. The Census population more closely matches FWRA membership, while, except in the 25 - 34 age group, there is even closer conformity when the sample is compared to the Census population.

The marital status of the sample was again very similar to the Census population. I interviewed a larger percentage of married people and a lower percentage of separated/widowed/divorced than are found in Friary Ward according to the Census.

The majority of residents (62%) only received formal education up to the age of sixteen (with the elderly respondents having left school at fourteen). If anything, a slightly higher percentage of FWRA members stayed on at school until eighteen, while an equal number (20%) received higher education.

The social class of those interviewed was derived from the Registrar General's Classification of Occupations. The five standard social classes were identified and used. Other groups included in this section are housewives, students/others and the retired/sick. Housewives formed the largest single social group (24%). A further quarter fell into the category of students/others, retired/sick, and unclassified. Another quarter were skilled manual and non-manual workers, while the remaining 25% comprised the remaining social classes I, II, IV and V. The figures in parentheses are a transformation of the survey percentages into figures which make them comparable with the Census population (cf. Appendix 3.3). The interviewed population were over-
Table 3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Members and Non-members of the Friary Ward Residents Association (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Members</th>
<th>FWRA Members</th>
<th>All Residents</th>
<th>Friary Ward (1971 Census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25 (33%)</td>
<td>24 (39%)</td>
<td>49 (35.8%)</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50 (67%)</td>
<td>38 (61%)</td>
<td>88 (64.2%)</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>137 (100%)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>19 (25%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>27 (19.7%)</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>25 (33%)</td>
<td>12 (19%)</td>
<td>37 (27.0%)</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>14 (10.2%)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>20 (14.6%)</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>15 (20%)</td>
<td>22 (35%)</td>
<td>37 (27.0%)</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>62 (100%)</td>
<td>137 (100%)</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>49 (65%)</td>
<td>36 (58%)</td>
<td>85 (62.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>18 (13.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>15 (20%)</td>
<td>13 (21%)</td>
<td>28 (20.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (4.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>62 (100%)</td>
<td>137 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>10 (7.3%)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>14 (10.2%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>21 (28%)</td>
<td>13 (21%)</td>
<td>34 (24.8%)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (3.6%)</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (5.1%)</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>23 (31%)</td>
<td>10 (16%)</td>
<td>33 (24.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students/others</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (5.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/sick</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
<td>15 (24%)</td>
<td>25 (18.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>62 (100%)</td>
<td>137 (100%)</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupier</td>
<td>39 (52%)</td>
<td>48 (78%)</td>
<td>87 (63.5%)</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>15 (10.9%)</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnished</td>
<td>20 (27%)</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
<td>29 (21.2%)</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfurnished</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>62 (100%)</td>
<td>137 (100%)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Residence</th>
<th>Non-Members</th>
<th>IWEA Members</th>
<th>All Residents</th>
<th>Friary Ward (1971 Census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>23 (31%)</td>
<td>1 ( 2%)</td>
<td>24 (17.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>25 (18.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 years</td>
<td>18 (24%)</td>
<td>19 ( 31%)</td>
<td>37 (27.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>19 (13.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and over</td>
<td>7 ( 9%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>21 (15.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born here and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous residence</td>
<td>3 ( 4%)</td>
<td>4 ( 6%)</td>
<td>7 ( 5.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>2 ( 3%)</td>
<td>2 ( 3%)</td>
<td>4 ( 2.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
<td>62 (100%)</td>
<td>137 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Car ownership       |             |              |               |                          |
| One car             | 44 (59%)    | 33 (53%)     | 77 (56.2%)    | 32.5%                    |
| Two or more cars    | 8 (11%)     | 3 ( 5%)      | 11 ( 8.0%)    | 4.2%                     |
| No car              | 21 (28%)    | 24 (39%)     | 45 (32.8%)    | 63.3%                    |
| Not classified      | 2 ( 3%)     | 2 ( 3%)      | 4 ( 2.9%)     | -                        |
| **Total**           | 75 (100%)   | 62 (100%)    | 137 (100%)    | 100%                     |

| Marital Status (3)  |             |              |               |                          |
| Single              | 13 (17%)    | 11 (18%)     | 24 (17.5%)    | 16.7%                    |
| Married             | 52 (69%)    | 41 (66%)     | 93 (67.8%)    | 50.8%                    |
| Separated / Divorced|     |              |               |                          |
| / Widowed           | 9 (12%)     | 9 (15%)      | 18 (13.1%)    | 32.5%                    |
| Not classified      | 1 ( 1%)     | 1 ( 2%)      | 2 ( 1.5%)     | -                        |
| **Total**           | 75 (100%)   | 62 (100%)    | 137 (100%)    | 100%                     |

See Appendix 3.3 for all Table notes in this chapter.
represented in social classes I, II and V and underrepresented in Social Class IV. The proportion in social class II is broadly similar. When the interviewed population is broken down by membership of FWRA, it can be seen that a higher proportion of FWRA members interviewed were professional and managerial workers than non-members, who tended to be skilled manual and non-manual workers. Only half as many FWRA member housewives were interviewed as non-FWRA member housewives. Conversely, more retired people who were FWRA members were interviewed than non-members, but this can be explained by the high proportion of elderly people in the total FWRA membership.

Residents' associations are sometimes criticised for being simply concerned with the state of the environment as it affects property prices. For this reason the membership of such organisations is usually said to consist overwhelmingly of owner-occupiers. Over three-quarters of the FWRA respondents were owner-occupiers, but the findings in Chapter 9 suggest this is too simplistic an explanation for their membership. Council tenants were more likely not to be FWRA members. Just under 15% of FWRA members I interviewed rented property in the private sector, and these were exclusively furnished tenancies. What differentiates public sector tenants from private sector tenants in their propensity and desire to join a residents' association? While a half of the non-members interviewed were owner-occupiers and another quarter lived in rented furnished accommodation, a very small percentage lived in rented unfurnished accommodation. In this respect my sample differed greatly from the 1971 Census, where 35% of the population of Friary Ward is recorded as living in this type of accommodation. The chances of tenants of unfurnished property not being in when calling or refusing to answer should be no higher than other types of respondents. When these interviews were completed in 1976, the full effects of the 1968 and 1974 Rent Acts had been felt in the form of a considerable reduction in the amount of rented accommodation available.

Car ownership is not only an index of mobility but also of wealth. It is arguable that two car or even one car ownership is generally not as essential in inner city areas as it is in rural areas with poor public transport.
According to the 1971 Census, nearly two-thirds of the residents of Friary Ward were car-less. On this basis, it has been subsequently argued by planning officers and the council that residents' parking is not the problem that residents make it out to be; in other words, because of the low car ownership figures, there is no reason to introduce a residents' parking scheme. Five years' later the 1971 Census can be seen to be totally inaccurate in this respect, a phenomenon which has been noted elsewhere (Stringer, 1978).

In 1976 only one-third of the households were without a car, which must be very similar to the present figure for the whole of Guildford, and probably higher than that of England and Wales. This information should be borne in mind in the later discussion of the issue of residents' parking in the Ward.

Contrary to what might be supposed, FWRA membership does not chiefly consist of young, professional couples. Nearly half (47%) the FWRA members I interviewed had lived in the Ward for more than ten years, compared with only a quarter of the non-members (24%). Only one person in five had lived in the Ward for less than three years and was a member of FWRA. Therefore FWRA membership is more likely to be held by residents who have lived for many years in Friary Ward than those who have only relatively recently moved into the area.

Unfortunately information is not provided in the Census on length of residence, although this question was asked in the Community Attitudes Survey ten years ago (RCLG, 1969, Table 26). Compared with the average length of residence of the sample living in municipal boroughs in the same size category as Guildford (30,000 - 60,000), the population of Friary Ward is far more mobile. Only 17% of the population in the Community Attitudes Survey had lived in their 'home' area for less than three years, compared with 36% in Friary Ward. Thirty-six per cent in the Government survey had either lived in the home area for at least twenty years or were born there and had continuous residence. In my sample in Friary Ward only 20% fell into this category.

Finally, in Table 3.2, the differences between members and non-members of FWRA in their membership of other types of clubs and organisations can be compared. The most immediate point to make is that, as other studies have found (RCLG, 1969, Tables 54, 57), 'joiners' or participators in one type
Table 3.2 Membership of Clubs and Organisations:
FWRA Members and Non-Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Non-members of FWRA n = 75</th>
<th>FWRA members n = 62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public bodies or committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations connected with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>16 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>50 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>12 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure/Sport/Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>18 (24%)</td>
<td>19 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (other than FWRA)</td>
<td>27 (36%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of activity are likely to be 'joiners' in others. Twice to three times as many FWRA members belonged to other types of clubs and organisations as did non-members of FWRA. The most popular type of organisations to which FWRA members belonged were leisure, sports and social clubs (35%) and organisations connected with work (31%). The largest proportion of non-members tended to belong to these same types of organisations. The proportion of clubs and organisations to which non-members belonged was much lower than FWRA members. FWRA members were also more likely to be officers of clubs and organisations to which they belonged than non-members. However, it is not sufficient to say that those who do not belong to the Residents' Association are non-joiners; in some cases their energy is directed to other forms of community involvement, be it sports and social clubs, parent-teacher associations or church clubs. One third of the non-member respondents (36%) did not belong to any organisation at all, which is very similar to the proportion of non-joiners in the Community Attitudes Survey (ibid, Table 52).

Demographic characteristics: the Committee of the Friary Ward Residents' Association

The organisational characteristics of the FWRA committee and the responsibilities of its members are described in detail in Appendix 3.4. In this last section attention focuses on the socio-economic characteristics of the FWRA committee members at the time of the interview survey. The FWRA committee consists of residents who are on average much younger (82% under 45 years old) than ordinary members (43% under forty-five years old) (Table 3.3). The highest proportion of ordinary members fall within the over sixty age group. With a relatively large number of younger people on the FWRA committee it does not come as a great surprise to find that a high proportion of committee members are single.

Committee members of FWRA tend to have received a longer formal education than ordinary members. At the time of the interviews there was one Ph.D research student on the committee and a lecturer from the North London Polytechnic. By contrast nearly two-thirds of the ordinary members had left school by the time they were sixteen. The educational background of committee members is reflected in their socio-economic status, with over half of the committee in SE Groups I or II. Less than one in five ordinary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA Committee n = 11</th>
<th>FWRA members n = 51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
<td>18 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>33 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>20 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>33 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2 (16%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students/others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/sick</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupier</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
<td>39 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented: furnished</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented: unfurnished</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 years</td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
<td>13 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and over</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>12 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born here and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous residence</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car ownership</td>
<td>FWRA Committee</td>
<td>FWRA members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 11</td>
<td>n = 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One car</td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
<td>27 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more cars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No car</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>19 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>51 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
members fell into this category. The largest social groups amongst ordinary members were the retired, skilled workers (manual and non-manual - S.E.G.III) and housewives. Socio-economic Groups IV and V were not represented on the Committee.

With regard to the remaining socio-economic indices, the FWRA committee was very similar to the main body of members. Just over half of both groups had access to at least one car, while about two in every five of each group did not possess a car at all. It has already been shown that the form of house tenure and the length of residence are two of the most important differentiators between members and non-members of the Residents' Association. In both of these respects the committee members are very similar to the ordinary members. The majority (about four in every five) in both groups were owner-occupiers, with a small percentage of council tenants and tenants of privately rented furnished accommodation. As was shown above, the membership of FWRA is largely composed of the older residents who have lived in the Ward for a number of years and this is reflected in the composition of the FWRA committee.

Discussion

The sample of residents interviewed in 1976 does not differ radically from the population of the Ward as described in the 1971 Census. There are some differences, but these are seen to be the product of a changing population in the Ward, rather than deficiencies in the sampling procedure. For example, the proportion of Council tenants and car owners is over-represented according to the 1971 Census, but in the former case it is known that there has been both municipalisation of existing property and additional Council building. The higher population of local authority tenants is likely to create changes in the other socio-economic categories. The rise in car ownership since 1971 is a national phenomenon.

The FWRA committee, like many voluntary organisations, claims much of its membership from the 'joining', middle-class section of the population. However, such a brief description does not tell the full story. The general support for FWRA is broadly based and all social classes are represented to a greater or lesser degree. In this respect the sample of FWRA members interviewed differs little from the non-membership interviewed. Furthermore,
contrary to what many might assume, it is not the recently arrived residents who form the bulk of the membership, but rather those who have long-established roots and ties in the area. Consequently, their environmental perceptions are coloured to a considerable degree by the changes they have both seen and experienced in the Ward. Their perceptions, given this factor, are likely to be different from those of the non-membership who, comparatively, have lived fewer years in the Ward.

Guildford Borough Councillors

Sampling procedure

It was not possible to interview all the elected members although every effort was made to do so. Thirty-four out of the forty-two councillors on Guildford Borough Council were interviewed, representing a response rate of 81%. The reasons for refusals were threefold. In some cases it proved to be impossible to arrange mutually convenient times for an interview to take place. In such cases a postal questionnaire was sent to the respondent. Five postal questionnaires were sent and two returned. In several cases the councillors refused to be interviewed, arguing that they made it a personal policy not to be interviewed by researchers. Finally, in one particular case an interview was arranged with a councillor and he failed to keep the appointment. Another interview was arranged, and again he failed to keep the appointment. On neither occasion did he inform me prior to the meeting that he would be unable to attend or did he contact me afterwards to apologise. The interviews with councillors generally took longer than with residents. Some councillors were willing to talk for three hours or more.

Demographic characteristics

The Guildford sample of councillors is very similar in social characteristics to the national sample of councillors found in the Maud Report (1967, Chapter I) (Table 3.4). The Guildford Borough councillors are much older on average than the local population and only a relatively small proportion are women (Table 3.4). However, in comparison with the national sample for England and Wales as given in the Maud Report, it can be seen that one
### Table 3.4 Demographic Characteristics of the Guildford Borough Councillors (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Population of Guildford Municipal Borough and Rural District (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students/others</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/sick</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupier</td>
<td>30 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented: furnished</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented: unfurnished</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One car</td>
<td>16 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more cars</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No car</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
councillor in four in Guildford is female as compared with one in eight over the whole country (Table 3.5). Compared with the national sample of municipal borough councillors, more of Guildford's councillors are middle-aged and have attained a high standard of education.

In terms of occupational characteristics, the largest group of councillors falls into Social Class I, which is chiefly composed of employers and managers. Under 10% are either skilled manual or non-manual workers, compared with 47% of the economically active in Guildford, and no councillor falls in SC group IV or V. Therefore, there is a similarity between the national sample and Guildford Borough Council in SC groups I and II and an under representation in SC Groups III, IV and V.

Probably the greatest disparity between Guildford councillors and the population of the borough can be seen in housing tenure. Eighty-eight per cent of the councillors interviewed were owner-occupiers, the remainder were unclassified. Not one councillor was either a council tenant or lived in privately rented accommodation. Even in the national sample of municipal borough councillors only 67% were owner-occupiers and 22% were either private or council tenants. Finally, with regard to mobility, no councillor was without a car, while over 40% had access to two or more cars. In Guildford a third of the population are car-less while only 16% have access to two or more cars.

Political composition and committee membership

The Conservative Party dominates Guildford Borough Council (Table 3.6). The sample interviewed mirrors almost exactly the political composition of the Council. Four councillors in every five were interviewed, which ensured that members on each Council Committee were represented. The Committees represented (with the number of members interviewed in brackets) are as follows: Policy and Resources (13); Planning (18); Building and Works (16); Personal Services (14); Arts and Recreation (13). Of the thirty-four councillors interviewed, eight (24%) were either Chairmen of Committees, Vice-Chairmen or Deputy Vice-Chairmen.
### Table 3.5 Demographic Characteristics of the Guildford Borough Councillors (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guildford Borough Council</th>
<th>England and Wales (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25 (74%)</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>24 (70%)</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class (15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.6 Political Composition of Guildford Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Number on Council</th>
<th>Number Interviewed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>29 (69%)</td>
<td>24 (70%)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>6 (14%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Reference to every socio-economic indicator reveals that the elected members for Guildford are by no means representative of the population of the borough as a whole. The councillors do not mirror the population of Guildford, although they do probably conform collectively to the stereotypical image of the resident of Guildford - middle-aged, middle-class, mobile owner-occupiers. However, the description earlier of the population and housing conditions of a sizeable proportion of the population reveals that the stereotype is far from being accurate.

How important is it that councillors mirror the social characteristics of the general population? On the basis that research has shown that, for example, social class as an important independent variable is capable of predicting differences in social attitudes and values, then one might be led to the conclusion that it is crucial.

Part of this thesis is concerned with assessing whether elected members can coorientate with residents, and take on their perspective. If they can, then socio-economic differences between the representative and his electorate might be seen to be of only minor importance. If, however, it is shown that councillors cannot coorientate with residents, then it is arguable that socio-economic differences are important as the cause of their inability to coorientate is derived from their one social position.

Guildford Borough Council Officers

Sampling procedure

Fourteen officers of Guildford Borough Council were interviewed. The Chief Executive was understandably reluctant to allow me unlimited access to all the officers. Eventually he agreed to me interviewing the Heads of each department and the senior officers of the housing and planning departments.

Demographic characteristics

As might be expected, the majority of senior officers working for Guildford Borough Council are male, middle-aged, married and mobile (Table 3.7). In these respects, they are similar to their employers, Guildford Borough Council (Table 3.4). The officers do differ from this latter group though in
Table 3.7 Demographic Characteristics of the Guildford Borough Council Officers

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced/Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car-ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One car</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two cars</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No car</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own or buying</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from local authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately rented - furnished</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately rented - unfurnished</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the higher level of formal education which they have received. Very few senior officers are Guildford, or even Surrey, born and raised. It is generally recognised within local authorities that career advancement necessitates mobility between authorities (cf. Department of the Environment, 1973) and Guildford Borough Council provides no exception.

Discussion

It is interesting to reflect upon the staff changes which have taken place since I completed the officer interviews in 1976 and the present time (Autumn 1979). The Head of Technical Services (into whose section the Planning Department falls) and the Chief Architect have both died. The Chief Planning Officer has become a Department of the Environment planning inspector. The planning officer responsible for town centre developments and the planning of Friary Ward, has taken up a planning post in Southern Africa; and the Environmental Health Officer responsible for the Stoke Fields General Improvement Area has moved to another local authority in Surrey. Consequently local authority officers with long-established roots in the community and a close empathetic relationship with both the environment and its inhabitants are probably in the minority. The implications in terms of coorientational abilities of local authority officers should be apparent. One might expect that many senior officers would have some difficulty coorientating with residents, except those who are constantly provided with information about the people and the area. Even then their knowledge will reflect the source of their information. Besides direct communication between the public and the officers, it can be seen in Table 7.1 that councillors are an important source of information. But it remains to be seen how well they too know the problems, wishes and interests of their electorate.

DATA ANALYSIS

Questionnaire Data

Coding

The data elicited by means of the questionnaire were in three forms: open-
ended responses; multiple-choice responses and scaled and ranked responses. In the case of the open-ended responses, all the data were examined and subsequently classified into a smaller number of groups, although it was decided at the coding stage to preserve as much detail as possible in order that the collapsing of some items could take place at a later date should this be necessary. For example, many answers were given to the question "What do you consider to be the chief environmental problems of Friary Ward?" At the coding stage, these answers were classified into some 37 groups. On subsequent analysis some groups were further collapsed. In Chapter 7 where the answers to this question are analysed, it will be seen that the analysis ultimately concentrated only on those responses which were given by more than 10% of the sample. Therefore many of the responses have not been discussed in this thesis. All the data from the questionnaire was coded for analysis by computer. A total of 690 codes were eventually put on coding sheets, which required ten computer punch cards per individual case. The total sample of 185 respondents meant that the questionnaire data required 1850 punch cards. To ease handling the data were transferred from cards onto tape.

Statistical analysis

The analysis of the questionnaires was undertaken largely by the use of the SPSS computer package, although a BMD programme was used for one analysis of variance. Because many of the questions were open-ended they were coded on a 'zero-one' basis and thus analysis was limited to statistical tests which require only nominal data. The analysis of the co-orientation results fall into this category, where the statistics used are percentages and chi-squared tests. However, as will be seen in Chapter 7, a variation of the $d^2$ statistic was also employed, as was a rank ordering procedure which allowed the use of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. The statistical procedures were kept relatively simple for the remainder of the data (e.g. t-tests, Fisher's Exact test, and correlation statistics) although a principal components analysis was employed on the 1971 Census data. The open-ended responses provided qualitative data which were used to supplement the
numerical analysis. In many cases, quotations and extended comments provide an excellent way of conveying the flavour and subtle interpretation that respondents place on issues and events.

Primary Written Sources

Statistical sources

The second source of data comes under the heading of primary written sources. Into this category falls the 1971 Census material which was used not only for examining the representativeness of the sample population but provided data for both the cartographical analysis of the socio-economic and housing conditions in Friary Ward and the factorial ecological study of Guildford (Chapter 4). In this case data was extracted from the small area statistics for each of the 120 enumeration districts in Guildford, and fed into the principal components analysis. Other forms of numerical data were provided by an examination of the Improvement Grants Register of Guildford Borough Council and the register of demolished houses and clearance areas. Data from both these sources provided invaluable supporting evidence in the testing of hypotheses concerning the housing and environmental policies of Guildford Borough Council. Each of these registers provides a rich source of material which could be further utilised for examining planning issues such as blighting, the spatial diffusion process in the application for house improvement grants, etc. The 1973 election provided the voting and turnout statistics for Chapter 7.

Documentary sources

Documentary material, in the form of Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council Planning Departments' plans and policy statements, and consultants' plans, also provided a valuable source of information on the recent planning history (post 1945) of Friary Ward. The Jellicoe Report on Guildford drawn up in 1945, "Traffic in Guildford" produced by Buchanan in 1965, and the Guildford and District Town Map (1966) are all crucial documents in the planning history of the Ward. Finally, the correspondence and newsletters of the Friary Ward Residents' Association since 1968 also...
provided a valuable source of documentary evidence used throughout this thesis.

Social Indicators

In the early stages of the research it was intended to examine the 'disadvantaged' in Guildford, especially in Friary Ward, by means of an analysis of social indicators. To this end, detailed statistics were collected from the Social Services Department, the Law Society (applications for Legal Aid), Surrey County Constabulary and the Citizens Advice Bureau. However, such an objective was later abandoned.

Action and Intervention Research

Strategies and examples

The third methodological approach I have adopted follows an action and intervention research strategy. Action research is a relatively familiar concept to social science researchers. The essence of action research is that those who do the research will be affected by the results of that research. However, in addition to this there is a reciprocal relationship between research and action, as research is part of the action and action is part of the research. Or, as Rowan puts it, "The process of doing the research is itself part of the action to be taken." (Rowan, 1976, p.184). Inner urban areas have often been used as the test-bed for this type of approach: the Home Office Community Development Projects are one of the most well-known recent examples in Britain. One of the important features of action research is that the researcher remains basically a researcher. His role within the community is essentially a data-gathering one. The products of his efforts are fed directly into the system and serve to inform and influence the decision-making process. Furthermore, the action so constituted produces more research data thereby providing a continuous perspective on the situation studied.

For example, I was able to analyse the improvement grant register of the local authority. This shows the detailed distribution of house improvement grants in the borough and the sums involved. As a result of my analysis of
the grants register (described in detail in Chapter 5), I have been able to show that there are financial advantages for local authorities who declare General Improvement Areas but do not carry out environmental improvements. Guildford Borough Council had saved by September 1977 over £6,000 and, when outstanding work has been completed, this should rise to over £9,000. This information has been given to the local authority and the Residents' Association and will be used by the Residents' Association in support of their demands for environmental improvements.

In action research, members of the community themselves are often responsible for carrying out research, even though they have no formal training in research and research methods. Often such research takes the form of surveys. In action research the intention is to pass on skills to members of the community so that they may do their own research in future without being dependent upon 'professionals'. A number of surveys have now been completed in Friary Ward (e.g. residents' parking scheme; attitudes towards parish status) using these techniques. In the case of the survey of residents' attitudes towards a Parish Council for Friary Ward, a questionnaire was constructed jointly between myself and several committee members of FWRA. With the assistance of a number of undergraduates from the University of Surrey and the committee of FWRA, a third of the households of Friary Ward were interviewed. The results of this survey were written up in a report and submitted to the Council. The results have also provided invaluable evidence in support of a major assumption found in many participation studies and assessed for its veracity in Chapter 9. An action research strategy has also provided substantive data on particular planning issues in Chapter 8 (the history of the Friary development scheme) and Chapter 9 (the residents' parking problem; the Drummond Road link road; the control of office expansion in residential areas).

In intervention research, research comes out in the form of shared experience with those with whom one is working. While such a strategy may not necessarily inform the research project in the form of hard data, it does provide a wealth of experiential material which can not only support material collected from more orthodox sources, but also suggests hypotheses and issues which warrant further exploration. An intervention research strategy has
fulfilled both of these objectives and has variously contributed to the thesis in the chapters which follow. A fuller account of the various roles which I have played in Friary Ward as a researcher ('change agent', 'broker', 'educator' as well as the more traditional 'chronicler of social activity' as I term it) and the value reasons for adopting such roles can be read elsewhere (Uzzell, 1979).

THE COORIENTATION MODEL

The last section of this chapter examines the coorientation model which has provided the methodological framework for the collection of data on residents', councillors' and officers' contrasting cognitions and perceptions of the inner-city environment.

If we are to ascertain the social reality of various urban groups, we need three basic kinds of information. Firstly, there has to be an assessment of the individual's cognitive map; in other words one needs to know how an individual construes any given situation. Then one needs to determine who are the other people relevant to the situation (these are analogous to Berger and Luckmann's (1967) 'significant others') and then assess their construal of the situation. Finally, in order to demonstrate the essentially social nature of the first two propositions, one needs also to assess the degree of correspondence which exists between them.

Reading through the coorientation literature there is continued reference to the coorientation model. However, within three years three coorientation models were put forward (Laing et al, 1966; Scheff, 1967; Chaffee and McLeod, 1968). In this thesis, it is the Chaffee and McLeod model of coorientation to which reference is made. In this there are three coorientational perspectives. These three perspectives or variables are agreement, congruency and accuracy, and are derived from person perception research (Tagiuri, Bruner and Blake, 1958).

Agreement

The first concept is that of agreement (Figure 3.3 (a)). This focuses
on the similarity in cognitions or the agreement two people have about an object. For example, in Figure 3.3 this would represent a Friary Ward resident's cognition of the inner urban environment and its degree of similarity with the cognition of that same environment held by a Guildford Borough Council planner. In this thesis the first coorientational variable is not described as the agreement variable but rather as the similarity variable. (For a detailed discussion of the similarity versus agreement label argument, see Appendix 3.5).

Congruency

The second concept is congruency or intrapersonal similarity (Figure 3.3(b)). Congruency is the similarity which exists between one person's cognition about an object and his perception or evaluation of the other person's cognition about the same object. Using the example here it would represent the similarity which exists between a Friary Ward resident's evaluation of his environment and his perception of how the Guildford Borough Council's planning department sees the same environment. Congruence is to a certain extent a measure of a person's faith in another person's level of awareness. For example, high congruency amongst residents would suggest that residents think that the local authority planners see the environment in much the same way as they do. Low congruency would suggest a lack of faith by residents in the planners' awareness of their concerns. In the coorientation model it is important to remember that the focus of attention moves away from studying the cognitions and perceptions of individuals or groups per se to examining the relationship which exists between these cognitions and perceptions (Figure 3.3 (a); (b); (c)).

Accuracy

The third concept is that of accuracy (Figure 3.3 (c)). This is the similarity between one person's perception of another person's cognition, and the other person's actual cognition. In our example, this is the similarity which exists between what the Friary Ward resident thinks a
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planner thinks about the environment and what the Guildford Borough Council planner actually thinks. If environmental perception studies are to be concerned with examining the interests, values and attitudes of urban residents and decision-makers, one of the first priorities should be to establish whether these groups understand each other and can accurately perceive the interests, values and attitudes of other groups. This is the basis of communication. Much research in the field of communications has concentrated on and emphasised the goal of agreement rather than accuracy in the communication process. Agreement between groups is only of importance if one is striving for a totally consensual model of society. Even if consensus were possible, it might not be a desirable goal in terms of arousing and maintaining public participation in the political process if Coser's arguments on the functions of social conflict are to be accepted (Coser, 1956). Such a view is held by Bowes and Stamm, who write, "Finally, because outcomes are of legitimately debatable promise, the goal of communication ideally should not be agreement but rather one of attaining accuracy, when each party in the system perceives correctly the outlook of others ... Ideally, this goal would serve to minimise perceptual distortion and maximise cognitive overlap among groups involved, enhancing adequate public debate and discussion on resources exploitation." (1974, p.2). Improved accuracy in communication between groups does not necessarily lead to increased agreement or congruency, but it is central to meaningful and efficacious political debate and to the type of political interaction which is the basis of a participatory democracy.

Measurement

The traditional method of collecting coorientational data has been to scale coorientation responses and then measure the differences. For example, in scaling congruency, the respondent's scaled cognition response is subtracted from the scaled response he gives to his perception of the cognition of the person with whom he is coorientating (d technique). These differences are summed for every item on which a coorientational measure
is taken. A slight refinement of the d technique is to square the differences before summing in order to remove directionality and give weight to the more extreme differences \( (d^2 \text{ technique}) \) (Hesse, 1976). This technique can be applied to each of the three coorientational indices.

Bowes and Stamm (op.cit., p.11) point to three particular problems associated with the d technique. These are the contamination of scaled responses by set and projection and the problem of reification. Reification is dealt with in a later chapter and the arguments which apply at a conceptual level apply equally at a methodological level (cf. Chapter 10). The problem of response set befalls any methodology where scaled responses are required, as it refers to the individual differences in using scales (in terms of range and variability of scaled response). Projection is more specific to the congruency index. This revolves around either the cues which the respondent (A) picks up concerning his coorientational partner's (B) orientation, or A's tendency to project his own rating on to B's presumed response. It is possible to argue that the first projection problem is almost inevitable and in some ways a necessary element as it contributes to the information which makes up A's social reality. Coorientation without any cues or knowledge of the coorientational partner or group's orientation is as valueless as it is unlikely. One should be coorientating with 'significant others' and presumably in one important respect they are significant because they continually communicate cues about their orientations by virtue of their position or relationship with the respondent.

Bowes and Stamm attempt to circumvent this by creating an 'index of profile similarity' which draws on linear regression and attempts to reflect "the similarity of pattern in scale use rather than absolute scale differences." (op.cit., p.12). In the interviews carried out for this thesis, respondents were not presented with a set of issues and asked to scale their responses in terms of the coorientational indices. Instead, respondents were asked what they considered to be the most important problems affecting Friary Ward. They were not expected to rank these problems. By adopting such a procedure it was hoped to facilitate as unrestrained a response as possible. Statistically, therefore, the data was collected at a nominal
scale. It will be seen in Chapter 7 that much of the data has been analysed simply in terms of percentages and percentage differences between the groups. Such an analysis is not uncommon in the coorientational literature (e.g. Stamm and Pearce, 1971; Stamm and Bowes, 1972; Tichenor et al, 1973). However, I applied a variant of the $d^2$ technique to the percentage figures in the data in order to provide an overall summary statistic of each coorientation table.

The $d$ statistic

In the tables in Chapter 7, three statistics are included. The $d$ statistic is the mean over/under-estimation between the two groups' responses (e.g. the residents' cognition; the councillors' cognition). While $d$ can be useful in showing the direction of the differences in the percentage support, it is not a particularly accurate measurement as a high over-estimation and a high under-estimation over a range of six issues can cancel out any difference, resulting in a mean difference close to 0.

The $C$ score

The second statistic is the overall coorientation score $C$ which is a variant of the $d^2$ statistic, and is used on the percentage figures presented in Chapter 7. The advantage of $d^2$ statistic is that it circumvents the problem of $d$ above, while at the same time gives weight to the more extreme differences. The coorientation statistic $C$ involves computing the sum of the square of the differences between the percentage responses, dividing by the number of issues being considered and then finding the square root. This is more meaningful as extreme differences do not cancel each other out. Thus in Table 6.22 (Chapter 7) a low $d$ score of 3.6% suggests a high degree of congruency. However, the $C$ statistic gives an overall congruency score of 18.5% which indicates very low congruency. In order to evaluate whether a coorientation score is low or high one must be able to measure it against a theoretical maximum and minimum score. The minimum score will always be 0, where there is no difference between the percentage of respondents in each group articulating concern over an issue. The maximum score is always
variable and is, of course, governed by the difference between, for example, the percentage support for each cognition (in the case of the similarity index). Therefore, if 30% of the residents articulated concern on each of the six most important issues, and these issues were not mentioned by any councillor, then the maximum coorientation score ($c$) would be 30%. However, in reality the percentage support for each issue declines from about 38% for the most frequently cited cognition to about 14% to the sixth most often cited cognition. The cognition or perception percentage against which this is compared can vary similarly. The mean percentage support for the six most commonly cited cognitions for each of the groups of residents and councillors were: non-members - 20.7%, FWRA members - 27.4%; all residents - 22.9%; councillors - 27.9%. As a guide a coorientation score of about 18% is not uncommon, indicating a high degree of dissimilarity, low congruency or low accuracy.

The Spearman rank-order correlation

The third summary statistic is $rs$ (Spearman rank-order correlation) which ranks the percentage support for each issue and tests the degree of association between the rankings of the two groups.
Guildford has steadily risen in the social scale. The role of well-to-do residents is constantly increasing and large houses have arisen around like Aladdin's palaces. This increasing prosperity is largely due to natural advantages. But there has emanated from those in authority in the borough, a wise policy of moving ahead. Cinderella could not always be kept in the background. To stand still would have been fatal to Guildford's prosperity. Prince popular sought her and today Guildford is one of the most noted residential resorts of Surrey.
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INTRODUCTION

In this chapter a picture of the social, economic and political context in which environmental cognitions are formed, and planning and participation takes place is described. The chapter begins with a factorial ecological analysis. This provides a composite image of Guildford through the main dimensions of social and economic life as drawn out by a principal components analysis of the 1971 population Census data for each enumeration district in the town.

The second section focuses entirely on the social, economic and housing characteristics of Friary Ward. Census data for each enumeration district in the Ward is mapped. This provides evidence in support of the interview data in Chapter 7, that one small and seemingly homogeneous inner-city area is a mosaic of social worlds and planning problems.

A FACTORIAL ECOLOGICAL STUDY OF GUILDFORD

Factor Analysis

One of the most useful methods of succinctly communicating an image of the socio-economic structure of Guildford is factorial ecology. This technique is a direct descendent of the more subjective methods of urban analysis devised by the Chicago School of Urban Ecologists in the 1920's. The Chicago ecologists, Burgess, Park and McKenzie among others, sought to analyse the relationship between the social and spatial structure of the city (cf. Park et al. 1923; Pahl, 1970; Berry and Horton, 1970; Timms, 1971; Herbert, 1972). Factorial ecology seeks to do the same, but subjective observations of such relationships are replaced by the supposedly more objective statistical procedure known as factor analysis, succinctly described by Harman thus:

"The principle concern of factor analysis is the resolution of a set of variables linearly in terms of (usually) a small number of categories or 'factors'. This resolution can be accomplished by the analysis of correlations among the variables. A satisfactory solution will yield factors which convey all the essential information of the original set of variables. Thus the chief aim is to obtain scientific parsimony or economy of description." (1967, p.4)

In factorial ecology variation in neighbourhood characteristics is accounted
for by the resolution of a set of spatially determined social and economic variables.

The Conclusions of Previous Studies

Since factor analysis was first used to study the social composition of cities, a considerable amount of evidence has been accumulated in western industrial societies which suggests that, despite the differing variables used and the different geographical contexts, the variation of sub-area populations of most western cities can be explained by three or four dimensions of differentiation (Timms, op.cit., pp. 54-63). Socio-economic status or social rank appears to have universal importance, while the second major factor of differentiation centres on a family types dimension. The ethnic composition of the population and its mobility characteristics have also been shown to be of considerable importance in differentiating sub-areas of population. Factor ecology studies have almost invariably been carried out on large metropolitan areas and cities, not relatively small market/commuter towns. Consequently, the results of this study will reflect this difference. Furthermore, evidence from British studies indicates that there are other important differences. Herbert suggests that these differences may not only reflect differences in the structure of society between Britain and other countries, but in particular the role of local authorities in the housing market (op.cit., p. 166). Housing tenure and density of occupancy have repeatedly emerged as the principal factors. In this respect the Guildford study is not exceptional. The results for Guildford are typical in many ways of similar British studies, although the percentage variance accounted for by the principal components is higher than that found in Herbert's studies of Swansea and Cardiff suggesting a less diversified population than is found in these two particular Welsh industrial cities (1970). The percentage variance accounted for by the first four principal components in Guildford, Swansea and Cardiff are tabulated in Table 4.1.
### Table 1.1 Percentage Variance of Principal Components: Guildford, Swansea, Cardiff Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Guildford</th>
<th>Swansea</th>
<th>Cardiff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% variance</td>
<td>cumulative %</td>
<td>% variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component I</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component II</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component III</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component IV</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1.2 Principal Component I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>loading</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupier</td>
<td>.81468</td>
<td>Married women working</td>
<td>-.76144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 0.5 persons per room</td>
<td>.71120</td>
<td>Council tenants</td>
<td>-.71431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two car ownership</td>
<td>.68788</td>
<td>Skilled workers</td>
<td>-.76144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals and managerial workers</td>
<td>.53329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1.3 Principal Component II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>loading</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private furnished rentings</td>
<td>.83483</td>
<td>One car ownership</td>
<td>-.41968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1.5 persons/room</td>
<td>.71328</td>
<td>Age under 16</td>
<td>-.43878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared dwellings</td>
<td>.66018</td>
<td>Council tenants</td>
<td>-.32019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of foreigners</td>
<td>.61013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single person households</td>
<td>.58767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 17-35</td>
<td>.51078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Analysis

Variables

The twenty-four variables selected for inclusion in the analysis covered a wide range of urban characteristics, and in common with factorial studies carried out in other cities, reflected the social, economic, demographic and housing standards of the modern city (cf. Herbert, op.cit., p.167). This data is readily available from the Census (1971 Census: Ward Library, Small Area Statistics) at enumeration district level. An additional advantage of the factorial ecological approach is that, with the use of a computer, large quantities of data can be handled. In this particular case information on twenty-four variables was available for 120 enumeration districts: therefore, 2880 'bits' of spatial, social and economic information were resolved in the principal components analysis.

The first ten variables relate to housing and housing standards. The second seven variables attempt to summarise some of the demographic and familial characteristics of Guildford. The third group of variables relate to the social and economic characteristics of Guildford. And finally, an ethnic variable is introduced.

(i) Housing and housing standards:
- Furnished houses and flats (rented)
- Council house occupiers
- Owner occupiers
- Unfurnished (rented)

(ii) Houses without inside W.C.
- Houses without bath
- Houses without hot water

Sharing dwellings
- Over 1.5 persons per room
- Less than 0.5 persons per room

(iii) Demographic and familial characteristics:
- Population under 16
- Population 17-35
- Population 36-60
- Population over 60
- One person household
- Six person household
(iv) Social and economic characteristics:

One car owner
Two cars or more owners
Professional and Managers - Social Groups 1 2 3 4 13
Intermediate and junior non-manual - Social Groups 5 6
Skilled manual - Social groups 8 9 12 14
Semi and unskilled manual - Social groups 7 10 11 15 16 17
Married women working

(v) Ethnic characteristics:

Foreigners

The Results

First principal component

From the positive and negative loadings (Table 4.2) it is possible to distinguish the essential elements in the social and economic life of Guildford. The first component represents a social rank dimension, whereby owner-occupiers, professional and managerial workers and two car owners are the dominant dimension in the social structure of Guildford. These high loadings are confirmed by the high correlation coefficients which exist between the three variables. Also loading high is a population density of less than .5 persons/room, which indicates that these residents are living in low density housing. Thus one pole of the dominant socio-economic aspect of Guildford life is characterised by a middle-class life-style, with low density owner-occupied housing, inhabited by residents of high socio-economic status and enjoying a high standard of living as measured by the high percentage of two car owners.

Contrasting with the middle-class life-style, the other pole focuses on the working-class population. Here we find council house tenants and skilled workers loading highly. There is also a third group of married working women, which suggests that on the several large council estates in Guildford there is a tendency not found in middle-class areas for married women to go out to work.

The percentage of householders in Guildford who are owner-occupiers is comparable to the proportion in England and Wales as a whole. The percentage of council house tenants is below the national average (Guildford 24%, England
and Wales 27.9%). There is also a very high percentage of professional, managerial and skilled non-manual workers in Guildford (50.7%) compared with the average for England and Wales (32.6%). Semi-skilled and skilled workers make up just under 50% of the Guildford work force, compared with the national average of 67.4%.

**Mapping the factor scores**

By the computation of factor scores it is possible to map the various factors geographically. Factor scores were calculated for each enumeration district and consequently one is able to plot each spatial area in terms of its relative importance on each dimension. By plotting each enumeration district in terms of its factor score, it is possible to produce a spatial representation of the various dimensions. Maps have been produced for each of the first three factors. The range of the factor scores was calculated for each principal component and each enumeration district was then classified as to whether it scored high, medium or low on each dimension. For example, the range of factor scores on the first principal component was +2.91536 to -1.70054, producing a total range of 4.6159. This figure was then divided by 3 (1.53863) in order to classify the enumeration districts into one of three groups. Consequently 'high' score enumeration districts were those enumeration districts whose factor scores fell between 2.91536 and 1.37673. 'Medium' score enumeration districts were those lying between 1.37673 and -0.16191 and 'low' score enumeration districts were those between -0.16191 and -1.70054. Thus 'high' score enumeration districts are those areas which have high positive loadings on each dimension, while 'low' score enumeration districts are equivalent to the high negative loadings on the same dimension. On the first map (Figure 4.1), 'high' represents those areas having a high incidence of professional and intermediate workers, living in low density private developments and possessing two cars.

The area to the south of Guildford (Figure 4.1) is partly rural, with housing stock which is chiefly post-1919. Its residential districts occupy the highest ground, lying on the north side of the North Downs. It is considered to be a highly desirable area in terms of environmental quality and housing standards, and provides a marked contrast to the northern part of the town which lies on the
broad floodplain of the River Wey. The distribution of expensive residential property reinforces the point put forward by Hoyt (1939, p.117-19), that any attempt to understand the social structure of a city in terms of its spatial structure must take into account the physical environment. Hoyt's model suggests that upper-class residential developments will migrate to areas of high land and water-side areas. This has occurred in Guildford. There is an outlier of upper-class development situated around Stoke Park, which is the largest area of open space within Guildford.

The flat floodplain of the Wey to the north of the town has been considered less desirable for residential development in the past, and consequently has only relatively recently been built upon. This land is the cheapest to be found in Guildford and has been used for all the major council housing developments. This is apparent from the 'low' score areas to the north of Slyfield Green and Bellfields, and to the west in Park Barn and Westborough. The negative loadings on the first factor are a product of these areas where there is a high preponderance of council housing, skilled manual workers and an above average percentage of married women working. Other small pockets of council housing, such as in Merrow and Onslow are also easily identified on the map.

Not one enumeration district in Friary Ward scores high, while those enumeration districts on the periphery of the Ward (e.g. along the River Wey and at the edge of the commercial centre) score low.

**Second principal component**

The second principal component (Table 4.3) accounts for over one-quarter of the variance (28.1%). In many studies (cf. Timms, 1971) the second principal component usually expresses a familial dimension - that is, a residential structure based upon family types. In Guildford, while certain variables relating to age load highly, the emphasis is more on housing type and its inhabitants rather than family structure per se. The reason for this has been suggested already. Nearly 25% of the population in Guildford rent property, either furnished or unfurnished, which in contrast to the rest of England and Wales (20.5%) and Surrey (18.6%) is relatively high. The housing dimension reflects not only the pattern of tenure, but also the quality of housing. From the six highest loadings on the second
factor, a dimension is identified which is suggestive of Burgess' 'zone in transition', (Timms, op. cit., p. 214) an area of private, rented furnished accommodation with a very high density of inhabitants per room (over 1½ persons/room which is the statutory definition of overcrowding). Furthermore, such accommodation is also often shared, suggesting poor quality. Furnished lettings are generally indicative of high mobility. Such a combination of variables is suggestive of a young mobile population of either single people or young couples, living in relatively crowded flats and bed-sitters.

The negative loadings on the second factor bring out more explicitly the familial aspect of the second factor. One of the characteristic features of British council housing estates is the manner in which they are often segregated not only in terms of class from the private, owner occupier housing sector, but also in terms of age structure. This is evident in the second factor where council housing loads highly with the under 16 age group. These loadings are supported by the high correlation coefficients between these variables. 'Council tenants' correlate significantly with 'age under 16' \((r = .408)\) and 'skilled workers' \((r = .571)\) which is illustrative of the social class dimension on council estates. Both are significant at the 0.001% level.

The second map (Figure 4.2) spatially illustrates the dimensions of the second principal component. In this instance we are dealing with a social phenomenon which is spatially more restricted than the first factor. The high incidence of shared, often overcrowded, private furnished rentings is found near the town centre, partly in Friary Ward. A high degree of overlap exists if this map is compared with a map of the age of residential development. The 'high' score areas are found in those parts of the town with late Victorian three or four storey houses which have been converted into flats and bedsits. Smaller pockets of rented accommodation exist in St. Nicholas Ward. But the majority of 'high' and 'medium' loadings on this principal component are to be found in an area of one mile radius from the town centre. The age structure of this area is distorted with a preponderance of old people and young couples. Similarly, there are fewer middle-aged people and young children. These are found in the outer ring of Guildford and can be identified by the 'low' score areas which illustrate the spatial distribution of negative loadings.
Third principal component

The third principal component (Table 4.4) accounts for just over 13% of the variance. This again is a housing dimension but rather than relating to the population/household type, it reflects the quality of housing. Many houses and flats, especially those in the unfurnished rented sector lack three of the basic amenities: an inside w.c., a fixed bath and running hot water. There is an especially high correlation between the latter two variables and unfurnished dwellings (at the 0.001% level). Loading less, although still correlating highly significantly (0.01%) with these variables are 'semi-skilled' and to a lesser extent 'skilled workers'. It is, as one would expect, the lower income groups who live in these properties.

The other variables which correlate significantly with this dimension are the different age groups. There is a correlation between 'old-age pensioners' and 'houses with a lack of basic amenities'. It is the inner town areas which have the highest incidence of both poor property and old people. Many of the residents of Friary Ward for example, have lived in the Ward all their lives. As they have grown older they have neither the financial resources nor the motivation to improve their accommodation. Housing improvements usually come after the old people have left and younger couples move into the area, and the presence of the 17-35 age group in the inner town areas is indicative of this population cycle. Methods such as principal components analysis are useful in identifying the concomitants of urban decay. For example, in this case, it is possible to relate the problem of sub-standard housing conditions with the age/social status of the people who live there.

The negative loadings on this dimension are interesting although not surprising in that they suggest that the inhabitants of these areas have a low mobility. Also the age structure loadings suggest that these older areas have a distorted age structure, with the 'age 61 and over' and 'age 17-35' being over-represented, while middle-aged couples with children are under-represented.

The third principal component is again largely spatially restricted to an area of three-quarters of a mile radius from the town centre (Figure 4.3). However, there are important exceptions to this pattern found to the north of the town in Stoke and Stoughton. Although some substandard housing is found in the suburbs, the chief problem areas are Friary Ward, where some of the housing dates back to 1850, and St. Nicholas Ward. Six out of the ten enumeration districts in Friary
### Table 4.4  Principal Component III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>loading</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses without fixed bath</td>
<td>.90287</td>
<td>Age 36-60</td>
<td>-.47207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses without running hot water</td>
<td>.88736</td>
<td>Two car owners</td>
<td>-.35261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses without inside WC</td>
<td>.63366</td>
<td>One car owners</td>
<td>-.27246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfurnished rentings</td>
<td>.36959</td>
<td>Age under 16</td>
<td>-.17744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 17-35</td>
<td>.30001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 61 and over</td>
<td>.27295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.5  Principal Component IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>loading</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 61 and over</td>
<td>.93541</td>
<td>Age 0-16</td>
<td>-.71179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single person households</td>
<td>.62848</td>
<td>Six person households</td>
<td>-.40413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 0.5 persons per room</td>
<td>.36521</td>
<td>Age 35-60</td>
<td>-.30645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.3 A Spatial Representation of Principal Component III
Ward score highly on this component, and fall into three distinct groups: the residential roads between the Woodbridge Road and the River Wey; the majority of the area which comprises the Stoke Fields General Improvement Area; and the eastern part of the Ward centring on York Road and the residential roads between Falcon Road and London Road Railway Station. The low factor score area is a between-the-wars housing development bordering the Royal Grammar School, the Civic Hall and a small recreation area known as the Allen House Grounds.

Fourth principal component

The fourth principal component (Table 4.5), accounting for 9% of the total variance, describes the space standards of certain population groups. Dominant in the positive loadings is the significant relationship which exists between old-age pensioners living alone, and at very low densities. This finding supports the conclusion of the Housing Review carried out by Guildford Borough Council in 1975.

The first three principal components account for just under 80% of the total variance, which compares favourably with published studies using principal components' analysis.

Discussion

Despite the affluent image which Guildford projects, these findings illustrate, not unexpectedly, that such affluence is far from universal. There are areas of poor housing and overcrowded accommodation. This is generally found within a three-quarter mile radius of the town centre and consequently includes Friary Ward. This factorial ecological study provides not only illustrative background data on the social and spatial structure of Guildford, but also sets Friary Ward and some of its environmental problems within a town-wide context.

Comparative statistics on the social, economic and housing characteristics of Friary Ward in relation to the rest of Guildford and England and Wales are provided in Table 4.6. These statistics simply amplify and provide numerical support for some of the conclusions drawn in the factorial ecological analysis.
Table 4.6 Population and Housing Characteristics of Friary Ward
(as derived from the 1971 Population Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friary Ward</th>
<th>Guildford Municipal Borough</th>
<th>England and Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III NM</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III M</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One car</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more cars</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No car</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrants entering UK after 1960</strong></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupier</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented: furnished</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented: unfurnished</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household in shared dwelling</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person household</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.6 contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Conditions (7)</th>
<th>Friary Ward</th>
<th>Guildford Municipal Borough</th>
<th>England and Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without inside WC</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without fixed bath</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without hot water</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With over 1.5 persons per room</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With under 0.5 persons per room</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix 4.1 for all Table notes in this chapter.
Introduction

The series of maps on the pages which follow illustrate visually the spatial distribution of some of the social and economic characteristics of Friary Ward. The information is based on data collected in the 1971 Census and is presented at enumeration district level. Figure 4.4 is an outline map of the Ward with the ten enumeration districts marked. Each enumeration district has been given a name in order to identify it in the following discussion.

Shepherd Westaway and Lee (1974, p.42) maintain that there are three key housing factors which affect the quality of domestic life: the physical condition of the housing stock; the type of amenities available to each household; and the extent of household overcrowding. In this section an examination will be made of the latter two housing indicators. There are three reasons for this: firstly, no information is readily available on the spatial distribution of poor or unfit properties; secondly, the latter two types of information are readily available from the Census; and thirdly, poor dwellings and a lack of standard amenities are often, although not always, related. It is characteristic of many of the houses that they lack standard amenities such as an inside W.C. and a fixed bath as well as having structural faults, poor ventilation and lighting, a poor internal layout and suffer some dampness.

Much of the property in the Ward dates from the late nineteenth/early twentieth century and can be divided into two types: firstly, the small Victorian terrace houses or working-men's cottages which were built cheaply to low standards; secondly, the more substantial lower-middle-class dwellings which are solid, spacious and generally still in a reasonable condition today.

Households without an inside W.C. (Figure 4.5)

The chief concentration of households without an inside W.C. is in the Drummond Road area in the centre of the Stoke Fields G1A, and in the College
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Road area. In both areas between 30% and 40% of the households do not possess an inside W.C. Many of the houses near the town centre have now been demolished, for example in North Place and Victoria Square (no longer in existence). The intensity of the problem here is likely to be less now than formerly, although there are still many streets where the absence of this amenity is likely to be widespread (e.g. Martyr Road, College Road). The houses in the areas of the heaviest shading (especially Drummond Road) are probably the smallest and certainly the oldest in the Ward. One row of small cottages in Drummond Road, for example, dates from 1850. These are 'typical' Victorian terrace houses with a parlour opening directly onto the street, a living-room and kitchen/scullery downstairs, and two, occasionally, three, bedrooms upstairs reached by a steep staircase from the centre of the house.

There are still large areas where about a quarter of the houses are without an inside W.C. The only area where the problem is comparatively minor is the York Road area. This is explained by the presence of large Victorian houses which have been converted into flats and bedsits and consequently have to possess the standard amenities. This area also contains the only substantial example of inter-war housing in the Ward, Eastgate Gardens.

Households without a fixed bath (Fig. 4.6)

The spatial incidence of households without a fixed bath partially parallels the distribution of households without an inside W.C. Drummond Road is again the area with the highest proportion of households without this standard amenity, as is, albeit to a lesser extent, the College Road area. On average, only one household in five is without a fixed bath in the majority of the enumeration districts.

The take-up of improvement grants does not have a ubiquitous distribution throughout the Ward. The relationship between the spatial distribution of improvement grants and households lacking standard amenities is, as might be expected, an inverse one. Households which have applied for improvement grants tend to live in the larger and more substantial properties in the Ward (e.g. Dapdune, Church and Foxenden Roads). Furthermore, as will be shown below, it is these areas which have the highest incidence of professional workers. The areas which
have experienced a low take-up of improvement grants are occupied by those in skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled occupations. In Drummond Road, for example, only 29% of the older houses have received improvement grants, compared with 90% in Dapdune Road.

Population aged over 60 years (Fig. 4.7)

As has been described above, the two chief population characteristics of Friary Ward are the high percentage of elderly residents and the increasing numbers of young people (15-24 age group) moving into the Ward. In many ways this is symptomatic of inner urban areas and a similar pattern is found, for example, in the inner London boroughs (ibid., p.48). In two enumeration districts (Drummond Road and Woodbridge Road) one person in three is aged over 60 years.

Twenty-five per cent of the residents in Friary Ward are aged over 60 years, and thus the areas with light shading and no shading at all are those areas where the proportion of elderly is below the Ward average. The low percentage of elderly folk found in Dapdune Road is an interesting finding when compared with, say, the map of the spatial distribution of professional people. This area of substantial late nineteenth/early twentieth century semi-detached redbrick housing would appear to be the first area in the Ward which experienced the drift back to the city centre by younger, professionally qualified couples. The demise in the primacy of an ageing population is a contemporary socio-economic characteristic of inner-city life. Interestingly, the 1971 Census caught the change just after it occurred. The 1981 Census might well reveal many more areas which have experienced this change in the inter-decennial period.

Households in owner-occupation (Fig. 4.8)

Although owner-occupation is often regarded as an index of status and wealth and an object of aspiration, the quality or standard of housing in the owner-occupied housing sector is very varied. In Friary Ward, for example, only 33.5% of the owner-occupier households had exclusive use of all the standard amenities in 1971. For Guildford as a whole this figure only rises to 49.3%. Some 3.5% of the owner-occupier households in Friary Ward lack a fixed bath (Guildford 0.8%). Such a situation lessens the difficulties of encouraging house improvements which one
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Percentage of Households in Owner-Occupation

- Under 29.9%
- 30.0%-39.9%
- 40.0%-49.9%
- Above 50.0%
normally finds where there is a high proportion of (absentee) landlords.

Households in privately rented accommodation (Fig. 4.9)

The high proportion of households in rented accommodation in the York Road area is the most striking feature of the sixth map. This area contains more than three times (78.2%) the proportion of private tenancies as are found in the town as a whole (23.8%). The residents of the area are chiefly composed of students, young single and married people, and generally the type of population to be found in rented rooms.

Although rented accommodation is concentrated in the York Road area, there are four other enumeration districts where the proportion of rented accommodation is at or above the Ward average (53.6%). One must remember that the term 'rented accommodation' applies not only to flats and bedsits but also houses. Much of the rented accommodation in the remaining enumeration districts in the Ward is in the form of houses, and although the Census does not give this information, it is likely that a number of the houses in this category are inhabited by elderly people who have rented them for many years and are paying a controlled rent.

Households in overcrowded conditions (Fig. 4.10)

Overcrowding is a difficult concept to measure, mainly because it refers to the use of housing space rather than a physical condition of the property itself. However, for the purpose of the Census, the standard of more than 1.5 persons per room is taken as an indicator of overcrowding. This is an arbitrary figure as it does not take into account the quality of the housing environment, the size of the rooms or the relationships amongst the inhabitants. If one refers to the previous map of rented accommodation, the spatial association between overcrowding and tenure is clearly brought out. If the map of privately rented accommodation were to be broken down into the furnished and unfurnished sectors, the association between overcrowding and the furnished sector would be apparent. Only 2.2% of unfurnished rentings are overcrowded, as compared with 12.6% of furnished rented accommodation. In the York Road area nearly one household in ten is classified as overcrowded (8.6%), while in three other enumeration
Figure 4.10
Percentage of Households with more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ Persons/Room

Legend:
- 0.0%–2.9%
- 3.0%–4.9%
- 5.0%–6.9%
- Above 7.0%
districts over 5% are in similar circumstances. These figures are comparable to
the level of overcrowding that one finds in inner London (ibid., p. 45), as are
the high percentage figures for poor housing conditions given earlier. This adds
further credence to the argument that inner city problems cannot be considered
to be the preserve of the large metropolitan areas.

Population in professional occupations (Fig. 4.11)

It has been stated before that since 1971 it is likely that the population
characteristics of the area have changed. How much will not be known until the
1981 Census. Some areas have witnessed considerable changes in their population
structure; for example, a number of poor artisans' cottages in Drummond Road
have been replaced over the last ten or so years by maisonettes and 'town houses'.
Many of the inhabitants of these new properties are young and belong to the
professional or 'white collar' employment sector. The Depdune, Foxenden and
College Roads areas all have a high percentage of professional workers (over 15%).

The Stoke Fields area has not been referred to specifically so far although the
quality of housing (several listed buildings) and the unique ambience of the area
in terms of its quiet alleys onto which the houses front might suggest that it
contains quite different housing and population characteristics. This is not the
case. 'Gentrification', as experienced in Barnsbury and Camden (cf. Hamnett,
1973), is not a feature of this area. The employment characteristics of the
population in Stoke Fields are not dissimilar to the remainder of the Ward.

Population in skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled occupations (Figs. 4.12, 4.13)

While professional workers are found predominantly in the south and east of
the Ward, the residential location of skilled workers is mainly in the western part
of the Ward between Stoke Road and the River Wey. Five out of the seven
enumeration districts in this area have more than 40% of the economically active
population engaged in skilled occupations. There is an areal concentration in
the Falcon Road area of semi-skilled and unskilled workers (over 60% of the
population) which is about three times the Ward and town average. This figure
is likely to have been substantially altered by the demolition of the terraced houses
in Falcon Road (cf. Chapter 5) and their replacement by local authority flats for
single people and old-age pensioners.

**Discussion**

One could produce many maps illustrating the varied social and economic characteristics of the population of Friary Ward. However, the intention here has been to illustrate cartographically the social and spatial heterogeneity of the population. Many plans for the Ward have been produced in the past (cf. Chapter 5) which ignored this fact and treated the area as if wholesale redevelopment was the obvious and only suitable prospect for its future. These maps also suggest that there might be a differential ability over space of residents to avail themselves of house improvement grants, and engage in the type of enthusiasm and activity which is needed for the successful fulfilment of area improvement as envisaged in the 1969 Housing Act. Participation techniques used in planning exercises should be sensitive to the socio-economic characteristics and abilities of the population. Consequently, the use of different techniques to reflect spatial variations in housing ownership patterns, educational level and financial solvency, even within an area as small as a General Improvement Area, might be explored given the nature of these findings.
THE PLANNING HISTORY OF FRIARY WARD, 1945-1979

"......... the town of GUILDFORD, which (taken with its environs) I, who have seen so many, many towns, think the prettiest, and, taken altogether, the most agreeable and most happy-looking that I ever saw in my life .......... Here is something of every thing ................."

William Cobbett, 1830.
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INTRODUCTION

In the last chapter a detailed examination was made of the socio-economic characteristics of the population of Guildford in general and Friary Ward in particular, in order to provide a backdrop to an examination and discussion of the problems of Friary Ward. The physical condition of the housing stock was also examined in detail as it has been a crucial element in the planning history of the ward, and continues to remain the object of public attention and planning resources.

The contextual background against which the surveyed perceptions and attitudes of residents, councillors and officers can be gauged, which is the central focus of this thesis, would be incomplete without a discussion of the history of planning in Friary Ward. One interpretation of the Ward's problems is revealed through Council and consultants' reports, plans and documents. These provide essential information for an understanding of the major concerns of the residents and the Friary Ward Residents' Association.

Changing Attitudes

The environment

As one transport planner put it to me, "Every major planner in this country has had a crack at planning the centre of Guildford, and in particular has tried to solve the traffic problems: Patrick Abercrombie, G. A. Jellicoe, Colin Buchanan." In this chapter it will become apparent that since 1945 there has been a considerable shift in policy by the Council in terms of how both urban renewal and the future of Friary Ward have been conceptualized. Briefly, between 1945 and 1965, the policy for the area reflected the recommendations of reports preferred by two firms of planning consultants. Their recommendation was redevelopment. After 1966, Guildford Borough Council, reflecting the changing attitudes of central government, increasingly favoured a policy of rehabilitation wherever possible.

The residents

The reader is also encouraged to take note of the changing attitudes of Guildford Borough Council towards the residents. In simple terms, the
attitude evinced pre-1968 was one which most readily falls into a
behaviourist model of man. The residents were seen as objects which can
be manipulated on the spatial chessboard of the city. Indeed, exchange
theory (Blau, 1964) with its concepts of reward, cost and outcome, might be
an appropriate tool in this particular context with which to examine the
relationship between planners and the public in the process of urban renewal.
This may appear as a harsh indictment, but a reading of the planning reports
which are discussed in detail in this chapter leave little room for an alter-
native conclusion. Such a criticism of the Council must however be tempered
as these planning proposals were eventually rejected.

After 1968, for a number of reasons which are detailed later, the attitude
of the planning officers towards Friary Ward reflected a change in the model
of the residents held by the Council. The residents were viewed as individuals
not only with needs, wishes and attitudes themselves, but as people with whom
negotiations were necessary if change was to be brought about. Urban renewal,
if it is to be successful, means that residents must be involved in that
change as active participants in the change process.

A relational model of man (Stringer, 1977) would seem to be a far more
appropriate perspective from which to view the relationship between the
residents and Council in the urban renewal process. In this model, the
individual is seen as an active rather than passive agent, and change (both
psychological and urban) is central to participatory and political, as well as
social activity. Such a model is a more realistic starting point for a dis-
cussion of participatory change and development. It is not the intention in
this chapter to assess whether this change in attitude was actually made
manifest in the Council's dealings with the public. Rather, I am concerned
to illustrate the nature of the 'official' attitudes and policies of the Council,
and the political basis from which such attitudes and policies originated.

PLANNING IN FRIARY WARD: PRE 1966 (REDEVELOPMENT)

Pre-1945

Friary Ward has had a history of blighting and uncertainty. The proposed
widening of Stoke Road into a dual carriageway, for example, with the consequent demolition of houses and commercial property was first raised just after the war. It is still an issue, as will be seen in Chapter 9, in 1979. Of lesser importance, a discussion about the siting of the proposed new municipal offices (in Friary Ward) has been going on for over forty years. It was the subject of a report produced by Patrick Abercrombie in 1936. The author wrote: "The northern boundary beyond the greens is the real surprise of the site to a stranger: Foxenden Quarry! This is indeed a marvellous place that recalls the famous Buttes-Chaumont at Paris. Not enough has been made of it perhaps. A faint idea of the possibilities of a terrace overlooking this abyss is gained from the archway into the wall: here is a background to a group comparable to the quarry foreground of Liverpool Cathedral." (Abercrombie, 1936). While the lyrical designs of Abercrombie never materialised on this site, the possibility of new municipal offices was felt to be real enough forty years later for the prospective Liberal candidates for Friary Ward in the Borough elections of 6th May 1976 to declare: "A Liberal Council would drop the plan to build new Borough Council Offices." (Liberal Election pamphlet, 1976: (cf. Appendix 6.1)). Although I believe this was essentially a red herring in the Liberal Councillors' election propaganda, its inclusion is indicative of the planning uncertainty in the Ward.

Since 1945 at least eleven reports and plans have been written which have had a direct bearing on the future of Friary Ward. Some of these have been produced by the planning and housing officers, while others were produced by firms of planning consultants. The perceptions and assumptions which contribute to the formation of these plans are no more objective than the attitudes expressed by the planners and councillors whom I interviewed in the Spring of 1976. However, they do represent what one might call 'official' attitudes towards the Ward, as they provide major reference points in subsequent planning and their influence has been germane in some cases over thirty years.

The Jellicoe Plan, 1945

In 1944, a consultant firm of town planners were employed by the
Municipal Borough Council of Guildford to prepare an 'Outline Plan' for the future of Guildford. Although the Jellicoe Plan (after G.A. Jellicoe) was drawn up with reference to the whole of Guildford, the proposals which emerged in 1945 had a direct bearing on Friary Ward. Furthermore the policy objectives and philosophy of growth have remained to the present day with considerable implications for some of the residents of the Ward. Some of the detailed proposals existed for some 20 years after the plan was published. The first policy of the Jellicoe Plan was to increase the population of the town from over 45,000 residents to about 53,000 which is very close to its present-day population of 54,091 (1971 census). The second policy proposal too has been followed right down to the present day, and it is this which formed the backbone of the Jellicoe Report. The following discussion is a commentary on the planning consequences for Guildford and Friary Ward of Jellicoe's philosophy.

The consequences of Jellicoe's philosophy

Jellicoe proposed, "To develop the Central Area as a centre of culture, amenity and business to serve beyond the confines of the Borough boundary" (Jellicoe Report, I.2, p.4). Despite the present-day population of just over 50,000 inhabitants, Guildford has a commercial hinterland the size of Leicester, serving about 250,000 people. In order to get the feel of the type of town and environment Jellicoe was trying to create, one only has to turn to the detailed recommendation emanating from his second policy objective: "...... to encourage the establishment of Guildford as a cultural centre of the arts, and especially music; as a summer open-air resort, and especially for cricket; as a shopping centre; as a market; as a legal centre; and as a City having a spiritual quality." (ibid, II, 6, p.5). Each of these recommendations has been fulfilled, with Guildford having its own Philharmonic Orchestra, the occasional visit of Surrey County Cricket Club for County matches, a large shopping centre and weekly market, a University, a law school and recently opened County Law Courts, and a Cathedral.

Abercrombie's Greater London Plan (1945) was very much in the mind of Jellicoe when writing his 1945 plan; so much so that an extract from the
Abercrombie Plan forms an appendix to the Outline Plan for Guildford. One part of the extract is particularly apposite: "Guildford is a town that could well act as a reception centre for a restricted number of business concerns such as insurance offices, etc., coming from London, thus giving employment to black-coat workers now travelling daily to London for employment (this work should be all the more welcome since Guildford has been displaced by Kingston as the seat of County Government and should make it less dependent on London as its place of work)." (ibid, Appendix, p.28). This recommendation has been perpetuated down to the present day with more Building Society offices per head of population in Guildford than any other town in South-East England (Surrey Daily Advertiser, April 1975).

Office development

The continued expansion of the tertiary sector, especially office development, has probably had a greater effect upon Friary Ward than any other planning decision. The expansion of the commercial centre has meant less residential accommodation, more traffic, more roads, more pollution and noise and more environmental deterioration. The expansion of the commercial centre at the expense of residential accommodation has occurred in three ways. Firstly, residential property has been taken over by commercial interests and many houses have been turned into offices. This has chiefly occurred where there are large Victorian houses, such as along Woodbridge Road: offices, including two language schools, can be found now almost as far out from the town centre as Dapdune Road. Secondly, the housing stock has been reduced by the normal process of demolition and redevelopment. In a number of areas (e.g. Chertsey Street) demolished houses have been replaced not by houses but by more offices. Thirdly, houses have been made derelict by the owners in the hope of redeveloping the site. However, with the economic recession after 1973, redevelopment has not been possible and consequently such houses have been left to deteriorate even further (e.g. Martyr Road), or they have been demolished and the land laid bare (e.g. Eagle Road).

Housing

The demolition of houses and the conversion of houses into offices
depletes the housing stock available when there were in 1976 just under 3000 people on the housing waiting list. Housing demands must be put into the context of differential needs: for example, a number of people on the housing list simply require transfers from one type of property to another, perhaps of a larger or smaller size. If one reduces numerically the availability of housing stock, one may also reduce the types of housing stock available. Furthermore, the type of accommodation which is found in Friary Ward is exactly the type of accommodation which is in greatest demand. In mid-1975 an interim statement of the Housing Review was presented to the Council. Between 1961 - 1971 the percentage of owner occupiers in Guildford increased from 44.9% to 51.6%, whilst the percentage of population in council houses declined slightly from 25.1% to 24.5%. However, a major slump occurred in the private rented sector, where the population in unfurnished units of accommodation dropped from 25.1% to 15.9%. Thus, the immediate effect of the 1968 Housing Act can be readily gauged. Add to this the more recent 1974 Rent Act which affected furnished property and it can be safely estimated that the amount of privately rented accommodation has declined even further. In 1971, 18% of Guildford's privately rented accommodation was in Friary Ward.

The alternatives to privately rented accommodation are basically two-fold: either buying accommodation on the open market or renting from the local authority. In October 1974, all the main estate agents in Guildford were surveyed by the Council (Guildford B.C., 1975, para. 7.5) and it was found that 229 properties were available for sale at more than £20,000, while only 126 were available under £12,500. As the Housing Review points out, the net result is increased pressure on rented accommodation. "If we take an identical £10,000 Council house and a £10,000 house on the open market, it can be seen that, while the rent may be £8.00 per week, the mortgage cost for acquisition would certainly be £100 per month, with an income requirement for the first-time occupier of about £5,000 per annum" (op.cit., para. 7.6). A more recent survey (Surrey Advertiser, 23rd June 1978) has shown that while house prices nationally have risen by about 14% over the last year, in Guildford this rise has been between 50% - 60%. A house costing £15,000 a year ago would now cost £24,000. ".....While you are lucky to find a
terraced house for under £20,000."

The implication of these figures is that the greatest pressure will be exerted upon the public housing sector. Yet council house completions in Guildford have not kept pace with demand or need. In fact, there is continual pressure by the Conservative majority on the Council to sell the local authority owned houses to tenants. Between 1964 and 1974 the Council added 1464 houses to the total Council housing stock. This average of 133 houses per year "was approximately one-third (29.2%) of the number constructed in the private sector during the same period." (op.cit).

In Table 4.6, the importance of privately rented accommodation can be seen. Friary Ward has nearly three times the national average and county average of privately rented accommodation, with over half (53.6%) of the total private households renting furnished and unfurnished accommodation. Friary Ward also has 10% less owner-occupied houses than Guildford, which has the same proportion as the national average. Finally, according to the 1971 Census, just under 5% of the households live in local authority housing, which is exactly one-fifth of the Guildford average. These figures must be treated with a certain degree of caution. The 1974 Rent Act will have had an effect on privately rented accommodation, while the Council has built a further 62 units in Falcon Road and acquired a number of pre-existing dwellings. In the light of these statistics the pressure on scarce housing resources can be estimated. Economic recession and negative governmental housing Acts have done little to improve the situation. These problems are compounded when the council has favoured a policy of expanding the commercial centre of the town continuously over a thirty year period, at the expense of residential accommodation and development.

**Jellicoe Plan: details**

Jellicoe's overall scheme for Guildford and Friary Ward is illustrated in his plans reproduced below (figs. 5.1 and 5.2). The redevelopment proposals are little short of Carthaginian, as it was his intention that most of the Ward should be given over to office and industrial development of one sort or another, interspersed with some residential accommodation. Jellicoe's intention, as revealed time and time again in his report, was to clear the
Figure 5.2  Jellicoe Plan: Detailed Planning Proposals (1945)
Ward of its working-class population and replace it with upper-income groups. His perception of the existing area and visions for the future are revealed in the following statements:

"The area lying NORTH OF NORTH STREET is now compressed and characterless. The Plan eliminates certain roads and creates two quiet squares, but it is intended to be diagrammatic only and the area should, if possible, be redeveloped as a whole when requirements are clarified. The area should probably be one of dignified offices and the architecture consist of unified street facades not exceeding three storeys." (Jellicoe Report, 1945, para. 54).

"Between Woodbridge Road and Stoke Road there is a colony of modern FLATS, sufficient to accommodation the same numbers, but not the same character of those occupying the site. The flats should be diversified as to rent and accommodation. They are planned round existing roads and have access from a quiet square containing a nursery school. The heights are between two and three storeys, with occasional blocks ascending six storeys or more." (op.cit, para 78).

"Stoke Road, the proposed main approach from London to the City Precinct, is composed of high-class TERRACE HOUSING or FLATS, not exceeding three storeys." (op.cit,para 79).

East or Stoke Road, Jellicoe's plans continued to reflect his socially-devise and class-dominated perspective:

"Further FLATS adjoin London Road Station." (op.cit, para 80).

"Housing between Allen House Grounds and Stoke Park has been cleared and is now occupied by high-class GARDENS partly restricted to use by the adjoining flats." (op.cit, para 81).

Thirty years later, one resident could still remember these proposals. These five paragraphs cover Jellicoe's prognosis for Friary Ward, excepting Foxenden Quarry (proposed open-air theatre and garden hotel), Woodbridge Road Cricket Ground (to remain a cricket ground) and the area between Woodbridge Road and the River Wey. Here Jellicoe became carried away with post VE day euphoria and our embarkation into a 'Brave New World'. For the latter area he suggests:

"Total change is proposed between the existing bridges. The POWER STATION remains ultimately to contain atomic power. The Station forecourt and terraced car park are wholly modern. In this local landscape are intended to be united the humanized and mechanized world." (op.cit, para 63).
Traffic in Guildford, 1965

The next major planning study in Guildford was completed some eighteen years after the Jellicoe Report by W. S. Atkins & Partners, and was concerned solely with traffic movements. (Atkins, 1963). However, several years later Guildford Borough Council asked Colin Buchanan & Partners to produce yet another plan. In March 1965, with a characteristic title, "Traffic in Guildford" was published. As the title suggests, the report was primarily concerned with improving traffic conditions but Buchanan saw that any discussion of transport routes must include the implications of these routes for the spaces between. Buchanan believed that transport planning could be used to positive effect in shaping the rest of the environment. By funnelling through traffic along one or two major routes one could create 'environmental areas'. However, if one was to plan for a modern car-owning community, one must start with a 'tabula rasa' on which all previous routing influences had been removed. To this end his conclusion, like that of Jellicoe twenty years previously, was that the houses in Friary Ward would have to be demolished. In a paragraph entitled 'Opportunities for Change', Buchanan wrote, "The arrangement of much of the central area is such that alteration and in most parts comprehensive redevelopment, is needed ........... the extensive housing areas lying north of the shopping centre are arranged in a way that it is quite incompatible with the space and movement needs of a car-owning population." (Buchanan, 1965, para 39).

This was the second report to be produced which favoured the comprehensive redevelopment of Friary Ward and the expansion of the commercial centre along the major arterial roads leading into the town centre. Traffic flow problems were seen to be one of the most important planning issues in Guildford. Buchanan recognised the inter-relationship which exists between traffic, land use and neighbourhoods, and in this particular battle the car was to be the victor.

Traffic Planning, 1965 - 1979

Buchanan's report to the Council was not considered suitable for dealing with the traffic problems of Guildford. His proposals for a primary road
network of urban motorways would not have received financial support from the Government and was thought rather extreme if not destructive for a town the size of Guildford. The Council switched their attention to "dealing with those areas most essential to the progress of Guildford" (Atkins, 1967, para 1.7). Atkins & Partners were called in again in November 1965, only eight months after Buchanan's report was submitted to the Council, to re-examine the road proposals for the town centre and to put forward a number of alternative traffic schemes. It was suggested to me by one Surrey County Council transport planner that their study was both incomplete and incomprehensible, although Atkins were able to recommend a number of schemes which have subsequently been accepted in whole or in part by the Council.

One final traffic and transport plan was produced by Guildford Borough Council in November 1970 which sought essentially to summarise the findings of the previous studies and coordinate at least on paper future transport developments (Guildford Borough Council, 1970a). The major features of these plans as far as road construction in Friary Ward was concerned have been the building of the College Road link (the York Road extension), the widening of Woodbridge Road and Onslow Street and the re-routing of traffic around the Friary site (cf. Figure 3.2). These will be discussed in detail in Chapters 7 and 9 for the relevance they have to the perceptions of residents and the participatory activities of FWRA. One consequence of the recent road building programme (especially the York Road extension) is that through-traffic along residential roads will be substantially reduced. As will be seen in Chapter 9, this is seen as a major environmental problem by residents. Furthermore, the initiation of environmental improvements in the Stoke Fields GIA (described later) has been contingent upon the completion of improvements to the major roads bordering the GIA (Woodbridge Road, York Road extension, Stoke Road).

**Guildford and District Town Map, 1966**

The Guildford and District Town Map was first submitted in 1953 and approved with modifications in 1958. In the Review of the County Development Plan (1965), it was stated that the Review of the Guildford Town Map would
be the subject of a later submission. In fact, the Approved Written Submission was published in 1972. However, the Approved Written Submission was based on the "Report and Analysis of Survey of the Guildford and District Town Map" which was produced in April 1966 in order to provide the then Minister of Housing and Local Government with "background details against which the proposals are made" (Surrey County Council, 1966, para. 1.2).

**Planning constraints**

The following paragraph summed up the problems of Guildford:

"Since 1953, Guildford has been the subject of considerable changes, maintaining and increasing its importance in South-West Surrey; its functions are increasing, notably as a result of the establishment of the University of Surrey in the town, and new office accommodation. There are limits, however, within which the town can grow physically, having regard to topography. Over the last decade traffic congestion and the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles has greatly increased, with only very limited road works to help alleviate the situation." (op. cit., para 1.3)

Peripheral expansion in Guildford is limited by the existence of the North Downs, all of which are Green Belt, and much of which are "Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty." To the north lies the flood-plain of the River Wey which is subject to periodic flooding. Upward expansion is also severely curtailed, as the Council has a general policy of restricting the development of tall buildings in order to maintain a uniform skyline. Consequently, town centre expansion can only proceed by means of the renewal of the older, inner areas. This option has been seen by the Council to be economically, politically and environmentally expedient.

**Office development**

It was stressed in the report that, although there was potential for some expansion of the shopping and office functions, these should be 'carefully controlled', restrained and kept 'within acceptable limits'. (op. cit., para 1.7).

One of the reasons for this was the amount of offices built in Guildford in the previous nine years. Between July 1957 and June 1966 over 435,000 sq. ft. of office floor space was permitted in Guildford. Of this, according to the
Report, 30,000 square feet were not yet built or still unoccupied. Despite the 'Brown Ban' (Control of Office and Industrial Development Act, 1965) and the general reservations expressed by the County Council over the growth in office floor space in Guildford, planning permission for office developments continued to be given. In July 1975 a survey was carried out by Surrey County Council planners, who found that 17,000 square feet of office floor space was under construction in Guildford and planning permission had been given for a further 273,000 square feet. (Surrey Daily Advertiser, 13th August 1975). These figures do not include developments under 3,000 square feet. At the time of the survey 23,383 square feet of office floor space was available to rent (Surrey Daily Advertiser, 14th August 1975). Thus, in mid-1975, just under a third of a million square feet of office development existed or was proposed. This figure must surely have exceeded that needed "for purely regional service functions, which cannot be adequately discharged from any other centre." (op. cit, para 4.8). Furthermore, it is difficult to believe that such development falls in with "....... the policy of the Council (Surrey County Council) ...... to restrict office development to the accommodation of local professional firms, essential ancillaries to local industry, for essential local needs and for occupation in certain towns by firms previously located in the Greater London Area." (Moor, 1973). In 1967, the Strategy for the South-East was published which also advocated the commercial expansion of Guildford, especially in the office sector, although without the regional riders which were included in the Guildford and District Town Map (South-East Economic Planning Council, 1967). The more recent history of office development and commercial expansion is described in Chapters 8 and 9.

A turning point

Two other issues were raised in the report which should be commented upon. Firstly, the planning authority gradually realised that Friary Ward did exist and, although the environment was not all that it might be, it could not just be dispensed with as Jellicoe and Buchanan had earlier proposed. Thus:

"In the Stoke Road (area), ...... there are many streets of terrace houses, built in Victorian or Edwardian times, that
are lacking in good environmental standards and are now reaching the end of their useful life. In guiding the improvement or redevelopment of these areas the local Planning Authority and the Borough Council will seek to ensure that adequate provision is made for open space, children's play areas, local shopping and car parking." (op. cit., para. 3.8).

So the possibility of improvement was raised for the first time in an altogether more optimistic plan for the future. Secondly, and this has a relevance to Chapter 9, the residents' parking problem was recognised in the report's statement: "there are some serious deficiencies in the garaging of private cars." (op. cit., para 6.16).

Pre-1966: Discussion

It should now be apparent that, in the first two decades after the Second World War, three planning issues assumed increasing importance in Friary Ward in terms of the perceptions by planning consultants and the local authority. The increasing concern in Guildford at the growth in traffic led the planners to examine ways of improving traffic flow. The establishment of the priority of cars before people resulted in Friary Ward being seen as an area available for planning manipulation in order to solve traffic flow problems.

The major planning reports also proposed redevelopment of Friary Ward as its 'useful residential life' was slowly coming to a close. However, there is evidence that there was a subtle change in policy over this twenty-year period, from one in which wholesale redevelopment and the turning of the area into an enclave of middle-class respectability was favoured to the present situation where there is greater respect for the inhabitants and rehabilitation is seen as an alternative form of area improvement.

Finally, the commercial expansion of the town centre was also recognised as a desirable planning objective and, with limits on commercial development upwards and at the urban periphery, the chief area of commercial/residential conflict was in the inner town area. This centred largely on Friary Ward as the houses in the Ward were either large and thus suitable for conversion into offices, or small and inexpensive where the sites could be redeveloped cheaply. In terms of land economics this process is explained
by land use and profitability being determined by the high opportunity costs in commercial property as opposed to residential property, compounded with the high economic rent which exists in times of great property speculation, as in the late 1960's and early 1970's (Ratcliffe, 1976). The commercial expansion of the town centre has continued down to the present day.

To sum up, assaults were being made on Friary Ward from three quarters: road schemes threatened the Ward along the routes into the town centre; commercial expansion was pushing out the town centre at the expense of the neighbouring residential areas; and the residential areas were themselves in danger of being destroyed and replaced by different people, lifestyles and activities.

**PLANNING IN FRIARY WARD: POST 1966 (REHABILITATION)**

The year 1966 was a watershed in the history of Friary Ward, because from that date the future existence of the Ward in its now familiar form became more certain. Although redevelopment as an option still existed, the reports which appeared subsequent to 1966 suggested that wholesale destruction was not only socially undesirable (although this was at no time stated) but economically profligate and financially burdensome.

**National Considerations**

Why should there have been a change in policy and attitude towards the Ward between 1966 and 1968? Apart from the financial constraints for a town the size of Guildford to redevelop a large area such as Friary Ward, two Government reports appeared which proved to be highly influential throughout the country. Firstly, in 1966, the Deeplish Study was published (MHLG, 1966) which was concerned with area improvement in a deteriorating environment in Rochdale, Lancashire. Secondly, in 1968, the Government White Paper "Old Houses Into New Homes" (MHLG, 1968) appeared which stressed the need to look at areas with poor housing rather than houses in poor areas. Although improvement grants have been available in England and Wales since 1949 and indeed exactly one hundred improvement grants had been given in Friary Ward between 1950 and 1966 (cf. Fig. 5.3), improvement tended to be
Figure 5.3  Total Improvement Grants given in Friary Ward, 1950 - 1977
piecemeal. The Government White Paper tried to convince local authorities that "Whole areas and streets cannot be brought up to proper standards unless something can be done for the environment as opposed to the interior of the houses." (ibid., 1968).

In 1968, Guildford Borough Council requested that a study be made of the Stoke Road Area (cf. Fig. 3.1) in order to assess its future. A joint report was produced by the Borough Engineer and the Chief Public Health Inspector, and very much reflected the perspectives of those two professions. The Stoke Road Area Report made reference to both Government publications. However, its interpretation of the White Paper was awry when it concluded: "Those areas suggested for improvement could be designated as 'General Improvement Areas' following the procedure outlined in the Government's Housing White Paper. Indeed they have, for some years, been looked upon as Improvement Areas and house to house inspections have been carried out and Improvement Grants given on an individual basis." (Guildford Borough Council, 1968, para. 3). The whole point of the 1969 Housing Act, which legislated for General Improvement Areas, was that improvement policy in the past had ignored the larger environment in which houses are situated. The 1969 Housing Act legislated for both housing and environmental improvements. Therefore, the change in policy towards Friary Ward reflected a national change in attitude towards inner-city environments (cf. Richardson, 1971; Cullingworth, 1972).

**Stoke Road Area Report, 1968**

Following the two Government Reports, it is not surprising to find that the Stoke Road Area Report concentrated on two aspects of renewal: the population characteristics and housing conditions of the inhabitants, and the quality of the external environment. Although rehabilitation rather than redevelopment was becoming an increasingly favoured method of renewal wherever possible, and despite the fact that both the Deeplish Study and the Government White Paper on Housing were both cited, the tone of the report still leaned towards redevelopment as a means of solving the area's problems, harking back to the days of Jellicoe and Buchanan, as illustrated
"There are few buildings in the area worth retaining for architectural or historic merit. Stoke Hospital is a notable exception. A group of cottages along the Seven Corners footpath forms a pleasant group and, with one exception, appear well maintained. However, further investigation may reveal poor structural conditions. In addition, there are a number of substantial post-war developments not readily available for development - in particular, the maisonettes in Drummond Road.

The general environment of the Study area is, however, drab; there are no parks or children's play areas or, indeed, trees, no modern schools or shops, few garages and an outdated road pattern. In addition, there are a number of non-conforming industries interspersed with the older houses, which are un-sighty and seriously detract from the street scene." (op. cit, 1968, para. 10).

As a result of the study, three types of planning proposals were made for the area. The first consisted of dividing the area into three categories (Fig. 5.4). Areas marked 'A' were to be considered "Action Areas", where "substantial reconstruction would seem to be the only practical solution to the problem" (ibid, para. 6). It was recognised though that after further studies such action might not be necessary on all those houses in 'A'. Areas 'C', centred on Markenfield Road and Foxenden Road, were seen to have an estimated life expectancy of 30 years, while Area 'B' had a predicted life expectancy of 15 to 20 years and would be redeveloped after 'A'. These plans were to be revised considerably within the next two years.

The second type of planning proposal consisted of making a number of very general recommendations for environmental improvements including residents' parking, the blocking off of roads leading into Woodbridge Road and Stoke Road, the creation of a small group of shops, children's play areas and sitting areas, pedestrian underpasses and bridges over Stoke Road and York Road and 'pleasant walkways'. Of these proposals, by 1978, only Drummond Road had been made into a cul-de-sac and one 'sitting-out' area created. Cul-de-sacs have recently been created in two other roads following the completion of road improvements in York Road/Woodbridge Road (June 1979). As for the other proposals, ten years' later FWRA
Figure 5.4  Stoke Road Area Report: Plan of Proposals (1965)
is still trying to persuade the Council to introduce them.

The final type of planning proposals took the form of detailed recommendations. These consisted of planting trees, reducing road widths and the creation of parking-bays, and are the basis of the environmental improvements promulgated by the Planning Department when the Stoke Fields General Improvement Area (hereafter GIA) was declared in December 1970.

**Stoke Fields General Improvement Area, 1970**

**The task ahead**

The observations made in the 1968 Stoke Road Area Report concerning both housing and environmental conditions in the Ward, were restated a little more forcefully in the detailed proposals submitted to the Personal Services Committee just prior to the declaration of the GIA in 1970. In the introduction to these proposals, the content of Part II of the 1969 Housing Act was discussed, in particular the rationale for declaring GIAs. The model of residents adumbrated by the Planning Department was that of passive victims of circumstances incapable of effecting change themselves. Although it does not state that the Friary Ward residents are to be seen in this light, by implication the interpretation is there:

"...... the environment of these areas is often poor, with people who have lived for many years in dull, drab surroundings, becoming almost immunised against them, and unaware of the possibilities of improvement." (Guildford Borough Council, 1970b, para 2.1).

In December 1970 there were 584 dwellings in the Stoke Fields GIA. Of these 175 (30%) did not possess all the standard amenities. Four hundred and nine houses had all the standard amenities but only 335 of these had all the standard amenities provided to a satisfactory level. Therefore the standard amenities were either totally absent or deficient in 42% of the housing stock in the GIA. To this figure must be added those houses which were fit and contained all the standard amenities but were not in a satisfactory state of repair. In December 1970 only 139 houses (23%) in the GIA were at the full standard.
The problems of encouraging, persuading and cajoling inhabitants to improve their property were fully understood. The area contained a large proportion of elderly people and landlords, both of whom, in many cases, possessed neither the resources nor the inclination to carry out improvements; a problem which remains down to the present day.

Considering the image the planning department conveyed concerning the external surroundings, the environmental improvement proposals look relatively conservative and unproblematic. However, it is in this area that contention, delay and non-implementation have occurred. The improvements were to be effected in three stages (cf. Fig. 5.5).

**Phase I**

(i) Acquisition of No. 9 Artillery Terrace to provide an access to the rear of Stoke Grove. (No. 8 was already in the Council's ownership).

(ii) Levelling and construction of garages, hard and soft landscaping and services area at rear of Stoke Grove on already cleared site.

(iii) Close off Stoke Fields to all private traffic and allocation of garages to residents who want them.

(iv) Closure of part of Artillery Terrace to provide a small pedestrianised area.

(v) Acquisition of Nos. 49/50 Drummond Road and 48 Drummond Road and Nos. 5 and 5a Artillery Terrace in preparation for Phase II.

(vi) Landscaping and parking bays in George Road.

**Phase II**

(i) Completion of link between Drummond Road and Artillery Terrace and provision of garages.

(ii) Landscaping and parking bays in Church Road, Artillery Terrace and Artillery Road.

**Phase III**

(i) Slight realignment of radii on Park Road to allow easier access through to Dapdune Road. This route envisaged ultimately as the main internal distributor road for the area.
Figure 5.5  Stoke Fields General Improvement Area:
Plan of Proposals (1970)
(ii) Completion of parking bays and landscaping in Gardner Road, Markenfield Road and Nettles Terrace.

Public participation

The tone and language of the proposals differed substantially from the Stoke Road Area Report produced just two years' previously. The GIA proposals showed a much greater awareness that one is dealing with people who are not always rational, who are resistant to change and who may not see the proposals in the same way as the Planning Department. Furthermore, there was a consciousness that neighbourhood improvement has social as well as physical effects. Evidence of this comes from two sections of the proposals. The first, in discussing the effects of Phase I states:

"This is the core of the proposed scheme and will require very careful handling both of the public relations and the detailing involved. Stoke Fields and Stoke Grove are the heart of this area and could be the most pleasant aspect. The object is to completely pedestrianise The Fields and provide garaging and service access from the garage area, which by careful landscaping and screening can be a minimal intrusion into the environment. This can only be achieved by co-operation with the residents." (Guildford Borough Council, 1970b, para 8.2).

The second statement, indicative of the changing attitude towards the role of the public in improvement schemes, is even more forceful:

"The Ministry lay great stress on the importance of public relations to explain to the people concerned what is proposed in the area. The Council should be receptive to the ideas and feelings of the people themselves. The improvement proposals for the area must certainly include some definite ideas, but these must be capable of adjustment in the light of people's response." (ibid., para. 9.1)

It is suggested that this more sensitive approach reflected a change in Government attitudes in the form of an increasing awareness of the social ramifications of area improvement and a realisation that planning should be for (and preferably with) people rather than areas. This comes out strongly, both in a speech by Anthony Greenwood in Parliament at the second reading of the 1969 Housing Bill (Hansard, 1969), and in the subsequent Ministry of Housing and Local Government Circular on Area Improvement (MHLG, 1969). Furthermore, 1969 saw the publication of the Skeffington Report on "People and Planning".
The planning department of Guildford Borough Council carried out a participation exercise in the GIA, using a variety of media to communicate their proposals: six exhibitions (including an 'exhibition house', an exhibition in the local primary school and two exhibitions in town centre shop windows), a public meeting, door to door canvassing, leaflet distribution and press publicity. It was proposed in the report that a meeting could be held with members of FWRA, "so that residents' views can be aired". (op.cit, 1970b, para 9.3). One rider was placed in the report to show that the local authority still considered that it had the final say in the future of the GIA:

"It must be remembered that the Council aims to improve the area for an envisaged period of at least 30 years. The views of present residents, whilst they might be considered, must not be overriding. The deciding factor must be what is best for the houses and for the area, in the long-term when, indeed, many of the existing occupants may no longer be there." (ibid)

Although the Council was talking of consultation rather than participation, it must be remembered that even nationally, experience of this type of venture was extremely limited. Guildford Borough Council had come a long way since not only the days of Jellicoe and Buchanan, but even the Stoke Road Area Report.

York Road extension (College Road Link)

The undertaking of environmental improvements in the GIA was contingent upon the completion of the College Road link road widening in Woodbridge Road. When this was complete, the residential roads leading into Woodbridge and Stoke Roads could be blocked off except for one access road from each of the main roads. It was argued that this would reduce the internal traffic flow and make possible the creation of parking bays, landscaping and the other improvements detailed above and shown on Figure 5.5.

The College Road link improvement scheme was subject to considerable delay initially, which in no small part held up the GIA scheme. The impression was given on a number of occasions, by councillors and a planning officer, that FWRA was responsible for the delays as it had protested at the
original route. The route to which FWRA objected involved demolishing a number of houses in Church Road. Eventually the local authority relented to FWRA pressure and routed the road along the line of College Road, which involved considerably less demolition. The dispute and the Council's submission inevitably caused ill-feeling. A closer examination of the history of the road proposal reveals that the issue was not as straightforward as the councillors and planners suggested.

In a letter (dated 21st January 1969) from Herbert Weller, the then Town Clerk of Guildford Borough Council to Miss W. Oliver, a FWRA committee member, the Town Clerk sought to clarify the history of the York Road extension. He stated that it was originally intended to link York Road with Woodbridge Road via College Road, but this was shown on detailed investigation to be inadequate for traffic capacity unless Onslow Road was made into a three-lane dual carriageway. This was considered unacceptable as such a road would be out of scale with a town the size of Guildford. As a consequence the Council proposed to move the road further north to run through Church Road into Woodbridge Road. This would mean that Onslow Road would only be made a two-lane dual carriageway. In order to cope with the traffic, a major north-south road would be built along the other side of the river in Walnut Tree Close and would be linked up to the Woodbridge Road by the York Road Extension continuing across the River Wey.

FWRA and the residents of Church Road objected to this and the York Road link was moved back to its original position. Onslow Road is still to be a two-lane dual carriageway and is considered adequate. It cannot be argued that the north-south road is essential to providing traffic relief to the scheme because this has now been abandoned, while any future attempt to link this proposed road with the York Road extension will have to be curtailed as the transport planners recently discovered that the County has just built the new Police Station and Law Courts over the proposed route!

Environmental improvements: the public response

The progress of environmental improvements in the GIA has been slow. The initial delay caused by the re-routing of the York Road - Woodbridge
Road link was obviously one important factor. As to whether it was a good decision to use College Road rather than Church Road is still debatable. On the Council's side many officers and members have argued that the delay meant that the road will now cost a considerable amount more to build in 1978 than in 1968, given the severe inflation over that ten year period. The residents have argued that many houses have been saved from needless demolition. One of the arguments I would put forward in the overall context of the problems of Friary Ward is that, when the road is built, its severance effects will be considerable, both physically and psychologically. If the designated route had been Church Road there would have been considerable pressure to expand the office sector even further into the Ward. The severance effect of the new road may be strong enough to halt office incursion further and retain intact the GIA which exists on the northern side of the road.

When the planning officers initiated the GIA consultation exercise and explained their proposals to the residents, it is understood that the residents were not particularly enamoured with the plans as presented. The landscaping proposals consisted chiefly of tree planting throughout the Ward. It has been recounted to me on a number of occasions that the residents did not want trees planted because the fall of leaves in the autumn would cause a mess and block drains. Furthermore, the residents of Stoke Grove and Stoke Fields were not happy at the prospect of these two roads being blocked off and access being available only from the garage area (cf. Fig. 5.5).

When the Planning Department did not get the co-operation it hoped for from residents, it seemed to lose both keenness and willingness to progress further with the environmental improvements. It has been readily admitted that the residents' rejection of some of the proposals knocked the wind out of the sails' of the Council. As if cast into the role of jilted lover, Guildford Borough Council lost its enthusiasm for developing the relationship further. However, it will become apparent that the reasons for inaction were more complex than is often suggested.

Environmental improvements: progress

If the improvements to be carried out in the three phases listed above are examined, only three of the proposed improvements to date have been
completed (Phase I (i), (ii) and (v)). Phase II (ii) - the completion of link between Drummond Road and Artillery Terrace - has undergone substantial modification and will not now take the form of a link road, but rather a raised pavement for emergency vehicle access only (cf. Chapter 9). No dates so far have been given by the Planning Department as to when the residential roads will be blocked off from Stoke Road and Woodbridge Road and when (or indeed if) the parking bays will be created in the roads listed. In many ways the change in attitude and willingness by the Council to push ahead with environmental improvements is further evidence that the exercise with the public at the early stages of the planning was only consultation rather than participation. If it had been participation, for example, of the type encouraged and undertaken by FWRA now, then some compromise would have been reached and environmental improvements carried out.

A critical evaluation of the history of the progress of environmental improvements in Stoke Fields GIA is had by reference to a report written by an environmental health officer in Guildford Borough Council, who had a special responsibility for the Stoke Fields GIA. He writes:

"The Council's present general improvement area remains an uncompleted general improvement area seven years after its declaration because it was discovered in practice that insufficient attention had been given to providing adequate staff on the ground and in administrative roles to ensure its speedy success. In terms of the individual dwellings, great progress has however been achieved, largely due to the cooperation and self volition of owners of dwellings in the area. In local environmental terms, it resembles a flop. Some of the reasons why this is are beyond the absolute control of the Council: these include the various changes in policy relating to the future, and delays in the commencement of the College Road link between Woodbridge Road and York Road. The effects on through traffic in the area, an environmentally bad point of the area, have thus yet to be seen when various schemes are completed. Activities which, however, are in the Council's full control and proper interest cannot be said to have been satisfactorily accomplished, as the residents of the area will state in no uncertain terms.

These sources of dissatisfaction include the continued existence of non-conforming users, in planning terms, in the area. The area is residential yet also contains some light industry and commercial distributors. Traffic congestion in the area is quite bad enough without the disturbance that fairly heavy lorries can provide. Dissatisfaction is also felt about the conditions of the alleys and paths in the area and the open spaces which the Council has made,
particular a triangle behind the works at the presently closed end of Artillery Terrace. It appears that this space is used either by alcoholic vagrants as a place to consume liquor or as a lavatory for the area's unsupervised dogs. The provision of off-street parking in the area also causes problems; what there is is insufficient and is out of character with the area. Quite a number of residents have turned their front gardens into hardstandings as a physical, if not visual, solution. It is therefore suggested that the Council's proposals for environmental improvements in the area be reappraised, with further consultation with the residents, and a proper rolling programme of improvements be formed, if found desirable." (Kay, 1977, para 5.15 - 5.16).

House Improvements

The author suggests that the Council's record as far as improving individual properties is good. As to whether this is a fair assessment can be attested by reference to an Interim Report produced in December 1974 giving details of the progress of housing improvements (Guildford Borough Council, 1974).

Table 5.1 gives the details of the number of houses in the GIA without all the standard amenities and/or not up to a satisfactory standard and/or not in a satisfactory state of repair. At the time of this report, of the 582 houses in the ward, about 527 were built prior to 1930. The percentage figures are based on the total number of houses, not only the older houses.

When the Stoke Fields GIA was declared, 30% of the houses lacked one or more of the standard amenities. By 1974, this figure was reduced to 18%. However, of those dwellings which possessed all the standard amenities, not all were at a satisfactory standard. Twelve per cent of the houses fell into this category in 1970 and this figure only fell by 2% in the intervening four year period. If groups (C) and (E) are added one has a useful indicator of overall level of improvement as this figure includes houses lacking one or more standard amenities, and houses containing all the standard amenities but not up to a satisfactory standard. In 1970 42% of the houses in the GIA fell into this category. Four years later, still over a quarter of the houses were not up to standard. Furthermore, under a half of the houses in the GIA were at the full standard (I).

One of the reasons behind the slow progress in house improvements is purely financial. In times of rapid inflation the Government contribution towards improvement costs (up to a maximum limit of £2,000) has not.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Total no. of dwellings in GIA</th>
<th>December 1970</th>
<th>December 1974</th>
<th>1970-74</th>
<th>% +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) No. of dwellings provided with all standard amenities</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>476*</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) No. of dwellings lacking one or more standard amenities</td>
<td>175*</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>106*</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) No. of dwellings provided with all standard amenities to a satisfactory standard</td>
<td>338*</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>418*</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) No. of dwellings provided with all standard amenities not to a satisfactory standard</td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) (C) + (E)</td>
<td>246*</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>164*</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) No. of dwellings at full standard</td>
<td>139*</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>258*</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) No. of dwellings not in a satisfactory state of repair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>256*</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Department of Housing and Health (Guildford Borough Council) estimates
1 Of these 582 dwellings, 527 were constructed prior to 1930
kept pace with building costs. The houses which need improving are invariably in the poorest parts of cities where residents are often least likely to have the capital, willingness or ability to take out a mortgage to have expensive improvements carried out. This is especially so for elderly people whose attitude is often along the lines of: "Well, I have gone without an inside W.C. for seventy years, why should I want one now?" Therefore there are difficulties, and these have been recognised by the Planning Department: "But the task of persuading some 300 owners - landlords, estate agents or owner-occupiers - to share the spirit and aims of the Council in the Stoke Fields General Improvement Area cannot be overestimated." (op.cit., 1974, p.2).

An examination of the number of grants approved in Friary Ward since 1950 provides a contextual background with which to evaluate the success of the improvement grant policy in the Stoke Fields GIA (Fig. 5.3). Until 1971, the increase in take-up of grants was very gradual, with even a slump after 1967. Although the GIA was declared in December 1970, it was 1972 before there was a sudden rise in grant applications and approvals. However, this demand was very short-lived for, in the following year, there was a decline which has continued right down until 1977, when it was back to the level of the early 1960's. This is disturbing since there are still a large number of properties needing improvements. The figures given in Table 5.1 apply only until 1974. The decline in improvement grant approvals since 1974 does not suggest a substantial improvement in the figures given in this Table. It is possible that more people will apply for grants in the next year or so in the light of an improvement in the economy, and the recent campaign (April 1978) by the Government to encourage people to improve their houses by applying for improvement grants.

The Economics of a General Improvement Area

As the take-up of improvement grants in the Stoke Fields GIA has at best been only moderately successful, and as the environmental improvement "resembles a flop", it then remains to question the benefits of actually retaining the GIA. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a discussion
of the economic benefits of GIA declaration for residents, but especially local authorities. Although this represents a slight digression from the themes examined in this chapter, the importance of the findings here preclude its omission. Even in the context of nationally comprehensive accounts of the establishment and progress of general improvement areas (Roberts, 1976) the following economic analysis presents an original contribution to the debate concerning the politics and effectiveness of area improvement (2).

Financing a GIA

Guildford Borough Council was undoubtedly enterprising and ambitious in declaring the Stoke Fields GIA in 1970, and full credit should be given to the Council for embarking on this experiment when nationally there was very little experience of such an undertaking. However, after nine years there has been relatively little progress, especially in environmental terms, while the accumulated experience nationally is now considerable. As Kay suggests, the Council should reappraise its proposals for environmental improvements in the Ward in a programme of more active participation with the residents. Otherwise there would seem to be little purpose in retaining the area as a GIA.

In fact this is not strictly true. There are considerable financial advantages in maintaining a GIA in an area where housing improvements are taking place, although not environmental improvements. If an individual wishes to improve his house, the local authority has within its powers the ability to reimburse the individual a certain percentage of his costs. After the 1974 Housing Act the amount the local authority reimburses is higher if the individual lives in a GIA. The local authority is then entitled to recover from the Exchequer a percentage of the grant it has made to the individual. The Exchequer contribution which a council receives towards the cost of the loan charges is again at a higher rate if the house is in a GIA (90%) than elsewhere (75%).

Local authorities are generally not in a position to find large sums of money for house improvement grants. Consequently they borrow money from a variety of sources (e.g. they issue local authority bonds, raise money from commercial sources such as merchant banks, and can even borrow from abroad). This money is eventually paid back with interest. Thus, simply,
borrowing of £100,000 at 5% interest would mean that the local authority would have to pay back £105,000. The principal sum borrowed and the interest is known as the loan charge. The local authority is entitled to receive a grant from the Exchequer to cover part of the costs of the loan charges. This grant is paid to the local authority in annual instalments over a period of twenty years. The financial advantages which accrue to both the resident and the local authority can be gauged from the following hypothetical case of two residents undertaking house improvements in Friary Ward, one whose house is inside the Stoke Fields GIA and the other whose house is outside the GIA (Table 5.2).

In both the hypothetical cases given below, and the actual figures of savings made by Guildford Borough Council in the Stoke Fields GIA (Table 5.3) the sums exclude the additional interest payable, as this is variable. In effect, this means that the figures of savings that the Council has made are underestimated rather than over-estimated.

Table 5.2 Differential Rate of House Improvement Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident A Inside Stoke Fields GIA</th>
<th>Resident B Outside Stoke Fields GIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost to resident for house improvements</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% grant the resident can claim from Guildford Borough Council</td>
<td>60% (£1,200)</td>
<td>50% (£1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% grant that Guildford Borough Council can claim from the Exchequer towards the cost of loan charges</td>
<td>90% (£1,080)</td>
<td>75% (£750)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount which Guildford Borough Council has to find from the rates</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What has this meant in terms of the Stoke Fields GIA? From the time of the declaration of the GIA in December 1970 until the 1974 Housing Act, in which the Exchequer contribution was changed, Guildford Borough Council had approved 107 improvements grants in the Stoke Fields GIA and granted a total of £62,605.73 towards householders' improvement costs. Under the 1969 Housing Act, the local authority was entitled to recover 75% of this total from the Exchequer. This percentage applied whether houses were inside or outside a GIA. As can be seen in Table 5.3, the actual cost to Guildford Borough Council for housing improvements which was to be found from the rates was £15,651.43. After the 1974 Housing Act (until 14th September 1977) Guildford Borough Council made a further 27 improvement grants costing £40,175.89. However, it could now recover 90% of its costs from the Exchequer which meant that the Council had only to find £4,017.59 from its own funds. Between 1st January 1977 and 16th May 1978 a further thirteen improvement grants were approved, although the work had yet to be completed (as at 31st May 1978). If this is successfully done, the Council will make grants totalling a further £20,594.03, of which it has to find 10% of this sum itself.

Therefore, when the works approved up until 16th May 1978 have been completed, Guildford Borough Council will have made grants totalling £123,375.65 of which it will have had to have found £21,728.97 from its own sources. If the GIA did not exist, it could only have recovered 75% instead of 90% of the grants from the Exchequer after 1st December 1974. This would have meant that instead of having to find £6,076.54 from the rates, it would have had to find £15,192.49. The existence of the Stoke Fields GIA has meant that the Council will have saved a minimum of £9,115.56 if all currently approved improvements are completed. This figure does not include the interest component of the loan charges, and is therefore an under-estimate of the actual sum saved.

How much has the local authority spent on environmental improvements? Currently, Government will approve expenditure on environmental improvements up to the sum of £200 per house multiplied by the number of houses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grants given by Guildford Borough Council for House Improvements in the Stoke Fields GIA</th>
<th>Percentage and amount of Principal recoverable from the Exchequer (not including recoverable interest charges)</th>
<th>Percentage and amount recoverable from the Exchequer (not including recoverable interest charges) if the improved houses were not within a GIA</th>
<th>Sum saved by Guildford Borough Council due to declaration of the Stoke Fields GIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1970 - 30 Nov. 1974</td>
<td>£62,605.73</td>
<td>(75%) £46,954.30</td>
<td>(75%) £46,954.30</td>
<td>£0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec. 1974 - 14 Sept 1977</td>
<td>£40,175.89</td>
<td>(90%) £36,158.30</td>
<td>(75%) £30,131.91</td>
<td>£6,026.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works approved between 1 Jan 1977 and 16 May 1978 but not yet completed</td>
<td>£20,594.03</td>
<td>(90%) £18,535.08</td>
<td>(75%) £15,445.52</td>
<td>£30,895.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£123,375.65</td>
<td>£101,647.68</td>
<td>£92,531.73</td>
<td>£91,159.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Financial Savings made by Guildford Borough Council as a result of the declaration of the Stoke Fields GIA
In the GIA. With 582 houses in the GIA Guildford Borough Council is empowered to spend up to £16,400. Of this the Council can recover 50% (£58,200) of the annual loan charges from the Exchequer over a period of twenty years. In the early days of the GIA, £41,000 was put aside for environmental improvements. To date this money has been spent on buying and demolishing property for one off-street parking site and creating one 'environmental area' (a shrubbed area with a park bench). Considering that half of the money spent is recoverable from the Exchequer and that over £100,000 could be spent, Guildford Borough Council's record on environmental improvements is extremely poor.

Discussion

A cynic might suggest that Guildford Borough Council declared the GIA as a means of receiving a higher rate of recompense for house improvements from Exchequer funds. At the same time environmental improvement costs have been kept as low as possible as these are subject to only 50% of reimbursement. This was not the case in Guildford as preferential GIA grants were only introduced in 1974. Nevertheless there are financial advantages in retaining the GIA and not carrying out environmental improvements. Fortunately there are financial advantages for the residents also, but the cost they have to bear is the loss of environmental improvements. It is not being suggested that the Council purposefully adopted this somewhat dishonest strategy. Having interviewed the officers involved in the GIA and read the reports to committees, there is considerable evidence to suggest that they entered into the GIA fully within the spirit of the 1969 Housing Act.

There is no time limit on the length a GIA can be declared, as is the case with Housing Action Areas (five years). General Improvement Areas are usually in existence for five to seven years. The Stoke Fields GIA has been in existence for nine years. It could still be a GIA for many years to come. It remains to be seen whether the Council continues its present policy or fulfils its obligations. In June 1979 FWRA initiated a campaign to get the GIA reviewed and environmental improvements implemented. However, the campaign could not have been more ill-timed as it coincided
with the election of the Conservative Government and the massive cutback in public expenditure.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

From an analysis of the plans and consultants' reports, it can be seen that the ideology of economic growth which Guildford Borough Council supports, and which is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8, has its origins in events over thirty years ago. As a consequence, many of the planning and environmental problems voiced by residents in Chapters 7 and 9 stem from the type of encouragement given to planning growth in the first year after the Second World War: commercial expansion; car parking problems; through-traffic on residential roads; pollution; and derelict housing.

The development of Guildford as a major regional centre is not the product of recent policy-making. Indeed, the analysis in this chapter supports the conclusion of Dearlove (1973) that councils rarely engage in policy-making; policies evolve over a long period of time and are the product of a multitude of often small decisions. Council activity is more accurately defined as being directed towards policy-maintenance. Therefore, it is not the job of residents' associations to influence policy-making, but rather to challenge policy-maintenance. In later chapters it is apparent that this is exactly the type of participation FWRA has sought.

Since 1945, there has been a change in renewal policy towards the Ward, affected by a number of factors. The publication of the Town Map was significant for Friary Ward in that it recognised that redevelopment, which had been advocated for twenty years, was not necessarily the panacea for inner-urban renewal problems. This change in attitude originated from both inside and outside the Council. First, there was a national reversal in renewal policy (from redevelopment to rehabilitation); second, the economic costs of large-scale urban redevelopment could not be sustained by small Borough Councils; and finally, there has been increasing public pressure to rehabilitate rather than redevelop the old inner-city areas.

This period also witnessed a change in the attitude of the Council towards the inhabitants of Friary Ward. The model of residents generally emphasized
until 1968 was one of passive victims of their environment, oblivious to their surroundings and incapable of perceiving an alternative future. However, when the plan for the GIA was put forward, the Council paid obeisance to the fact that residents may themselves have ideas as to the sort of environment they want. Again, the reasons for this change lay both inside and outside the specific activities of the Council. There was, at this time, an increasing awareness of the social ramifications of area improvement and the realisation that one should be planning for (or preferably with) people rather than areas. Central Government was very influential in promulgating such a view. Allied to this was the statutory recognition of public participation in planning by the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act. The Skeffington Report published a year later seemed to be directed especially to areas the size of Friary Ward. Now that public participation had become the enfant terrible of British town planning, the public had to be consulted.

The early participation exercises in Friary Ward were not particularly successful, at least as far as Guildford Borough Council were concerned. The activities of the Friary Ward Residents' Association in respect of the College Road link (York Road extension) caused a long and expensive delay in the road building programme. The GIA participation exercise too resulted in very few environmental improvements being realised. Even nine years after the declaration of the GIA the environment is little different from its 1970 state. The lack of environmental improvements in the Ward generally, and the GIA particularly, form the basis of many of the residents' complaints about the area (Chapter 7). An economic analysis of the approval of improvement grants by Guildford Borough Council in the Stoke Fields GIA reveals that the Council made substantial financial savings by declaring the GIA but not carrying out environmental improvements.

Two final observations can be made. Although Friary Ward is a small area, plans of various scales have been highly influential in determining its present state and the problems it currently faces. Paradoxically, it is those plans at the larger scale such as the Jellicoe Plan and the Guildford and District Town Map, and even the Strategy for the South-East, which have altered the nature of Friary Ward. It is also noteworthy that the most influential plans have been those of a strategic nature rather than those concerned with detailed land use planning. This reinforces an important point
made in Chapter 9. One should not look simply and solely to local sources of influence in shaping plans and decision-making. National events and activities can be equally, if not more decisive.

Historical parameters, like spatial parameters, should not be too narrowly defined. While recent local government is obviously significant, it is important to grasp an historical perspective and understand that the present state of an area such as Friary Ward is the product of many decades of policy-maintenance and decision-making.
Footnotes:

1. Under the Sixth Schedule of the 1974 Housing Act, the standard amenities are:

   (i) a fixed bath or shower,  (ii) a hot and cold water supply at a fixed bath or shower,  (iii) a wash hand basin
   (iv) a hot and cold water supply at a wash hand basin
   (v) a sink  (vi) a hot and cold water supply at a sink
   (vii) a water closet

2. It should be pointed out that other types of economic analysis have been undertaken in areas of urban renewal generally and GIAs’ in particular. For example, see Pearson and Henney (1972) and Hamnett (1973) on gentrification; Duncan (1974) on the allocation of improvement grants; Kirkby (1979) on the economics of rehabilitation versus redevelopment.
"For many people the gap between the ideals of democracy and the reality has become almost too wide to sustain credibility. In theory, we are supposed to fill the gap with the concept of representation, but for those oppressed by a well ground sense of powerlessness, the ability to assist in a minute way in electing a City Councillor once a year is little consolation. In these circumstances for people to stay away from the poll is at least as rational an action as to attend it."

Harvey Cox

* Cities: The Public Dimension, Harmondsworth: Penguin, p.57
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INTRODUCTION

Five themes are examined in this thesis: the decline in the quality of 'localness' in local government; the vote: seat bias in elections; the rural bias on Guildford Borough Council; the degree of electorate/councillor contact; and the political awareness of the electorate. While election data provides important contextual material on the politics and balance of power in Guildford, it also serves a more important function. Each of the themes is an important component in democracy, and especially local democracy. It will be seen that the findings presented in this chapter on each of the issues reveals local democracy to be in a parlous state. The themes have not been chosen because the findings reinforce the case for more participation. Each of the issues is central to an equitable and efficacious democratic system. Furthermore, the themes also represent different levels of influence on the political process in general and on Guildford Borough Council in particular.

The decline in the quality of 'localness' in local government, is not only important at a social-psychological level for the active involvement of the public in decision-making affecting their lives and environment, but is also important in terms of the quality of representation individual areas receive. The importance and distinctiveness of small areas and the problems they face was drawn out in Chapter 4. Arguably, the greater the number of representatives and size of the electorate, the more difficult it becomes for the Council to appreciate the problems and interests of such areas. Whether this is actually the case will be seen in Chapter 7. The vote: seat bias is a structural problem which gives rise not only to an unequal influence of rural areas over urban areas, but also militates against the election of minority groups to the Council. The unequal influence of the rural areas over urban areas on the Council is a theme which runs not only through this chapter, but later ones as well. The critical consequences of this difference are made clear in Chapter 7. The level of contact between and knowledge of local councillors is crucial to the fair and effective functioning of local democracy. The implications of these findings for coorientation and participation are discussed in this and the relevant chapters (Chapters 7 and 9).
Local Issues and National Parties

Local elections are the poor relation of their national counterparts in terms of the interest they generate. This might be gauged by the turnout figures for local elections which are generally about 30% lower than for national elections. The inter-relationship between local and national elections is ambiguous. It is often argued by elected members that party politics are unimportant. Yet an examination of the 'tickets' for candidates standing in local elections reveals that very few are independent and the overwhelming majority represent one of the three major national political parties. In the 1973 Guildford Borough Council elections 92.4% of the candidates represented either the Conservative, Liberal or Labour parties.

It might be expected that local issues or charismatic personalities would be important factors in electoral success. In some cases they are. But the major swings which occur nationally towards particular parties suggest that many people vote in local elections for a particular party rather than for a particular person. Uniform swings are a special feature of British elections (Taylor and Johnson, 1979). Green (1972), using a factor-analytic approach, found that the national component in local elections was so important that it accounted for just under three-quarters of the variance in an analysis of ward swings in two major northern towns. Furthermore, the low level of contact the majority of the electorate have with their councillors (cf. Chapter 7) indicates that most of the electorate are not in a position to accurately predict the policy positions and preferences individual councillors hold.

Local Government Reorganisation

Another factor which has served only to remove the 'localness' from local elections has been local government reorganisation. The Local Government Act of 1972 brought about the conjunction of rural and urban wards to produce the new district councils. The effect of the Act on Guildford was to increase the population of the borough by 115%, and the administrative area by 315%. It is ironic that the
new, larger, perhaps more efficient and more remote local authorities should come into existence at a time when every encouragement was also being given to creating closer cooperation and participation between governmental administration and the public (Skelfington Report, 1969; Dobry Report, 1974). A second consequence of local government reform is that the larger, but low density, rural areas now have political dominance over the smaller, but high density, urban areas.

Where Councillors live

Critics have called for some form of residential qualification as a prerequisite for electoral representation. Although this exists at one level, i.e. a Guildford councillor must live within the boundaries of the Borough, there is no requirement to actually live in the ward for which one is standing. It is arguable that, apart from the rewards of experiencing at first-hand the living conditions within the ward one represents, communication and contact with the electorate would also be facilitated.

Of the twenty-one councillors who represent the seven town wards, eleven live in the wards for which they were elected, whilst ten live in other wards. While this is a significant figure in itself, what is even more interesting is that there is a likelihood of such a difference occurring according to the political party allegiance of councillors, and the socio-economic status of the ward. It would appear that higher socio-economic areas have a greater probability of their representatives living within the ward than lower socio-economic areas. But, more important, as a corollary of this, there is a significant relationship between party membership and ward representation/residence. Conservative-controlled wards have a greater probability of their councillors living in the ward they represent than either Liberal or Labour-controlled wards (Table 6.1).

In the urban wards there is a significant difference between Conservative councillors who live in the ward they represent and Liberal/Labour councillors who live outside their ward. In the case of the rural wards, the difference lies in the opposite direction. One might expect at least some councillors to live outside their ward but in fact none does. The generally attractive environment and the relationship between domicile and high status socio-economic areas
Table 6.1  Place of Residence of Guildford Borough Councillors
   by political party membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>All Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib/Lab</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Ind/Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live inside ward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live outside ward</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's exact
p = .056
(significant by Tocher)

Table 6.2  Electoral Turnout (7 June 1973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban wards</th>
<th>Rural wards</th>
<th>Friary Ward</th>
<th>Guildford Borough Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnout</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Representation Score</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3  Election Results (7 June 1973): Urban and Rural Wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes cast (%)</td>
<td>44086 (49.4%)</td>
<td>20535 (23%)</td>
<td>19990 (22.4%)</td>
<td>4590 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats gained (%)</td>
<td>29 (69%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>6 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional seats</td>
<td>21 (+8)</td>
<td>10 (-5)</td>
<td>9 (-3)</td>
<td>2 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is the likely explanation of this. Thus, in the urban wards, there is a much lower percentage of Liberal/Labour councillors living in the ward they represent, while in the rural wards the opposite holds true. As the Liberal and Labour councillors do not live in the wards they represent, it is instructive to examine where they do live. All the Liberal and Labour councillors who live outside the ward they represent live in Conservative-controlled wards, except one. Again this supports the popular notion that councillors tend to live in high-status areas. Of the three Conservatives who live outside the ward they represent, two live in wards which were either Liberal dominated (Friary) or mixed (Liberal/Conservative, Holy Trinity).

Perhaps this is stating nothing new; in fact we have known for a long time that the councillor selection process is neither random nor without reference to social, economic or educational background. Nevertheless, the spatial segregation of representative and represented has implications for the coorientational awareness by the elected members of the public's concerns, and the public's faith in the Council understanding their interests.

**Electoral Turnout**

Differences in electoral turnout occur not only between wards but between different types of elections. In the 1976 General Election the turnout for Guildford Borough Council was 66.6%. However, in the previous year, the local elections only managed to attract 39.3% of the potential electorate. It is paradoxical that local elections attract less interest than their national counterparts, yet one might imagine that the election of local authority candidates would be of more interest and importance than the election of one Member of Parliament who is to represent over 120,000 people. One reason for this paradox is provided by another: local elections are rarely fought on local issues. Candidates invariably stand on behalf of one of the major national political parties; only eight of the 105 candidates were 'independent' in the 1974 local elections. Even election campaign literature (6th May 1976) reveals great disparities between the major parties in terms of the attention they give to local issues (Appendix 7.1 - 7.3).
Compare the Liberal Party approach with its emphasis on community politics, with the Conservative Party document with its focus clearly on national issues. Ironically, in the column headed 'Conservatives Care About Local Government', most of the text is given over to what a Conservative Government would do if successful at a General Election. As for the local Labour Party manifesto, apart from the inaccuracies (cf. 'Houses As Offices'), the document gives the impression that its authors were hard pressed to think of local issues.

Under half the population votes in local elections (Table 6.2). In Guildford there is a slightly higher turnout in the urban areas than the rural areas, although the difference is not significant. The range of turnout in rural areas is much greater ($SD = 8.05$) than in urban areas ($SD = 4.92$) with as low as 25.1% of the electorate voting in Worplesdon although 50.6% of the population voted in the Clandons and the Horsleys. The turnout for Friary Ward was slightly higher than the mean for Guildford Borough Council in toto.

**Effective representation**

Another facet of the interest shown in local elections is provided by the 'Effective Representation Score' (ERS). The ERS reflects more accurately the level of support for political candidates and parties. While turnout figures express as a percentage the number voting in proportion to the population entitled to vote, the ERS is the number voting for the elected candidates in proportion to the population entitled to vote. It is calculated by means of the following equation:

$$E = \frac{C_1, C_2, C_n / n}{n}$$

where $C_1, C_2, C_n$ is the number of votes for each winning candidate; $n$ is the number of seats available in the contested ward; and $E$ is the total electorate entitled to vote. For Guildford Borough Council the ERS is 20.1%. This means that only one person in five voted for the elected members of the Council as being representative of their interests, values and political goals. Conversely, and it is worthwhile emphasizing the point, 80% of the inhabitants entitled to vote do not support the elected
members of Guildford Borough Council. While it could be argued that of this 80%, many supported the Council but did not vote, a proof of active support must be that one is willing at a minimal level to make a mark on a piece of paper once every three years. While the effective representation score was on average 20%, in one rural ward it dropped to below 15% while in another rural ward it reached 26.1%. Again, there was no significant difference between the means of the urban and rural areas (Table 6.2), although the distribution about the mean was greater in the rural wards (S.D. = 3.7%) than the urban wards (S.D. = 1.6%).

THE VOTE: SEAT BIAS

'First-Past-The-Post'

Guildford is a Conservative Party stronghold. After the local elections of June 1973 twenty-nine of the forty-two seats were captured by the Conservative Party (Table 6.3). However, the 'first-past-the-post' voting system in Britain produces massive distortions in the vote: seat ratio, i.e. the translation of votes into seats exaggerates the number of seats the majority party gains, and does not reflect the true electoral support of any one party. In contrast to the 'first-past-the-post' system in which the man who polls the highest vote secures the seat, the proportional representation system distributes seats according to the proportion of votes each party secures.

It can be seen in Table 6.3 that the Conservative Party gained only 49% of the vote in the 1973 local authority elections yet secured 69% of the seats. The Liberal Party, the second most supported party, polled 23% of the votes but gained only 12% of the seats. The overall anomaly is that the opposition parties in Guildford gained over 50% of the votes but only 31% of the seats and therefore were totally outnumbered by a party more people voted against than for. As an electoral result this is not an isolated incident. In the most recent local elections (3rd May 1979) the Conservative Party secured 52% of the votes but 76% of the seats (Table 6.4).
### Table 6.4: Election Results (3 May 1979): Urban and Rural Wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes cast (%)</td>
<td>76179 (52.4%)</td>
<td>25791 (17.7%)</td>
<td>37546 (25.8%)</td>
<td>5852 (4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats gained (%)</td>
<td>24 (76%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional seats</td>
<td>24 (+10)</td>
<td>8 (-5)</td>
<td>11 (-5)</td>
<td>2 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.5: Election Results (7 June 1973): Urban Wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes cast (%)</td>
<td>23599 (44.4%)</td>
<td>14610 (27.5%)</td>
<td>14484 (27.2%)</td>
<td>478 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats gained (%)</td>
<td>11 (52%)</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional seats</td>
<td>9 (+2)</td>
<td>6 (-2)</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.6: Election Results (7 June 1973): Rural Wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes cast (%)</td>
<td>20487 (56.9%)</td>
<td>5925 (16.4%)</td>
<td>5506 (15.3%)</td>
<td>4112 (11.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats gained (%)</td>
<td>18 (86%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional seats</td>
<td>12 (+6)</td>
<td>3 (-2)</td>
<td>3 (-3)</td>
<td>2 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.7: Competition for seats: Urban/Rural Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Average number of candidates per ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proportional Representation

The translation of votes into seats in the first-past-the-post system produces important 'undemocratic' biasing effects. In Tables 6.3 to 6.6 the distribution of seats between parties has been calculated if a proportional representation voting system had been adopted. Within such a system (and there are a number of proportional representation 'systems') not only is a vote never wasted, i.e. every vote positively contributes to the election of a candidate, but problems such as low competition and rural/urban differences are avoided as the (currently) forty-five wards would be transformed into one constituency.

Discussion

Johnston questions whether first-past-the-post constituencies can ever provide equality of representation, simply because while one "....... can use the spatial variable to describe how inequalities are produced, spatial manipulation alone will not remove the problems, but merely redistribute them." (Johnston, 1976, p.34). From this it follows that plurality (first-past-the-post) electoral systems with spatially-based constituencies favour territorially based parties. And so for a small party or group to secure seats, it requires an areal concentration of its supporters. Excluding the national political parties, groups standing in local elections seek to gain support around specific, often local, issues such as transportation, the environment, or 'the rates'. It is highly unlikely that the support for such a group will be concentrated in one particular area; instead sympathisers will be found throughout the electoral district. For a group such as this support is generally too thin in any one place to be effective in proportion to the total votes polled overall. In other words, such groups cannot secure a great enough concentration of voters within any one ward to take the seat. Consequently, the present electoral system favours candidates from national political parties, despite the argument that local elections should perhaps be the scene of a different type of political activity and the formation of different types of political groupings.
Gudgin & Taylor (1974) have constructed a developmental model of electoral bias which can be applied to the formative growth of minor parties and political groupings. Initially concentrated in one area, their support spreads beyond their home strongholds. There then follows a period of instability with all the parties competing for votes, after which there is a return to the basic two-party system with the 'new' party emerging as one of the major parties. There is a votes/seats barrier through which it is necessary to penetrate in order to receive an equitable proportion of seats in relation to the number of votes cast. This form of electoral bias is partly explained by the 'cube law' (Kendall and Stuart, 1950). This states that, within a two-party contest, the number of seats a party wins is proportional to the cube of the relative number of votes it receives. Thus, if a party wins with a voting proportion of 2:1, a seat proportion will result of the order of 8:1.

If we take the following assumptions as true: (a) political parties in modern democracies are based on aspatial political cleavages, (b) the plurality elections involving these parties are spatially organised into territorially defined constituencies. "This implies that the distribution of the various party votes is independent of the pattern of local constituencies. If this is in fact the case, it suggests that British general elections are nothing more than rather large-scale probability experiments." (Gudgin and Taylor, 1974, p.56).

THE RURAL BIAS ON GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Electoral Competition and Partisanship

Competitiveness and partisanship are two important concepts in the analysis of electoral data (Stanyer, 1973). Table 6.7 illustrates that the competition for seats in the urban areas was much greater than in rural wards. In general there were three candidates standing for each urban seat, in contrast to two candidates standing for each rural seat. Two rural seats were uncontested. The lower degree of competition was also reflected in the greater degree of partisanship in rural areas, where many contests were
simply between two parties, or one party and an independent. The lack of competition and overwhelming support for the Conservative Party in rural Guildford ensured that nearly half (43%) of the councillors on Guildford Borough Council were rural Conservatives.

Allied to the lack of competition in rural wards, and the anomalies of the first-past-the-post electoral system, is the low voting power needed to return a rural councillor. For example, in Pirbright it only required 310 votes to elect the ward member out of a poll of 568 voters (turnout 31.5%). Normandy fared little better where 499 votes out of 843 was enough to secure the seat (turnout 36%). If to these two results two uncontested seats are added, one finds that four (Conservative) seats were held for a total of 809 votes (10% of the seats for 0.9% of the borough's votes). While the voters of Pirbright and Normandy thus had a disproportionate influence on the composition of the Council Chamber, such a criticism applies to rural wards in general. It required on average only 1716 voters to elect a rural councillor in 1973, compared with 2532 voters required to return a councillor in an urban ward.

A complementary aspect of the finding that it needs more voters to elect an urban councillor than a rural councillor is that minority parties need more voters to secure a seat than does the majority party. In the 1973 local authority election it required on average 1520 voters to gain a Conservative seat. However, it required 3332 voters to secure a Labour Party seat and 4107 voters to gain a Liberal Party seat (two-and-three-quarters times as many voters as for the Conservative Party). In the rural wards, the situation was even more extreme with 1184 voters sufficient to elect a Conservative councillor, while it took 5925 voters to gain one Liberal member. Over five thousand Labour Party votes were totally wasted (27% of the Conservative poll) as they did not gain even one seat. In urban Guildford, the discrepancy was slightly reduced due to a more competitive contest but still nevertheless biased (Conservatives 2145; Liberals 3653; Labour 2414).

Council Committee Composition

The unequal power relationship between town and country is further
expressed within the committee structure of Guildford Borough Council. The town wards have twenty-one members, as do the rural wards. Thus there is no numerical dominance based on spatial factors alone. Any majority there is is political and derived from the dominance of the Conservative party in the Council. The charge of rural bias has been brought most strongly against the Planning Committee. On initial inspection it is difficult to see why, as there are eighteen wards in Guildford and each one has a representative on the Planning Committee. But the discrepancy occurs when it is realised that different criteria are being adopted for committee composition as opposed to full Council composition. In the case of the full Council, the urban and rural wards have equal representation, twenty-one seats each, which is roughly in proportion to their relative population size - about one councillor to every 2,000 votes (1). However, as each ward has a representative on the Planning Committee in proportion to their relative population, the urban areas are in fact discriminated against in favour of the rural areas. And so there are only seven urban councillors compared with eleven rural councillors on the committee, thus giving an easily workable majority. These figures would imply that 61% of the population live in the rural areas (in fact, it is 50.3%) and 39% in the town (actual, 49.7%). More important, this means that there is one councillor representing 6288 urban voters to every one councillor representing every 4045 rural voters. In this sense the rural areas are over-represented in Committee (7 : 11 councillors) and representation is not proportional to population or electoral size.

This bias is compounded with the problem of Conservative partisanship in Guildford as a whole, and this will always make it difficult for the town wards to make their interests felt and have equal status alongside the Conservative-dominated, rural interest groups. From this standpoint there is a very real need for participation to counter-balance an inequality in the present representational system. Thus, not only is there a need for voluntary organisations such as the Guildford Society and Friary Ward Residents’ Association through which people can voice their concerns but such organisations play a vital role in competing with and complementing the 'official' democratic channels. I intend this not to be a value judgment on their success but rather an acknowledgment of their existence, and their
own self perception as having a role to play in the political process.

The Need for Participation: Discussion

While spatial bias and political partisanship are both factors of some considerable importance in determining the distribution of power, one of the causes of this maldistribution is the 1972 Local Government Act, and the resultant Local Government reorganisation which came into operation on 1st April 1974. One of the more serious consequences of the reform has been the increase in size of all local authority areas. The size/efficiency formula was invoked and it was deemed that the larger the authority, the more efficient it would be. As a result, Guildford's population increased in 1974 by 115.0% and its area increased by 814.6%. It was argued at the time that this would not bring about feelings of increased alienation between the public and decision-makers. However, it is ironic that the Act was passed only three years after the Skeffington Report advocated a closer integration of public administration and the citizen. But it is not just size which has caused problems. It is the political consequences as far as representation is concerned that has probably been the most crucial and least reported on. Larger, but less populated, rural areas now have political dominance over smaller, but densely populated urban areas. It may not be enough to invest millions of pounds into the inner-city areas and job creation schemes, as has been suggested as a result of the Inner Area Studies (DOE, 1977). If the problems are structural and allied as much to the distribution of power as the distribution of resources, then the input of large quantities of money will only have a limited effect. Inner city problems, especially the structural and power-based type referred to in Chapter I, are not confined to the large urban centres such as Birmingham, Manchester and Liverpool. Wherever there are urban communities experiencing spatial conflicts in the distribution of power and influence, the type of problems outlined here will be found.

Participation by residents and groups is one means by which this gap could and should be reduced. But the effectiveness of participation will be dependent upon educating councillors in rural areas of the problems of the inner-town; for instance, Friary Ward has just under 3% of the population.
of Guildford, yet has a substantial proportion of the urban dereliction, residential decay, office and commercial expansion and its detrimental consequences, pollution and traffic using residential roads. As will become apparent in the next chapter, many rural councillors are not aware of these problems, and even for those who are, they do not assume the same magnitude as they do for local residents and councillors of the affected ward. For participation to be effective, it must involve both educating rural councillors of the problems of inner areas and then influencing them to do something about them - to act not only on behalf of their own wards but other areas as well. This is another variant on the participatory idea of the private citizen becoming the public citizen - an individual taking on the responsibility of society as a whole.

THE DEGREE OF ELECTORATE/COUNCILLOR CONTACT

The use made by the electorate of their local elected member is an important aspect of both representation and participation. One of the findings of the Community Attitudes Survey (RCLG, 1969) was that despite the expensive and elaborate procedure in existence for the election of local representatives very few people with problems or grievances first contact their local councillor (ibid, Table 107). This is also true in the Guildford study (cf. Chapter 7) where over four times as many people contacted an officer as opposed to their local councillor when they had a problem. However, when the hypothetical question was put to respondents, "Would you contact your local councillor to find out about an issue, to comment or to complain?", two-thirds of the sample maintained that they would (Table 6.8). Clearly then, the elector sees a representative role for the local councillor although when it personally comes to utilising that service, the elector more often than not feels it is more effective to contact an officer of the council. Very few residents contacted their Member of Parliament, and when they did it was only after they had become exhausted at having achieved no success with either their local councillor or an officer. A number of people in this particular study contacted their M.P. and, in some cases, this was after the local ward councillor had been found to be ineffectual.
### Table 6.8  "Would you contact your local councillor?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th></th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.9  "If not, why?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th></th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time/too old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't do any good/they don't do anything</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know who they are</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave it to FWRA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to a Council officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't be able to put my case strongly enough</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Friary Ward, 26.3% of the residents interviewed said that they would not contact their local ward councillor for one reason or another (Table 6.8). But such a figure conceals a small but not insignificant difference which exists between FWRA members and non-members. Non-members tended to be far more critical of their ward councillor and a third of them said that they would not contact him or her in order to complain about something, or to seek advice or assistance. Only 21% of FWRA members said that they would not contact their local representative, and their reasons for not doing so were far less critical or cynical than non-members.

Nearly two-thirds of the non-members as compared with under half of FWRA members said that they would not contact their councillor because they felt it would not do any good (Table 6.9) or because they thought that councillors do not do anything in respect to their requests or complaints anyway. Rather than lacking faith in the performance of councillors, FWRA members said that they would rather leave it to FWRA to contact their representatives as they would probably be more effective. Even some non-members said that they would do this. This might lead to what many would consider the paradoxical conclusion that FWRA members show more support for their elected members than do non-members of FWRA. Paradoxical, because community groups are often stereotyped as being highly critical of local government. Nearly a third of the residents felt they lacked the ability or confidence to contact their elected member.

While a substantial proportion were either cynical about the usefulness of contacting their local councillors, or doubted their personal powers in one way or another, a very small percentage admitted to not knowing who their representatives were. As will become apparent in the next section, the gap between knowing who their representatives are and thinking they know who their representatives are is much greater than many imagine.

THE POLITICAL AWARENESS OF THE ELECTORATE

Knowledge of the Local Councillor

Using the advocatory functions of the elected member is dependent upon the elector knowing who his representative is. The following findings suggest
that not only is the level of local political knowledge limited, but varies considerably between different social groups. The Research Studies produced for the Maud Report (1967) and Redcliffe Maud (1969) are both unhelpful in providing any national survey information on the knowledge held by electors of their local representatives, as are a number of academic studies of specific local authorities. For example, although Hampton (1970) looks at the local representative, he does not examine electors' knowledge of their councillor and takes it for granted that the public know who their representatives are.

In Friary Ward residents were asked: "Can you name the councillors for this Ward?" and "Do you know what party they stand for?" The level of political ignorance revealed is as astonishing as it is worrying and provides a sobering counter-balance to high-minded speeches made by politicians that Britain is the most democratic country in the West. Less than a third (Table 6.10) of the sample interviewed in Friary Ward managed to name correctly one or more of the councillors for the ward. Twelve per cent named a councillor who represented another ward, or named the Guildford constituency MP. Over half the sample (55.5%) admitted to not knowing the name of their local elected member.

Aggregate statistics do however conceal an important difference in political knowledge and awareness between members and non-members of FWRA. Nearly half the FWRA members (45%) could name correctly at least one of their local councillors compared with less than one non-member in five (19%) who could do the same \( (X^2 = 8.37, p < .02\%) \)

**Knowledge of the Local Political Party**

The knowledge possessed by residents of the political party to which their elected member belonged was better than that knowledge of the names of the councillors, but nevertheless still poor. Only two residents in every five could correctly name the party to which at least one of the members belonged. Again, over twice as many FWRA members (58%) as non-members (27%) could name the correct party of at least one of the councillors \( (X^2 = 5.71, p < .06\%) \). Despite the fact that all the councillors
Table 6.10  "Can you name the councillors for this Ward?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th></th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One correct</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two correct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three correct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named one or more from another ward/MP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11  "Which political party do they stand for?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th></th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One correct</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two correct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three correct</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more Conservative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more Labour</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One from each major party</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
representing Friary Ward at the time were members of the Liberal Party, a substantial proportion of residents believed that at least one or more were from either the Conservative or Labour Parties. The ward has been subject to considerable swings in the past (Labour to Liberal to Conservative dominance) and therefore some confusion might be expected. One facet of the political knowledge of a minority of the population was revealed in the interviews. Some 6% of the residents maintained that each party was represented in the ward. This was expressed in the form of a normative judgment rather than a knowledgable statement. A number of people believe that there has to be a representative from each of the three major parties.

The results presented over the last few pages suggest that FWRA members are not only much more likely to contact an elected member of the local authority than are non-members, but they are also much more likely to know who their councillor is and what party he represents. FWRA members, then, over-represent considerably the degree of political knowledge and interest in the community as a whole. Possibly only a longitudinal study could reveal whether FWRA members were more politically aware before joining the Association, or whether having joined FWRA they subsequently became more interested in local politics. The latter idea is appealing as it would indicate that FWRA serves an important educative function, and no doubt this does occur. However, those individuals who take an interest in local politics and the environment are likely to be interested in the spatial consequences of those politics, and are more likely to join a community group which they see as attempting to influence those politics.

Political Knowledge in Friary Ward, Guildford and Redlands Ward, Reading: A Comparison

Although this question cannot be answered specifically, the results can be compared with a 'control' group in another study. Prentice (1975) examined the political awareness of sample groups in Reading, Berkshire, in wards of differing political composition. One ward chosen was Liberal-controlled, like Friary Ward, although its population characteristics were different (Tables 6.12; 6.13). While the social class sample characteristics are similar in respect of social classes I, II, IV and V, Redlands
### Table 6.12 Social Class Composition of Friary Ward, Guildford, and Redlands Ward, Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Not in employment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friary</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67 (48.9%)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redlands</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29 (27.4%)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.13 Number of years resident (Guildford 'in Friary Ward'; Reading 'in the town')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 3 years</th>
<th>4 - 10 years</th>
<th>Over 10 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friary</strong></td>
<td>49 (35.8%)</td>
<td>37 (27.0%)</td>
<td>51 (37.2%)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redlands</strong></td>
<td>19 (17.9%)</td>
<td>13 (12.3%)</td>
<td>74 (69.8%)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ward, Reading, has a much higher percentage of skilled workers than does Friary Ward, while Friary Ward has a high proportion of residents 'not employed' ($X^2 = 16.6, p < .01\%$). Redlands Ward residents had on average lived in the town significantly longer than Friary Ward residents ($X^2 = 25.45, p < .001\%$). It should be noted that there was a difference in the wording of the two questions with Redlands residents being asked how long they had lived in the town, as compared with Friary Ward residents' length of residence in the ward. One might expect the difference between the two groups to have been less if they had been asked the same question.

In the Liberal-control led ward in Reading, 23.6\% of the residents could name at least one Borough councillor, compared with 30.7\% of the residents in Friary Ward. Compared with Labour and Conservative wards which were also surveyed in Reading, the political awareness of the respondents in the Liberal ward was much higher. In Redlands Ward, 20.8\% of the respondents correctly named the party of their Borough councillors. As has been shown above, this figure is half the figure found in Friary Ward, while the number of respondents who had no idea of the party to which their councillor belonged was completely different; 54.7\% in Reading and 29.2\% in Guildford. Therefore, while none of these results is encouraging in terms of political education, Guildford councillors can draw solace from the fact that Friary Ward residents seem to be more politically knowledgable than Reading residents.

The Role of the Member of Parliament

In this discussion of representation very little has been written about the Member of Parliament for Guildford. The reason is simple; for the overwhelming majority of residents he has little place within local politics. If a resident is not satisfied that the local elected member has done all that he might to represent the resident's position, the alternative is twofold: either to seek redress through the local government ombudsman or to approach the local MP. One cannot approach the ombudsman directly; communication, other than in exceptional circumstances, has to be made through one's local councillor. This consequently might be difficult if a complaint of maladministration is partly directed towards the local ward
councillor. For example, unlike an MP, the local councillor has constitutionally, if not actually, taken the decision to which the complaint is addressed. There is no separation of executive and legislative power as at central government level where many decisions are ministerial. Secondly, in order to be effective, councillors must develop an amiable working relationship with council officers. Councillors may be loathe to press a complaint with the determination it often needs.

Cohen (1973) maintains that an increasing number of citizens are taking their complaints about local government to their MPs and not their councillors. Of those interviewed in Friary Ward, only a small percentage went to their MP, and without exception with personal housing problems. This was often only after repeated and unsuccessful attempts to get satisfaction from both local authority officers and councillors. For these residents, going to their MP represented a last ditch attempt at trying to get something done about their particular problem. Cohen suggests that many people are quite convinced that MPs can override council decisions, in the same manner that central government can override local authorities. From the way in which residents in Friary Ward spoke of MPs, the impression was given that Parliamentary representatives are regarded as the ultimate weapon to use against local authorities. There was often the suggestion that, before they actually communicate with their MP, residents have a very high expectation that he will be able to help them with their difficulties. Despite the fact that there is no legal foundation in the belief that MPs have more influence over a local authority than individual ward councillors, they are nevertheless perceived to be more influential.

Very few residents interviewed had actually contacted their MP, and the mention of an MP was usually in the context of what would be done if no satisfaction was found elsewhere. One case in particular is worth reporting as it illustrates graphically the complex relationship which exists between the local administration, the MP and the interests of the aggrieved citizen.

This example illustrates how one couple perceive their MP and the significance he has for them in their lives. "I think David Howell is after a Government post. He isn't a people's man. Your problem is trivial to him." How many other people see their MP in a similar light? It was
suggested above that the ward councillor may not be the best person to approach over a problem because he/she may have taken part in the decision which resulted in that problem. Furthermore, the ward councillor may stand for a policy which exacerbates the perceived problem. As this particular couple said, "Councillors don't want to know...... For example, the Conservative Party want to sell houses to people. Council houses weren't built for that purpose. It's alright for them, they have got houses. If people want to buy houses, they should go elsewhere. You can't have an MP like David Howell representing your interests from that point of view. His policy is to sell council houses and to stop council houses being built and try to phase them out, so how can he have any interest in whether you get a house as he doesn't want them in the first place."

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Five issues are highlighted in this chapter: the decline in the quality of 'localness' in local authority elections; the vote:seat bias; the disproportionate representation of rural areas; the low degree of councillor/electorate contact; and the low level of political knowledge by the electorate of their elected representative and the party for which he stands.

The 'localness' has been removed from Council elections, despite the claim by many councillors that party politics has no place in local government. A number of factors are responsible: (a) the electorate often base their voting decisions on national policies and criteria, (b) the majority of candidates represent national political parties, and (c) local government reorganisation has increased the population and administrative area of local councils. The quality of 'localness' has been removed in other ways as well. Only half the urban councillors live in the wards for which they are elected. Therefore, apart from not actually experiencing living conditions in the ward, their contact and communication with the electorate is also diminished. It was also found that councillors representing low socio-economic status wards are more likely to live in high socio-economic wards, alongside the representatives of those wards. Therefore, those wards which may need to have their interests more carefully represented because they
either suffer a disproportionate amount of social, economic and environmental problems, or are more dependent upon State intervention, are likely to be the ones least satisfactorily represented in this particular sense.

The decline in the quality of 'localness' has implications for the coorientational awareness of councillors, and the faith residents have in councillors' understanding and representing their interests. This is especially apparent in the next chapter where the ability of rural councillors to coorientate with inner-city residents is contrasted with that of urban councillors. The increasing spatial segregation of representatives and the electorate can only strengthen the arguments for enhanced public participation.

A detailed account was given of how the first-past-the-post electoral system creates various biases in the votes:seats ratio. When this condition is compounded with the emphasis given to national parties and policies, the difficulty of participatory groups engaging in electoral politics is highlighted. Interest groups who wish to fight elections, perhaps on special or local issues, generally do not have the areal concentration of votes to secure seats. Therefore, in the one event in which participatory groups are able to compete for power against other interest groups (political parties), the electoral system itself precludes their effectiveness. Proportional representation would overcome this problem as it would many of the other biases described in this chapter.

Rural/urban differences constantly recur as a theme throughout this thesis. In this chapter it appears in a number of guises. Rural areas have a disproportionate influence in the Council Chamber because electoral competitiveness is less and partisanship greater in rural wards. That is, less votes are needed to elect councillors in rural wards than in the urban wards. The political dominance of the rural areas is especially marked on the Planning Committee. Although the urban and rural wards have an equal population, there are more rural than urban wards represented on the Planning Committee because each ward has one member on the Committee. This ensures the political dominance of the rural interests in planning matters. It also means that rural councillors represent a considerably smaller electorate than do urban councillors.

The rural/urban difference is important for a number of reasons. The
solutions to many of the inner urban problems of Guildford are dependent upon all the Council being cognisant of their existence. Whether this is the case is assessed in the next chapter. It is not sufficient though for only the urban councillors to be aware of the problems residents face, as they are substantially outnumbered on the Planning Committee. Furthermore, some of the problems which Friary Ward residents encounter are actually caused by the residents of the rural areas. The residents' car parking problem is exacerbated by the shoppers and workers who come into the town centre from the outlying areas and park their cars in the residential roads, thereby avoiding paying high parking charges in the multi-storey car parks. This as an issue is discussed in detail in Chapter 9. It only remains here to say though that the continued existence of this particular problem is in the interest of rural councillors. Therefore, with rural councillors holding the majority of seats, change is difficult. Many of the other problems articulated by residents in the next chapter are also 'caused' (in the sense of being made manifest) by those people who live outside Guildford town, for example, traffic on residential roads and the noise and air pollution this creates.

None of the electoral and representational problems described in this chapter is insignificant. Each is politically crucial in determining the amount of knowledge possessed and the distribution of attention and resources given to different areas.
(1) | Guildford population - 122,600
    | Size of electorate - 88,506
    | Guildford, Urban - 44,015
    | Guildford, Rural - 44,491
Chapter 7

COORIENTATION AND THE PROBLEMS OF FRIARY WARD

"If democracy depends upon choice and choice upon accuracy of data, then I suspect our country may be in a hell of a fix."

Judge John D. Voelker, 1960

* Preface in F. McNaughton, Mennen Williams of Michigan, Fighter for Progress, New York: Oceans
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INTRODUCTION

It is often suggested by critics of contemporary town planning and architecture that planners/designers are not user-oriented. By this it is not suggested that they do not plan with the user in mind, but rather that their ideas as to how the user interprets and makes use of the environment is at variance with the public's actual use. It is argued in Chapter 2 that conflict between user and provider has often been conceptualised as a product of faulty communication, although it might equally be a consequence of conflicting values, aspirations and expectations. Regardless of the causes of the mismatch between the design preferences of the planners and planned, the differences which do exist can be traced to conflicts between designers' construct systems and those of the public. As Stringer points out, if a plan or design "is to be accepted and put to use, there must be a congruence between the plan and the users' constructs, unless considerable strain is to result." (Stringer, 1974, p.187). Stringer goes on to suggest that two (morally unacceptable) solutions to this problem might be achieved. Either the users adapt their constructs so as to become congruent with the plan, or the plan itself has built-in or illusory properties which deceive the public into believing that the plan satisfies their needs, wishes or interests. A third, more acceptable, solution is for the planner to appraise himself of the public's various construct systems and then make his plans "maximally congruent with theirs" (ibid, p.188).

COMMUNICATION

How can the planner or politician, for he has the responsibility both of representing the interests of the consumers and approving or rejecting the plan, know how those for whom he is planning construe the world? Equally, democracy requires that those who put men in power know how those in power construe the world. If not, one cannot be sure (sure at least as one can be within a representative democracy) that such men will represent one's interests. Reciprocal communication is imperative if a mutual understanding of how various groups in society construe the world is to exist. A consequence of
this communication should be a closer congruence between planning provision and public expectations, wishes and needs.

From Local Government to the Public

One might imagine that it would be easier for the public to know how politicians and planners see the world than vice-versa. The public pronouncements of politicians in the press, in the Council Chamber and at public meetings, along with personal contact are all part of everyday political communication. As for planners, direct personal contact and the public realities of their profession in the form of the built environment are tangible evidence of their construal of the world. Thus, in theory, provided that individuals and groups have personal contact or are able to interpret the values of planners and politicians from their deeds, it should not be difficult to assess whether politicians truly represent the interests of the public, and planners reflect their wishes.

In reality of course, relatively few members of the public have personal contact with either councillors or public officials, while as yet we know little of how sophisticated an analysis people can make of the environment solely from the built form. Although the public might speak to the local councillor when he carries out his triennial door-to-door electoral canvassing, their only chance of communicating with a councillor is usually at a public meeting (e.g. a residents' association meeting), a Council meeting or by making an appointment (cf. Dearlove, 1973, p.187 - 190). As for public officials, appointments are again the only means of access, and even then contact is usually with low or middle-ranking officers or clerks. When residents in Friary Ward were asked whom they had contacted the last time they had a problem and sought local authority assistance, the majority (44.5%) had contacted a council officer as compared with only 10.9% who had seen their local councillor. When this is set within the context of the frequency with which residents communicated with the local authority (see later) it is revealed that contact is at best desultory.
As for the reverse side of this equation the means of communication by which councillors and officers learn of residents' opinions are numerous, but one might suspect are used only by certain sections of the public. From Table 7.1, it can be seen that councillors and officers learn of residents' views from a variety of sources, although personal contact, letters, telephone calls and residents' organisations are pre-eminent. Such means of communication favour the articulate, self-confident, 'joining' sections of society. As Miller and Stokes emphasise: "... even the contacts he (the politician) apparently makes at random are likely to be with people who grossly over-represent the degree of political information and interest in the constituency as a whole" (1963, p.55). Thus the reality reflected is a partial one. Furthermore, it appears that councillors rely very heavily on the public coming to them; their role is passive and responsive rather than active and zetetic.

Frequency of Communication

While various channels of communication are open to the public, and even though councillors and officers are receptive to such channels (despite their possible biases), how many members of the public actually choose to use these channels to convey their interpretations of and reactions to the environment to the decision-makers? When residents (excluding FWRA Committee members) were asked whether they had personally tried to get something done about a problem affecting them or their environment (Table 7.2), 56.3% maintained that they had done so. When asked how satisfied they were with the outcome (on a five point scale (very satisfied = 5)) a mean satisfaction score of only 2.73 was achieved (SD = 1.18), which is below average. When these residents were later asked when was the last time they had contacted someone from the local authority (Table 7.3) the results revealed that it was a relatively infrequent occurrence. Over a quarter of the sample had never contacted anyone from the local authority, while another quarter last contacted someone from the local authority over six months prior to the study. There is no significant difference between the number of times
Table 7.1  "Where do you learn of residents' opinions?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact/ informal meetings</td>
<td>23 (68%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents' groups/ Parish Councils</td>
<td>23 (68%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/letters</td>
<td>22 (65%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local branch of political party</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local newspaper</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local businesses and traders/ professionally</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other councillors/officers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2  "Have you personally tried to get something done about any problem affecting you or this area?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (self)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental nuisance</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking/residents' parking</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (others)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal matter</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3  "When was the last time you contacted someone from the local authority?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the last month</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 months ago</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 months ago</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12 months ago</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over a year ago</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FWRA members and non-members had contacted the Council. Communication between resident and Council is at best sporadic, with no machinery in existence for the constant monitoring of public opinion. While councillors and officers are obviously tapped in to a number of communication networks, especially those involving political parties and community groups, when it comes to learning the opinions and attitudes of individuals, councillors and officers rely very much on the initiative being taken by the individual, and only then by certain sections of the public. One might imagine that this arbitrary selective collection and transmission of information by councillors, officers and the public is the norm.

**EMPATHISING WITH THE COMMUNITY**

Despite the existence of such an erratic communications system councillors and officers must still take decisions on the future planning of the environment. Furthermore, it is generally assumed that those who represent the public know the temper of the community. Paradoxically, very little attention has been given to questioning the knowledge that councillors have of the social reality of their constituents. The major part of this chapter focuses on not only what councillors and officers consider to be the issues of Friary Ward, but what they think residents consider to be the problems of this inner-town area. The importance of reciprocity in communications has already been highlighted. Consequently the residents' opinions on how they see the Ward will be examined in relation to how they think the councillors and officers see the Ward.

**A Review of Previous Studies**

Very few empirical studies have been carried out to date to assess how well community leaders can be said to know their constituents' opinions. The subject itself has had a chequered history. With the considerable interest in psychological research on leadership after 1945, a number of studies were carried out to assess the abilities of leaders and non-leaders in estimating the opinions of their own groups. (Chowdhry and Newcomb, 1952; Talland, 1954).
With the decline in fashion of leadership studies, this area of research waned although the potential interest has always existed in the social perception literature (Tagiuri, 1969). When interest in the subject was revitalised it reappeared in a political rather than a strictly psychological guise, concentrating largely on the representativeness of political leaders (Miller and Stokes, 1963; Sigel and Friesema, 1965). Since then, studies have broadened to take in not only state legislators' perceptions of public opinion (Hesse, 1976) but also those of community leaders (Fiedler, Fiedler and Campf, 1971) and the public itself (Fields and Schuman, 1976). The boundary between these studies and others in social psychology and political science is a narrow one; the last study mentioned might well be seen as part of the now extensive literature on 'pluralistic ignorance' (Cantril, 1958; O'Gorman, 1975).

The findings of these studies are far from conclusive. Sigel and Friesema in discussing the results of their study warn that: "Anyone holding to the view that responsive decision-making must be based on accurate leadership perception of the public's preferences will find no encouragement in our results." (1965, p.888). Indeed the authors begin their paper by referring to the study of Miller and Stokes carried out two years previously (1963) in which they maintain that the latter found that only a weak relationship existed between constituency preferences and the representatives' perceptions of those preferences. A close reading of Miller and Stokes, reveals that this is an inaccurate reporting of their findings.

Miller and Stokes examined Congressmen's cognitions and perceptions of their constituents' preferences on three issues: government provision of social and economic welfare; American involvement in world affairs; and federal action on behalf of the Negro. Only a partial coorientation model was used. The authors did not examine the congruency and accuracy of constituents, although they did measure Congressmen's similarity, congruency and accuracy with constituents. Miller and Stokes found that the correlation of the constituents' opinions on the issue of Negro rights with the perceived opinion of Congressmen was 0.63. However, the accuracy correlation coefficient for foreign involvement was almost negligible, while it was also small on the social welfare issue. But a more detailed examination of the
findings revealed that the Congressman's perceptions and attitudes were more strongly associated with the attitude of his electoral majority than with the constituency as a whole.

Hesse too found that rural state Senators were "remarkably accurate, both in assessing the predominance of opinion within their constituencies and in estimating the degree of issue neutrality." (1976, p.630). However, urban Senators were not so accurate at estimating (primarily rural) constituency problems. It might be hypothesized from this that if largely urban issues were being coorientated on, then rural Senators would be correspondingly more inaccurate than urban Senators. Hesse also found that the pattern of congruency data was consistently similar to the agreement data, i.e. where disagreement is relatively high so is non-congruency. Hesse further showed empirically that those Senators who engaged in synchronic communication (Senator to constituent communication, i.e. talking to) were less able to accurately predict constituents' perceptions, and sought primarily agreement and congruency, and not accuracy with constituents. On the other hand those Senators who engaged in a high degree of diachronic communication (constituent to Senator communication, i.e. listening to) were much more able to accurately predict constituents' concerns, and primarily sought accuracy rather than agreement or congruency.

In contrast to these findings Sigel and Friesema (op.cit) found that a substantial proportion of community leaders were unable to estimate public opinion both in terms of magnitude and direction. Fiedler too compared the similarity in cognitions between community leaders (identified by a 'reputational' method) and a random sample of members of the community (Fiedler, Fiedler and Campf, 1971). Having asked both groups to indicate the most serious problem in the community, Fiedler found an inverse relationship between the number of times a problem was mentioned by community leaders and the number of times mentioned by a random sample of householders (rs = -.74, p < .05). It is interesting and significant that politicians were found, in two studies, to be able to accurately predict constituents' problems and concerns, while community leaders were unable to do so. Such a conclusion certainly contradicts Prewitt's (1970) suggestion
that councillors are not perceptive of public opinion, especially on social issues. It is surprising that so little empirical work has been done in this area, or in the related field of examining the public's perception as to how aware councillors are of the concerns of residents and how well the former are protecting the latter's interests.
Introduction

In this study a full examination of this area has been undertaken. Not only were councillors and council officials questioned as to their own cognitions of the problems of Friary Ward and their perception of how the residents see the Ward, but the residents' cognitions were contrasted with those of the councillors and officers, and the residents' perceptions of the councillors' cognitions were also measured. Thus the full coorientation 'matrix' was undertaken to assess the reciprocal levels of understanding of each group's social reality of the environmental problems of Friary Ward.

It would have been interesting to ask councillors to coorientate with members and non-members of FWRA. This was attempted on several occasions but with little success. Many councillors and officers found it difficult to specifically coorientate with the two separate groups and found it easier simply to coorientate with a 'generalised other'. In one case, a female rural councillor obviously felt intimidated by the fact that she could not answer the questions (questions which she perhaps felt that she should have been able to answer) and became quite abusive. Literally jumping to her feet she cried that she couldn't care less about "these tin-pot associations." Another Conservative rural councillor interpreted the exercise as 'subversive', and said that the questions were clever, and asked who had put me up to it? He willingly answered my questions, however, once convinced that no 'conspiracy' was involved. Nevertheless the coorientation questions obviously hit a raw nerve for a number of councillors who were revealed to be totally ignorant about an area about which they take decisions. Intra-community co-orientation data (accuracy and congruency) was not collected although the similarity between the cognitions of FWRA Committee members, members and non-members of FWRA was evaluated.

It will be remembered that three concepts are central to the coorientation model. They are interpersonal similarity, intrapersonal congruence and interpersonal accuracy. Each of the coorientational concepts will be examined in turn. Furthermore, each concept will be subdivided into sections according
to the perspective of one particular group. Thus, while 'similarity' involves comparing two groups, the perspective taken will be that of one group. Thus, in the first sub-section the six most important issues cited by residents are compared with the percentage response to those issues by councillors. In a later subsection the perspective is reversed: the six most important cognitions of councillors are contrasted with the percentage response to those issues by residents. A chart (Figure 7.1) is presented of the sequence in which each of the coorientational relationships is discussed for each urban group (1).

One final point needs to be made. The prime function of this chapter is to discuss the coorientational relationships and understandings which exist between various groups in Guildford. However, as the coorientational relationships are set within the context of planning and environmental issues, this provides an excellent opportunity to discuss in a detached way how each of these issues is seen by the groups concerned and what importance each takes on for each group relative to another group. Furthermore, the issues discussed are the very issues which are raised in other contexts in this thesis; for example, the state of housing and roads is a constant theme in the chapter dealing with the planning history of the Ward. The expansion of the commercial centre of the town is the main focus of Chapter 8. Residents' parking has been an important 'participation' issue and is discussed in Chapter 9. The detailed description of the major planning concerns in Friary Ward also serves to provide a mental picture of the reality of the issues for the different protagonists involved.

**COORIENTATIONAL SIMILARITY**

The Perspective of the Friary Ward Residents

The first coorientational concept is concerned with ascertaining how each group sees the problems of Friary Ward. This cognition is thus a measure of the awareness by each group of the environmental problems. When the residents were asked what they considered to be the chief problems of Friary Ward, a total of thirty two different responses were elicited. A large
### Similarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friary Ward Residents</th>
<th>Guildford Borough Councillors</th>
<th>FWRA Members &amp; Non-Members</th>
<th>FWRA Committee Members</th>
<th>Local Authority Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(p. 212)</td>
<td>(p. 219)</td>
<td>(p. 222)</td>
<td>(p. 225)</td>
<td>(p. 228)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Congruency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friary Ward Residents</th>
<th>Guildford Borough Councillors</th>
<th>Urban and Rural Councillors</th>
<th>FWRA Members &amp; Non-Members</th>
<th>FWRA Committee Members</th>
<th>Local Authority Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(p. 231)</td>
<td>(p. 234)</td>
<td>(p. 240)</td>
<td>(p. 242)</td>
<td>(p. 245)</td>
<td>(p. 245)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friary Ward Residents</th>
<th>Guildford Borough Councillors</th>
<th>Urban and Rural Councillors</th>
<th>FWRA Members &amp; Non-Members</th>
<th>FWRA Committee Members</th>
<th>Local Authority Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(p. 249)</td>
<td>(p. 251)</td>
<td>(p. 251)</td>
<td>(p. 254)</td>
<td>(p. 254)</td>
<td>(p. 256)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1 Co-orientation: Sequence of Analyses
proportion of these problems were only cited by a few residents, but this figure nevertheless illustrates that neither urban renewal nor the measurement of environmental cognitions and perceptions is without its difficulties. In order to simplify the analysis only those issues cited by more than 10% of the residents were analysed.

The most frequently mentioned problem of residents' parking encompassed not only the lack of garages in an area of predominantly nineteenth century terraced and semi-detached houses, but the competition for on-street parking places between residents and non-residents (particularly shoppers) and the existence of two-hour parking limits in those streets nearest the town centre. Throughout the Ward there is a very limited amount of off-street parking space coupled with a system of yellow lines and parking bays for a restricted number of vehicles. Parking presents a source of friction between not only the residents and the local authority, but on a day-to-day basis between the residents and traffic wardens, shoppers and workers from outside the area. A detailed account of the parking problem and the Residents' Association's attempt to obtain a residents' parking scheme is given in Chapter 9.

The amount of extraneous traffic passing through the Ward was also considered to be a major problem by a third of the residents (32.8%). This refers not to those cars and lorries travelling on the main roads into Guildford (e.g. Woodbridge Road and Stoke Road) but those vehicles using the residential roads as short cuts. One resident put this complaint in its wider context: "The problems of Friary Ward are essentially the same as the rest of Guildford - the sacrifice of residential property for either commerce or the religious deification of the motor-car, which is related to commerce." Thus, while there is considerable resemblance to councillors' cognitions on the issue of car parking in Friary Ward, the similarity between residents' and councillors' cognitions begins to decline as the second most important problem is identified. Reference to Table 7.4 will reveal that this decline continues, with one exception.

Of slightly less importance to the residents is an issue which I have termed 'a deteriorating environment'. Such an idea involves the removal of those activities which make the Ward a less than pleasant place in
### Table 7.4 Coorientation - Similarity:
#### Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents %</th>
<th>Councillors %</th>
<th>Officers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houses</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial conflict</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| n                     | 137         | 34            | 14         |
| rs = .657             |             | rs = .101     |
| d = -4.0%             |             | d = -8.5%     |
| C = 10.0%             |             | C = 15.8%     |

### Table 7.5 Similarity: Councillors' cognitions by type of ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban councillors %</th>
<th>Rural councillors %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial conflict</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| n                     | 15                   | 19                   |
| rs = .314             |                      |                      |
which to live. Some residents went so far as to say that the place is "turning into a slum" because it is used for purposes detrimental to the Ward, and the little character that is left is being destroyed. Of a less extreme nature, although no less significant, a number of residents maintained that at present there are dangerous traffic spots in the Ward, a lack of safe play areas for children, noise, pollution, untidy streets, bad lighting and pavements, and uncontrolled dogs causing a nuisance. Again, while about one in five residents cited these problems, only one in ten of the councillors thought likewise.

A slightly smaller gap in terms of the similarity of cognitions between residents and councillors is revealed in the case of deteriorating houses in the Ward. This description includes dangerous and empty properties and houses whose condition, in the eyes of the residents, has been allowed to deteriorate by their owners (in some cases the local authority). The nature of the deteriorating environment in Friary Ward, of which houses are an important component, was described in many ways by residents. One middle-aged lady complained of the "...... general shabbiness - it could be nice if it was cleaned up. One has a problem of a mixture of residential and small businesses. For example, the scrapyard next door - the Council cannot force them to clean it up because it is not a public health risk." A sense of frustration and hopelessness was well expressed by one elderly man who has lived in Stoke Road for many years: "The place is turning into a slum. No effort is made to make it tidy. There are Chinese, Pakis, squatters, houses boarded up. The Council don't ask anybody. This area is full of bad planning. For example, seats where there could have been housing for old people. They (old people) don't want to live in the suburbs with high bus fares in."

One resident in four listed deteriorating houses as an important problem as compared with only half this number amongst councillors. Not one officer said that deteriorating property was a problem in the Ward. This is a highly political issue and it might be expected that both councillors and officers would be unwilling to admit to the existence of this type of problem. A voluntary response of this type produces a double-bind situation for those in power. If they do not admit the existence of this problem they are seen to
be naive and unobservant. If they do admit it they are questioned as to why they are doing nothing about it.

The fifth most commonly cited problem was that of the conflict between residential and commercial development. The expansion of the commercial centre of the town and the depopulation of residential streets is an issue which arises in several chapters in this thesis and is later identified as a crucial factor in the environmental politics of Friary Ward. This has usually taken the form of either houses being turned into offices or houses being demolished and replaced by offices. There appears to be a high degree of awareness amongst councillors and officers of this problem. The awareness of this problem by councillors might be considered surprising considering the apparent lack of concern evinced by the local authority when FWRA has raised this issue over the years. However, those issues which the highest proportion of councillors have said are problems are exactly those issues on which FWRA has pressurised the Council most strongly over the last four years. Obviously councillors and officers learn of an area's problems from many sources but the communication function of the Residents' Association must be seen to be an important factor in raising the level of awareness of the local authority to these problems. This is not a completely satisfactory answer as there is present the inevitable exception: FWRA publicised the problem of deteriorating houses too in recent years, but this is cited by only less than one in ten councillors and no officers.

Over these six problem/issue areas, only on one occasion was there a close similarity in cognitions between councillors and residents. In four out of the six cases a greater proportion of residents cited problems than did councillors, while the reverse was the case on one occasion.

**Councillors’ image: the rural difference**

To date, there has been only one other study of the coorientational relationship between politicians and their constituents (Hesse, 1976) and therefore there is very little accumulated, empirically-tested, explanatory information on this subject. Hesse found that constituency background was an important factor in determining knowledge levels, i.e. the nature of the
constituency from which councillors hailed (urban or rural). If one re-examines the six most important residents’ cognitions and the number of times they are cited by urban and rural councillors, a number of interesting variations appear (Table 7.5).

Urban councillors were far more likely to be able to name the most important problems affecting Friary Ward residents than were rural councillors. In the case of residents’ parking and extraneous traffic on residential roads there were statistically significant differences between the environmental cognitions of urban councillors and rural councillors (Fishers Exact Test: $p = .024$; $p = .054$). While such a finding may be expected, it does lend empirical support to the arguments that critics of local government reform have used for several years now: that the new local authorities are too large, and too divorced from the daily concerns of the electorate. Local councillors cannot be expected to know and understand the problems of the borough when they cover such a large area and population. This, it is presumed, was not the case when local authorities were smaller. If these findings can be supported by other data, then two conclusions seem inevitable. Either local authority boundaries need to be substantially revised in order to make them smaller, or communication between the public and local government requires radical improvement. If the latter option is adopted, the creation of a third-tier of local government would seem to be the simplest answer. Since 1896 rural areas have a third-tier representative body in the form of Parish Councils. No such system is available to urban residents. Although city residents have organisations like FWRA, they are not statutorily recognised and do not command the legitimacy and powers possessed by Parish Councils.

The survey also found that political party membership was related to the awareness of problems, but there are difficulties in making clear-cut associations of this kind. Firstly, Labour and Liberal councillors were more aware of the problems of the Ward but party membership here is very much a dependent variable. Virtually all the Labour and Liberal members were representatives of urban wards. Furthermore, the number of Labour and Liberal councillors form a very small percentage of the total, and thus one should be wary of reading too much into this aspect of the results.
In Chapter 3, three techniques were described that summarise the overall coorientational relationships between two groups over the number of issues under consideration. Each of these scores (C; d; rs) is used in an attempt to provide a summary statement about the degree of similarity in cognitions between residents and councillors. An overall analysis of Table 7.4 reveals there is not a great deal of difference between the cognitions of residents and councillors. The coorientation score (C) of 10.0% is relatively low, given the greater extremes revealed later. Furthermore, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient of .687 indicates a relatively high degree of association in priority between the residents' and councillors' cognitions. When the residents' cognitions are contrasted with those of the officers' there is virtually no association at all (rs = .101) in the priority given to problems, while the coorientation C score of 15.8% indicates a much greater divergence of opinion between the two groups, (i.e. a low degree of similarity in cognitions).

The Perspective of the Guildford Borough Councillors

Residents' parking was considered to be the most important problem facing residents in the eyes of the councillors (38.2%) and consequently there was considerable cognitive similarity between the councillors and residents' cognitions (Table 7.6). However, 38% of the councillors interviewed also said that the Friary Development Scheme was a major problem. As one can see from Table 7.6, only 4% of the residents thought likewise. This difference was statistically significant ($X^2 = 29.23, p < .001$) identifying considerable cognitive dissimilarity. Such a significant difference is found also in the next most important problem articulated. Just over a quarter of the councillors maintained that much of the residential property in the Ward was nearing the end of its life, the area was worn out and could no longer achieve the purpose for which it was built. Not surprisingly, only one resident out of 137. agreed with this viewpoint, which echoes the arguments used prior to 1965 to justify the wholesale demolition of property in the Ward (cf. Chapter 5). Again the cognitive dissimilarity was statistically significant ($X^2 = 30.24, p < 0.001$). In a similar vein to the idea of the area

Summary

In Chapter 3, three techniques were described that summarise the overall coorientational relationships between two groups over the number of issues under consideration. Each of these scores (C; d; rs) is used in an attempt to provide a summary statement about the degree of similarity in cognitions between residents and councillors. An overall analysis of Table 7.4 reveals there is not a great deal of difference between the cognitions of residents and councillors. The coorientation score (C) of 10.0% is relatively low, given the greater extremes revealed later. Furthermore, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient of .687 indicates a relatively high degree of association in priority between the residents' and councillors' cognitions. When the residents' cognitions are contrasted with those of the officers' there is virtually no association at all (rs = .101) in the priority given to problems, while the coorientation C score of 15.8% indicates a much greater divergence of opinion between the two groups, (i.e. a low degree of similarity in cognitions).
### Table 7.6 Similarity: Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Issue</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area worn out</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v commercial conflict</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment and renewal</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $r_s = .147$  
- $d = -13.0\%$  
- $C = 19.3\%$

### Table 7.7 Similarity: Councillors' Cognitions by type of ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Issue</th>
<th>Urban Councillors</th>
<th>Rural Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area worn out</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v commercial conflict</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban renewal</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $r_s = -.015$  
- $d = -6.8\%$  
- $C = 12.1\%$

rs = .567
being worn out there was a significant difference between the attitude of councillors and residents to area redevelopment and renewal ($X^2 = 5.09$, $p < .05$).

Thus, three out of the six most important problems in Friary Ward identified by elected members were significantly different from those identified by residents. In coorientation terms there was considerable cognitive dissimilarity between councillors and residents in half of the environmental problems listed. If one takes an overview of councillors' and residents' cognitions, it appears that councillors are far more concerned with the physical fabric and state of the area, while residents, although concerned with this, place an equal, if not greater, emphasis on the facilities and quality of life in the Ward. It should be pointed out that about 12% of councillors said that they did not know what were the problems of Friary Ward.

Councillors' image: the rural difference

In the previous section, it was shown that whether a councillor represents an urban or rural ward is an important factor in determining if a councillor is aware of the problems of an inner city area. The problems listed in Table 7.5 were those identified as being most important by residents. Table 7.7 lists those problems identified by at least 20% of the urban and rural councillors as being critical in Friary Ward. Again, the substantial difference between the cognitions of urban and rural councillors is well illustrated. Not only are a higher proportion of urban councillors aware of many of the problems previously identified by residents, but the urban councillors are also aware of some of the less satisfactory conditions in the Ward, such as the high proportion of overcrowding and the lack of suitable housing. When these figures in turn are broken down, it tends to be the Liberal and Labour councillors who are aware of this situation rather than the Conservative councillors. This is partly explained by the fact that at the time of the survey the three councillors for the Ward were Liberals. Again, one-fifth of the rural councillors said that they did not know what the problems of the Ward were, whereas none of the urban councillors made a similar statement.

In the case of the three most important problems in Friary Ward as seen by urban councillors, there is a statistically significant difference between
their environmental cognitions and those of the rural members (Fishers Exact Test: \( p = .024; \ p = .023; \ p = .054 \)). This is further evidence that the awareness by rural councillors of urban (in this case inner urban) problems is not high.

**Summary**

The contrasting reality of the problems of Friary Ward is well summarised again by the three coorientation measures. The negative \( d \) value (-13.0%) indicates that there is an overall mean underestimation by residents of many of the problems singled out by councillors as being crucial. The very high \( C \) score (19.3%) emphasises too the almost entirely different way in which the councillors see the Ward as compared with its inhabitants. It will be remembered that the \( C \) score removes the direction of difference (+/-) and thereby reflects more accurately the true difference between the two cognitions. A \( C \) score of 19.3% represents a very high degree of dissimilarity.

The degree of similarity between councillors and officers too has been measured and both the \( C \) score (12.1%) and the \( d \) score (-6.8%) indicate that councillor thinking is much closer to that of the local authority officers than it is to the residents.

The Perspectives of FWRA Members and Non-Members

A close examination of residents' cognitions reveals important differences between members and non-members of FWRA (Table 7.8). In the case of the two most important problems identified by FWRA members, there is a statistically significant difference between the cognitions of members and non-members. A significantly greater percentage of FWRA members than non-members considered that the problems of extraneous traffic \( (X^2 = 4.27, \ p < .05) \) and a deteriorating environment \( (X^2 = 9.67, \ p < .01) \) were crucial issues in the Ward. Furthermore, a significantly greater percentage of FWRA members than councillors \( (X^2 = 6.56, \ p < .05) \) believed that the deteriorating environment in Friary Ward was a problem. In the remaining cases the FWRA members' concern was with those problems already described, and focused on the local facilities for residents (residents' parking; availability
### Table 7.8 Similarity: FWRA Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>FWRA members %</th>
<th>Non-members %</th>
<th>Councillors %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating environment</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v commercial conflict</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational facilities</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[rs = 0.714, r_s = 0.371, d = -8.7\%, c = 13.1\%\]

### Table 7.9 Similarity: Non-Members of FWRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Non-members %</th>
<th>FWRA members %</th>
<th>Councillors %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating environment</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problems</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[rs = 0.623, r_s = 0.914, p < 0.05, d = -2.7\%, c = 13.4\%\]
of local schools) and two aspects of the housing problem in Guildford.

There is a relatively high degree of similarity between the environmental cognitions of FWRA members and non-members (C = 13.1%; \( r_s = .714 \)). However, the chi-squared differences and the C score both suggest that, while FWRA as a body can be said to represent the residents in terms of being cogniscent of all the residents' concerns, the emphasis given to several of the environmental problems is markedly different.

The non-members of FWRA considered that parking was the chief problem of the Ward. From the figures in Table 7.9 it appears that a much lower percentage of non-members than FWRA members were concerned with the deteriorating houses and environment and the amount of through traffic on residential roads.

Although the C-score of 13.4% is only 0.3% different from the C-score of FWRA members, it does represent a move towards a different perspective on the problems of Friary Ward, a perspective which is borne out by the chi-squared tests. Interestingly, when the coorientation scores are computed for the test of cognitive similarity between non-members and councillors, the C-score drops to only 6.5%, which is the lowest level to which it falls in all the results presented in this chapter. The high degree of cognitive similarity between non-members and councillors is supported by the correlation coefficient of \( r_s = .914 \) (p < .05). Therefore, it would appear that non-members not only see the environmental problems of Friary Ward in a perspective more similar to that of councillors than to that of their neighbours in FWRA, but also have a similar set of priorities.

Non-members of FWRA differed from members in two other categories (the lack of pedestrian crossings, \( X^2 = 7.22, \) p < .01) and no problems in the Ward). The significance of these findings lies in the membership characteristics of FWRA. It has been empirically established that the group complaining about the lack of pedestrian crossings was overwhelmingly composed of mothers with small children who walk quite frequently to the town centre and to the local clinic, both journeys involving the crossing of major roads. As was apparent in Chapter 3, the largest category of residents who do not join FWRA are in the younger sections of the population who have
lived in the Ward for only a short period of time. Secondly, and perhaps predictably, non-members were relatively content with the state of the environment and therefore had not joined the FWRA as they did not see it satisfying any of their needs. This is established empirically in Chapter 9. It is thus not too speculative to suggest that the 'typical' recently-arrived, young residents of the Ward are home-centred and more concerned with improving and modernising their property with the aid of improvement grants than expending their energies on the outside environment. Several years ago it might have been argued that as this particular group had chosen to move into this particular area they were presumably satisfied with the state of the environment. But, given the state of the housing market, the lack of inexpensive property, inflated prices and building society cut-backs on lending, such an assumption now seems a little naive.

Summary

These findings show that not only is it unwise to treat the public as one undifferentiated body, but that to regard the views (or assumed views) of non-joiners as the norm, and the views of environmental pressure groups as unrepresentative, is philosophically unsound. There is no norm; each group has its own perspectives based on its interests and membership composition. As the coorientation score illustrates, councillors are likely to regard residents' groups views as unrepresentative when they differ significantly from their own. Non-members' views are closer to those of councillors and therefore they are regarded as normative.

The Perspective of the FWRA Committee

The Residents' Association committee plays an instrumental role in FWRA thinking and activities and although the small sample size presents statistical problems, it is nevertheless worthwhile examining the similarity in environmental cognitions between FWRA committee members and the rest of the sample. Again, the findings of this analysis will contribute to answering two fundamental questions: How representative is the committee of the ordinary membership and the residents as a whole; and what are they representative of?
Table 7.10  Similarity: FWRA Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA committee %</th>
<th>FWRA members %</th>
<th>Non-members %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating environment</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v commercial conflict</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing about a sense of community</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 11  51  75

rs = .052  rs = -328

Table 7.11  Similarity: Local Authority Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Officers %</th>
<th>Councillors %</th>
<th>Residents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning uncertainty and blighting</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v commercial conflict</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area worn out</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 14  34  137

rs = -.592  rs = -.722

d = -1.5%   d = -14.4%

C = 12.9%    C = 20.0%
As the sample only comprised eleven committee members, it was decided to list only those problems which were cited by more than 25% of the FWRA committee (Table 7.10). The concerns of the FWRA committee were very similar to the concerns of the membership generally, although one important departure was the expressed desire to bring about a sense of community in the Ward. Three FWRA committee members out of the eleven mentioned such a goal, as compared with none of the ordinary members interviewed (Fishers Exact $p = .004$). The FWRA committee also expressed a much greater concern over the incursion of commercial development into residential areas (Fishers Exact $p = .07$, significant with Tocher's modification). Summary coorientation scores would be inappropriate with a sample size of only eleven, as the statistic is based on sample percentages.

The issues which differentiate the FWRA committee from the ordinary membership are of a more sophisticated and abstract nature than many of the other issues mentioned. One might not therefore expect there to be a close similarity between congnitions on these issues. This raises the question of differentiating needs from desires. Leaders are often far more concerned with meeting community needs (which may be long-range goals) rather than community desires (short-term, more superficial objectives). This in turn reintroduces the question of how community leaders (and politicians) can best represent communities. Presumably a delegatory role would lay emphasis on the fulfillment of community wishes. The generally accepted and adopted independence role gives representatives a wider brief to pursue those goals which they believe to be in the community's interests. (cf. Pitkin (1961) for a full account of the mandate/independence debate). Burke neatly defined the difference by arguing that the representative should serve the community's interest but not its will (cf. Miller and Stokes, 1963, p.45). From the data presented in Table 7.10 it would appear that FWRA attempts to represent both the will of its membership and its interests. The evidence is not as clear in the case of the non-joiners of FWRA (in terms of the magnitude of support for certain issues) although the direction and similarity of issues cited is considerable.
Summary

From these figures we may conclude that the FWRA committee represents the concerns of its membership very well. There is a slightly larger disparity between the environmental cognitions of FWRA committee and non-membership, but nevertheless the issues identified by the non-members are equally identified by the committee. Therefore, in terms of the awareness of environmental problems of Friary Ward, the FWRA committee can be said to represent all the residents in the Ward.

The Perspective of the Local Authority Officers

Interestingly, the local authority officers interviewed introduced blighting and uncertainty as one of the most important problems of Friary Ward (Table 6.11). Blighting is, for obvious reasons, a highly contentious political subject and it is not surprising that so few councillors were prepared to admit its existence. By contrast, officers were far more forthcoming on this subject and perhaps could afford to be so as it may be argued that the responsibility for blighting rests with the councillors. It was only on this issue that councillors and officers diverged so greatly in opinion (Fishers Exact Test p = .05).

Two forms of evidence testify to the existence of blighting. Firstly, a number of residents complained of road proposals which have not been realised; for example, it has been planned to widen Stoke Road for thirty years and the local authority's intentions are still not clear. One craftsman, an upholsterer, explained that it was not worthwhile expanding his workshop in Stoke Road because he did not know when he was going to be asked to move. On the other hand, he was suffering financially because space restrictions prevented him from expanding his business. He said that he had tried to get firm dates from Surrey County Council but it refused to say when he could be relocated or when the road would be widened, entailing the demolition of his property.

Secondly, evidence on Demolition and Closing Orders held by the Housing Department lists in a number of cases the dates on which families vacated property and the date on which that property was eventually demolished.
The period between vacation and demolition varied between five months and fifty-five months (Table 6.12), with over three-quarters of the property left uninhabited for over one year.

Table 7.12  Time lag between vacation and demolition of property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 months - 1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(18.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year - 2 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(44.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years - 3 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(15.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years - 4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years - 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Register of Demolitions and Closing Orders, Guildford B.C.

Summary

The data presented in Table 6.11 suggests that the officers are more likely to have similar cognitions to councillors than to residents as to the problems of Friary Ward. The coorientation score of 12.9% for the relationship between the cognitions of officers and councillors is significantly lower than the C-score for officers and residents. The overall view of the officers is that the area is worn out, is subject to commercial incursions and its future is at best uncertain. Such a perspective is not dissimilar to the picture painted in the 1960's and described in detail in Chapter 5. Thus, while the planning reports and consultative documents published in the 1970's suggest a relatively bright future for the area, the reality of the situation for officers is quite different.

SUMMARY

There appears to be some degree of similarity between the cognitions of residents and councillors, certainly over what residents consider to be the
major problems affecting the Ward and the priority given to those problems. However, when the residents' environmental cognitions are broken down by membership and non-membership of FWRA a number of important differences begin to emerge. FWRA members emphasised some problems more than did non-members. Non-members of FWRA tended to be more satisfied with the environment. They saw the Ward more similarly to councillors, than to their neighbours in FWRA. Non-members' environmental priorities too were similar to those of the elected members. To treat the public, even in a small and superficially homogeneous area such as Friary Ward, as one undifferentiated mass is injudicious. The survey has shown that the interests and membership composition of a social group will determine its perspective on the world. Because the perspective of one particular social group is similar to another group who hold a power position within the community, it does not make the views of that social group normative. This issue will be raised again in the conclusion with reference to the ideas of Moscovici on social change discussed in Chapter 2.

The FWRA committee tended to select more abstract and sophisticated issues. For this reason one might not expect a close degree of similarity between their cognitions and those of the membership generally (or those of the non-members). The point was made that the FWRA committee attempts to serve both the interests and the will of the membership. I concluded that the FWRA committee represents well the issues of the members, and although there is a slightly larger disparity between the cognitions of themselves and non-members, the relationship is still close.

There are a number of important dissimilarities between the environmental cognitions of councillors and those of residents. These can be summarised thus: while councillors tend to express concern over the physical fabric of the area, residents show disquiet not only over the state of the environment but also the quality of life in the Ward. The councillors' cognitions are much closer to those of the local authority officers than they are to the residents' environmental cognitions. In many ways, one of the most important findings to emerge from the study is the different environmental cognitions and perceptions of inner-Guildford held by urban and rural councillors. Urban councillors, as one might expect, are more aware of the problems facing the
residents and have a more detailed knowledge of the Ward than do rural councillors. Those councillors empathising most closely with residents tend to be representatives of the Liberal and Labour parties. This comes as no surprise as three of the five Liberal councillors on Guildford Borough Council represented Friary Ward at the time of the survey, while one of the six Labour councillors was a past member for Friary Ward.

The local authority officers' cognitions are closer to the environmental cognitions of councillors than they are to those of the residents. It will be remembered that the councillors' cognitions were more similar to officers' than to residents'. This reflects the more continuous and substantial contact between these two groups and adds further credence to the evidence on the close, mutually supportive relationships which exist between officers and councillors put forward elsewhere (Dearlove, 1973, pp. 188-189; Darke and Walker, 1977, pp. 49-69; Gyford, 1976, pp. 42-48).

COORIENTATIONAL CONGRUENCY

The Perspective of the Friary Ward Residents

In coorientation terms, congruency is the relationship which exists between what a person thinks about an object and what he thinks another person thinks about that same object. Therefore, high congruency exists, for example, when a person thinks that another person's attitude towards the environment is similar to his own. Low congruency is where one person believes another person's attitude towards the environment is dissimilar to his own: congruency is an intrapersonal concept. One interpretation of congruency is to see the concept as a measurement of faith; that is high congruency can be interpreted as an expression of faith by residents in the Council being aware of their problems. Low congruency would mean that residents do not think that elected members are aware of their problems and therefore would have low expectations as to anything being done about those problems by the local authority.

The traditional approach to examining congruency focuses on comparing the cognitions of one group with that same group's perceptions of another
Table 7.13  Coorientation - Congruency: Residents (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cognition %</th>
<th>Perception %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating environment</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v commercial conflict</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational facilities</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = .971, p < .01
d = -18.4%
C = 19.6%

Table 7.14  Congruency: Residents (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception %</th>
<th>Cognition %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better traffic flow</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of housing</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing trade into the town</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition and redevelopment</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = .200

d = 4.4%
C = 16.7%
group's cognitions. However, the approach can also be reversed by examining what one group perceives another group to be concerned with and then to measure that perception with the group's own cognition. In the former case, the researcher is interested in how close the 'perception' is to the 'cognition'; in the latter, the interest focuses on how close the 'cognition' is to the 'perception'. Surprisingly such a distinction has not been made in the co-orientation literature to date. As will be seen in Tables 7.13 and 7.14 these two approaches lead to quite different sets of results.

**Congruency (1)**

Table 7.13 reveals that residents have a very low estimation of councillors' ability to understand the environmental problems of the Ward (C = 19.6%). Furthermore, the d-score of 18.4% indicates that the residents believe that the councillors underestimate their concerns. There is a highly significant degree of association between the rank ordering of cognitions and perceptions (rs = .971, p < .01). This suggests that although residents have little faith in the councillors' awareness, the higher the proportion of residents who identify an issue, the higher the proportion of residents who believe councillors are aware of their problems. This suggests that residents project the importance they give to issues onto their perception of councillors' concerns; in other words residents believe that councillors give the same priority to issues as they do. This projection effect is commented upon later and appears to be a feature common to coorientational congruency.

**Congruency (2)**

Table 7.14 records those issues which residents considered councillors give priority, which are then compared to the number of residents who did likewise. Except where residents felt councillors were aware of residents' parking problems and the need for more housing suitable for the type of population that live in inner-city areas, the remaining responses have strong negative undertones.
Summary

The lack of faith by residents in councillors' understanding or wish to understand their problems is tinged with an element of cynicism. The residents perceive the councillors to be more concerned with increasing the prosperity of the town ('bringing trade into the town') by means of infra-structural improvements ('better traffic flow'; 'demolition and redevelopment') than bringing about solutions to the problems which they consider to be important, more immediate and disadvantageous to the Ward. The low congruency between residents and councillors is further supported by the C-score of 16.7% and the low correlation figure.

The Perspective of the Guildford Borough Councillors

Congruency (I)

The differences between the cognitions of councillors and their perceptions of the residents' cognitions fall into three distinct categories (Table 7.15). The first category is one of high congruency, and this applies to the two most important cognitions of councillors (residents' parking; the Friary Development Scheme).

The second category concerns the area being seen to be worn out and the residential property nearing the end of its useful life, and the conflict between commercial developments and residential accommodation. Here, although one in every four councillors considered these to be important problems in the Ward, only one in every seventeen councillors thought that residents would think the same. One suspects there is low congruency for each of these issues for different reasons. In the case of the area being considered worn out, the councillors could be expected to think that the residents are unlikely to agree with them. If discussed openly, this would undoubtedly be a highly political and contentious issue. It would rekindle memories of the attitudes of Guildford Borough Council to the area as described in Chapter 5. On the other hand, can this argument be used to explain councillors' perceptions of residents' cognitions over the issue of residential versus commercial conflict? The Residents' Association was
### Table 7.15 Congruency: Councillors (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents’ parking</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area worn out</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v commercial conflict</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment and renewal</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 34 \]

\[ rs = 0.313 \]
\[ d = -8.7\% \]
\[ C = 13.9\% \]

### Table 7.16 Congruency: Councillors (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents’ parking</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blighting</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 34 \]

\[ rs = 0.539 \]
\[ d = -1.6\% \]
\[ C = 7.9\% \]
publicising this issue at the time of my interviews. The low congruency figure here may reflect an attempt by councillors to minimise the conflictual nature of this issue. Two alternative explanations might be that councillors were not aware of the comments FWRA made about this issue, or if they were, as is more likely, they chose to believe that FWRA's comments were not typical of the general feelings of the population.

The third category is where the councillors are highly aware of the problems of extraneous traffic passing along residential roads. Whereas one in five councillors considered this to be a problem themselves, one in three estimated that the residents thought it a problem. The high congruency figure for councillors, as compared with residents, might well be explained by the activities of FWRA. Residents' parking and extraneous traffic were both important issues over which FWRA generated considerable publicity at the time. Indeed, a photograph of a number of residents holding placards protesting at the amount of fast, through-traffic passing through Markenfield Road appeared on the front page of the Surrey Daily Advertiser. In both these cases it might be argued that as FWRA was campaigning about these issues at the time, the higher level of awareness of these issues by councillors might in no small part be due to the activities of the Residents' Association. The case of the Friary Development Scheme is slightly different.

Although FWRA did submit a long and detailed objection to the Friary site planning proposals and although it has been claimed that "The Friary Ward Residents' Association and The Guildford Society were the two amenity associations making the biggest protests", (Ayley, 1978, p.32), very few residents showed any concern about the Friary Development Scheme (cf. Table 7.23). In the residents' eyes there were many more problems which were of much greater importance closer to home. The high congruency which exists in this case can be explained in one of two ways. Either the councillors interpreted the FWRA interest as being an expression of common concern or their response reflects the opinion which they thought residents should hold, or would hold because the Friary site is within the Ward. Interestingly, there is no difference in response between rural councillors and urban councillors on this issue, as one might have expected. A third of both
urban (33.3%) and rural (31.6%) councillors thought that residents would think the Friary Scheme a problem for the Ward.

**Congruency (2)**

What did councillors think that residents were most concerned about? Reference to Table 7.16 reveals that the councillors' perceptions were very close to their own cognitions. The Guildford councillors introduce two environmental problems which they listed as less important among their own cognitions. Firstly, they perceived the residents to be concerned with the houses which are deteriorating and empty in the Ward. Secondly, they considered that blighting too is seen by residents to be an issue. In both these cases the percentage of councillors who list this as their own cognition is smaller, which is interesting, especially in the context of the politically contentious nature of the issues. This does imply that the councillors were aware that residents felt these two environmental issues were important problems in the area, regardless of whether they felt the same way.

**Summary and Discussion**

The summary coorientation scores for Tables 7.15 indicate that, although councillors are aware of the differences between themselves and how they think residents see the problems of Friary Ward, they generally consider residents to see the Ward in much the same way as they do. This conclusion is fully borne out by the coorientation scores for Table 7.16. In the case of the three most important issues in Table 7.16, the councillors consider the residents to think the issues less important than they do. In the case of deteriorating houses and blighting, the reverse is true. Perhaps the first three issues are politically more acceptable. The C-score of 7.9% is extremely low, suggesting that councillors believe that residents see the Ward almost the same way as they do. In fact a comparison of the two sets of congruency scores (residents 16.7%, 19.6%; councillors 13.9%, 7.9%) suggests that councillors are much more likely to think that residents' perceptions of the environmental problems correspond to their own than are residents likely to think councillors cognitions are congruent with theirs. Therefore, residents evince little faith in the ability of councillors to empathise with their needs.
and desires. On the other hand councillors believe that the residents perceive the world in much the same way as they do: there is a ubiquitous social reality where differences are in degree not kind.

These results support the findings of Miller and Stokes (1963) and Hesse (1976). As Hesse wrote, "Almost without exception the senators underestimate the degree of disagreement between themselves and their constituents" (ibid, p.630). Unfortunately, neither study reports on the degree of congruency achieved by constituents.

This tendency to overestimate the degree of agreement between politicians and the electorate can be explained by reference to both political and psychological theory. It will be seen though that both are closely linked.

Firstly, it was argued in Chapter 3 that both politicians and planners try to work within a politically and socially consensual atmosphere as this makes the job of urban administration and democracy that much easier. Therefore, if politicians believe that the public see the world in much the same way as they do, or, and this is perhaps more doubtful, they see the world in much the same way as do the public, then the potential for strain or conflict is correspondingly reduced.

A second political interpretation is derived from the "electoral chain of command theory". (Dearlove, 1973). In this, a direct link in command is posited between the electorate through the politicians to the local authority officers. In this way the vote is an important part of decision-making and is not simply a sop to democracy. Furthermore, because the electorate is the ultimate decision-maker, councillors and officers are responsible to that electorate. Therefore, as Jennings puts it: "Within the limits laid down by Parliament and of central control, they adopt a policy which accords, as they think, with the views of the local electorate." (Jennings, 1947, p.17). As Dearlove argues, the electoral chain of command is more apparent than real, while sanction by the vote is often a hollow threat, for a number of reasons. Nevertheless, it may well be that councillors, in however safe a seat, are aware of the fickleness of the voter. And as Miller and Stokes point out in their study, Congressmen overestimated their visibility to the local public. There is no reason to suppose that such over-estimation does not occur in this country and at this level of government. Therefore, if the constituency
is to have, and be seen to have, any influence on the politician, two conditions must be met. The councillor's votes in the Chamber must agree substantially with his own policy preferences or his perception of his constituents' views; and the attitudes and perceptions governing the councillor's behaviour must correspond, however imperfectly, with his constituents' actual attitudes. As to whether the second condition holds true will be assessed in the later section of this chapter on coorientational accuracy. For the first condition to be fulfilled a high level of congruency is required, and achieved.

The psychological interpretations of these results have equal plausibility; they can be viewed as essentially complementing the political interpretations and in fact providing psychological explanations for political behaviour.

Fields and Schuman, in a study concerning public beliefs about the beliefs of the public, argue that people engage in what they call "looking-glass perceptions" (1976). People look out into the world and somehow see their own opinions reflected back. Fields and Schuman suggest that individuals project onto others their own opinions and attitudes, primarily because they regard their own opinions as not only sensible but obvious and, therefore, must be held by all other responsible people. 'Simple projection' might equally operate in the reverse direction, i.e. people make assumptions about the attitudes held by others and then adopt these attitudes themselves. It is doubtful though whether this latter phenomenon occurs in the case of councillors.

Finally, cognitive dissonance theory suggests that individuals experience tension when they perceive that their attitudes and perceptions are greatly at variance with those whom they esteem or value or those whose esteem or support they desire (Festinger, 1957; 1964). When dissonance occurs, those experiencing it try to reduce the inconsistency by either re-interpreting their information or altering their perception of the other. In a political context, cognitive dissonance would occur when councillors have a particular cognition of a situation which is at variance with their perception of the cognition held by those whom they are meant to represent. If so, councillors would attempt to make their cognitions as consonant as possible with their perception of the attitudes held by their electorate. In so doing, they would, as Hesse points out and this study confirms, "underestimate the degree of
disagreement between themselves and their constituents." (op. cit).

The Perspective of the Urban and Rural Councillors

It was shown in the earlier section on coorientational similarity that the nature of the ward (urban or rural) is a crucial factor in determining councillors’ cognitions. As can be seen from Table 7.17, this conclusion can also be applied to coorientational congruency. A number of individual perceptions bear close examination. There is a high level of awareness by urban councillors of the residents’ parking problem, extraneous traffic and the Friary Development Scheme, with a high proportion of the councillors believing that these are the concerns of residents. On the other hand, there are three issues over which urban councillors show concern but obviously feel that the residents do not share their view. Nearly half the urban councillors considered that the area was worn out and beyond its useful life, but a much smaller percentage thought the residents themselves would feel this way (Fishers Exact p = .05). A third of the councillors thought the area should come in for renewal, but, again, they believed this would not receive widespread popular support (Fisher Exact, p = .16, significant with Tocher’s modification). On such politically contentious issues a low degree of congruency is not surprising. Finally, there is a significant difference between the number of urban councillors recognising the conflict between commercial and residential land use and the number of councillors who believe that residents consider this to be an issue (Fishers Exact p = .02).

The rural councillors consider the Friary Development Scheme and residential/commercial conflict to be the two major concerns of the Ward, although they believe that residents are concerned with the Friary Scheme and extraneous traffic. In the case of residential/commercial conflict and extraneous traffic, there is a significant difference between the cognitions and perceptions of rural councillors (Fishers Exact p = .12, significant with Tocher’s modification).

It is immediately apparent from Table 7.17 that there is a higher degree of congruency by rural councillors than urban councillors. This is borne
Table 7.17  Congruency: Urban and Rural Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Councillors Cognition</th>
<th>Urban Councillors Perception</th>
<th>Rural Councillors Cognition</th>
<th>Rural Councillors Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area worn out</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential vs commercial conflict</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban renewal</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elighting</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td></td>
<td>.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
out by the C-scores of 18.4% for urban councillors and 13% for rural councillors.

Summary

It seems paradoxical that urban councillors should have low congruency with residents, while rural councillors have high congruency. It is important to remember though that congruency is an intrapersonal concept. Whether rural councillors are accurate in their perceptions will be seen in the next section, for it may well be that they have high congruency and low accuracy. Not only would this suggest that they believe (incorrectly) that residents think the same way as they do but it would provide further evidence that rural councillors have a low level of understanding of the problems of an urban ward. It could also be suggested that were this the outcome, when councillors are unable to accurately coorientate with residents they minimise the degree of cognitive dissonance by increasing their level of congruency. In this way internal consonance is produced and councillors feel they are fulfilling their representative function. In the case of urban councillors, if they have low congruency but high accuracy, this would show that, while there was little intrapersonal similarity between their cognitions and their perceptions of the attitudes of residents, the councillors can at least accurately predict the viewpoint of residents.

The Perspectives of FWRA Members and Non-Members

Although it was shown in the section on coorientational similarity that FWRA members and non-members have different priorities as to the problems of the Ward, the most important finding here is that neither FWRA members nor non-members have much faith in the elected members being aware of their environmental problems. Both sets of scores are marked by low congruency (Table 7.18).

Congruency (I)

The congruency score of FWRA members is the lowest so far recorded (C = 21.5%), indicating a serious level of non-congruency among FWRA
Table 7.18  Congruency: FWRA Members and Non-Members (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognition %</td>
<td>Perception %</td>
<td>Cognition %</td>
<td>Perception %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating environment</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v commercial conflict</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational facilities</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problems</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = .647, p < .05
\( d = -18.3\% \)
\( C = 21.5\% \)

Table 7.19  Congruency: FWRA Members and Non-Members (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognition %</td>
<td>Perception %</td>
<td>Cognition %</td>
<td>Perception %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway improvements/ improve traffic control</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing trade into Guildford</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of suitable housing</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition and redevelopment</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problems</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = .108
\( d = 3.3\% \)
\( C = 17.9\% \)

rs = -.420
\( d = 1.2\% \)
\( C = 11.3\% \)
members when coorientating with councillors. The C-score of 14.6% for non-members indicates a little less cynicism, but nevertheless tends also towards non-congruency. The FWRA congruency correlation ($r_s = .647$, $p < .05$) does suggest that, although FWRA members have little faith in councillors' awareness of their problems, they do believe that councillors give the same priority to the problems that they (the residents) consider important. This cannot, however, be said for non-members, where there is no association ($r_s = .101$) at all between their priorities and the priorities they believe are held by councillors.

**Congruency (2)**

If we now examine what residents think councillors are primarily concerned with, an altogether different range of priorities emerges. Table 7.19 lists those issues with which FWRA members and non-members think the councillors are most concerned. There is a considerable amount of agreement between FWRA members and non-members in their perceptions, which suggests that, in the light of the significant differences found in other situations, the image that councillors project is commonly received and shared by all residents.

**Summary**

These results are important as they indicate that the reality which is made available to the public is received equally by all sections of the public, i.e. both those who are interested in environmental matters and those who are not. There is no suggestion here that FWRA members are receiving one interpretation of reality from the Council, while non-members are receiving another; or that they are interpreting the reality conveyed by the Council in a significantly different way from non-members. Perhaps, even more important, these findings do not suggest that councillors are communicating different interpretations of reality to different sections of the public. The FWRA C-score of 17.9% is high reflecting the belief held by members that there is little relationship between the way the councillors see the problems of Friary Ward and the way in which they are interpreted and experienced by residents.
The Perspective of the FWRA Committee

In the case of the congruency data of both the FWRA committee (Table 7.20) and the Guildford Borough Council officers (Table 7.21), the scores should be seen as suggestive of a general trend rather than a definitive statement. The small sample sizes of both groups makes the calculation of a coorientation score difficult as such a score is based on percentage figures. For this reason a number of general statements are made about the data.

As in Tables 7.13 to 7.14, the relationship between cognitions and perceptions is not reciprocal. The FWRA committee neither believes that its concerns are particularly similar to the concerns of councillors; nor does it believe that what concerns councillors has an equal priority in its own eyes. Thus, there is a low level of congruency at two levels. Such a conclusion is reinforced by the negative correlation coefficient ($r_s = -.618, p < .05$). This suggests that the FWRA committee virtually places in reverse order the priorities ascribed to councillors. Furthermore, the element of cynicism re-appears in their choice of the preoccupations of councillors. The FWRA committee sees the elected members being concerned with traffic improvements and commercial development, but not spending money on the Ward where it is needed both in its own right and to ameliorate the worst effects of the economic growth policies adopted by the Council. As will be seen in Chapters 8 and 9, these three issues are among the most important that the FWRA committee has taken up and tried to influence the Council.

The Perspective of the Local Authority Officers

The senior officers of Guildford Borough Council, unlike the elected members, not only thought that parts of the Ward were blighted, but considered that the residents too would believe the area subject to blight (Table 7.21). This difference between members and officers on so important an issue is noteworthy. But, aside from this instance, the problems identified by the officers are very similar to those selected by the councillors. Over a third of the officers said that they did not know what the residents thought were the
Table 7.20  Congruency: FWRA Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating environment</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential vs commercial conflict</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing about a sense of community</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway improvements/improve traffic flow</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending too much money</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 11

rs = -.618, p < .05

Table 7.21  Congruency: Local Authority Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and uncertainty</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential vs commercial conflict</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area worn out</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition and redevelopment</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 14

rs = .926, p < .01
chief problems of the Ward. A C-score has not been calculated because of the small sample size. However, the correlation coefficient (rs = - .926, p < .01) reveals that there is a statistically significant inverse relationship between the problems which the officers consider to be most important and the problems which they think residents consider to be of priority. Regardless of whether or not the officers are accurate in their perceptions, the inverse correlation reveals that officers are aware, and admit to being aware, of the different set of priorities and different perspectives of residents. This did not occur in the case of the elected members.

SUMMARY

Residents did not feel that councillors were cognisant of their concerns, although they believed that councillors gave the same priority to issues as they did. Councillors were largely seen as supporting an ideology of economic growth regardless of its detrimental effects on the environment and the people of Friary Ward. Even when the residents are statistically broken down, there is considerable similarity between the perceptions of FWRA members and non-members as to the concerns of councillors, which are seen to be at variance with the residents' own perspectives on the problems of the Ward. This suggests that, not only are councillors communicating a ubiquitous image and similar information to all sections of the population, but also that each section of the population is receiving the same image and information. As FWRA members are not receiving one interpretation of reality from councillors and non-members another, then it is FWRA's interpretation of that reality, vis a vis the interests, values and aspirations of its members that differentiates them from non-members. As with the residents as a whole, the congruency scores reveal that the FWRA committee neither believe that it sees the problems of the Ward in the same way as councillors nor that councillors are able to empathise with the committee's perspective.

Councillors tend to believe that residents see the environment in the same way as they do. Furthermore, councillors are much more likely to think residents see the problems of Friary Ward the same way as they do, than are residents likely to believe that councillors' cognitions are congruent with
theirs. On some politically sensitive issues, however, councillors recognise that few residents will agree with them. With this exception, it appears that councillors believe that there is a ubiquitous social reality where differences are in degree, not kind. Theories drawn from psychology and politics are put forward to account for the attempt by councillors to make their perceptions of residents' environmental cognitions congruent with their own cognitions. The two psychological theories (cognitive dissonance theory; simple projection) are seen as essentially psychological interpretations of political behaviour (consensus theory; electoral chain of command theory).

Paradoxically, urban councillors were found to assume a low level of congruency with residents, while rural councillors exhibited a high degree of congruency. It is hypothesised that urban councillors believe that certain differences exist between themselves and the residents. Rural councillors, however, in order to reduce cognitive dissonance and satisfy their representative function, minimise these perceived differences. A high degree of congruency in this situation may well be an indicator of a poor level of understanding of inner urban problems. The local authority officers interviewed produced a different set of priorities to the ones they thought residents would produce. Their perception of residents' concerns were more similar to those of the councillors than to the residents themselves.

COORIENTATIONAL ACCURACY

The final coorientation concept is that of accuracy. This is the relationship which exists between one person's perception of another person's cognition and the other person's actual cognition. Thus high accuracy exists when the one person's perception of another's cognition is similar to the other person's actual cognition. Accuracy is then testing the predictive ability of one group by another. It was argued earlier that accuracy is probably the most important coorientational concept because it is the basis of true communication. Councillors may not agree with, or even have similar cognitions to, residents as to the problems of Friary Ward. But if councillors are to minimally represent the public, they should be in a position to
accurately predict the concerns of residents. Likewise, it is important that residents can accurately predict how their councillors see the Ward. If one agrees with Miller and Stokes that "given the limited information the average voter carries to the polls, the public might be thought incompetent to perform any task of appraisal." (op.cit., p.53), it becomes very important that electors can accurately estimate, with the knowledge which they do possess, how the prospective candidate sees their environment.

The Perspective of the Friary Ward Residents

The coorientational accuracy findings can be readily summarised. In the case of those issues which residents thought disadvantageous to the Ward, residents overestimated the amount of concern shown by councillors to those issues. Where residents themselves expressed a great deal of sympathy and concern over an issue, they tended to underestimate the amount of concern shown by the councillors. The first three issues fall into the first category, while only the fourth issue falls into the latter. These findings confirm the conclusions arrived at for the congruency data: residents display a lack of faith in, if not a certain cynicism of, the councillors' ability to see the Ward in the same way as they do.

The C-score of 18.5% reinforces the conclusion that the residents have a poor ability to accurately predict the concerns of councillors. Of course, this does raise the fundamental question of whether the councillors were completely honest in their responses to the interview questions when none of them admitted to a concern with 'bringing trade into the town' and few to 'improving the traffic flow'. In the case of bringing trade into the town, this would not be an obvious answer for councillors when asked what they considered to be the chief problems affecting Friary Ward. However, for residents, the reality of the situation is that this is a pre-eminent concern of councillors. Furthermore, it is a policy which has environmentally damaging effects on the Ward. It will show in Chapter 8 that, despite what the councillors say, in practise their policies actively encourage trade and commercialism in the town. This then raises the question that although coorientation shows that residents are
### Table 7.22: Coorientation - Accuracy: Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway improvements/improve traffic flow</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of housing</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring trade into the town</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = -.200  
d = 3.6%  
C = 18.5%

### Table 7.23: Accuracy: Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priary Development Scheme</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blighting</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = -.200  
d = 4.6%  
C = 13.3%
not able to accurately predict the articulated concerns of councillors, their perceptions may nevertheless, when measured against actual policy outputs, be quite accurate. The evidence presented in the remainder of this thesis goes some way to supporting this hypothesis.

The Perspective of the Guildford Borough Councillors

The ability of councillors to accurately predict the concerns of residents appears to be greater than the corresponding coorientational ability of residents (Table 7.23). There is a relatively high degree of correspondence between the perceptions of councillors and the cognitions of residents. However, the councillors do go awry in their estimation of residents' concern over the Friary Development Scheme. Just under a third of the councillors maintained that the residents would see this as one of the chief problems affecting their Ward, whereas in fact under 5% of the Friary Ward residents expressed any disquiet over the issue. In this one case there is a gross inaccuracy of perception and a failure to coorientate correctly. This particular case of coorientational inaccuracy considerably influences the mean difference (d) and overall inaccuracy score (O). If the case of the Friary Development Scheme is removed, the mean difference is reduced to +1.1% while the overall inaccuracy score is reduced to only 5.7%. Generally, councillors can quite accurately predict the major concerns of residents.

The Perspectives of the Urban and Rural Councillors

It was shown in the previous two sections on coorientational similarity and congruency that the type of constituency (urban or rural) was a crucial factor in determining the coorientational abilities of councillors. This conclusion applies equally to coorientational accuracy (Table 7.24). In the case of coorientational congruency it was found that rural councillors evinced a much higher degree of congruency than did urban councillors. It was suggested that rural councillors might well be inaccurate though in predicting residents' concerns, and that a high degree of congruency was one way of reducing cognitive dissonance and positively ascribing to themselves a representational
Table 7.24 Accuracy: Urban and Rural Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban councillors' perception (%)</th>
<th>Residents' cognition (%)</th>
<th>Rural councillors' perception (%)</th>
<th>Residents' cognition (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorating houses</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blighting</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area worn out</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential v commercial conflict</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban renewal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = .855, p < .05  
rs = .158

d = 14.2%  
d = 2.3%

c = 15.8%  
c = 15.8%
function. On the other hand, it was hypothesised that urban councillors could have low congruency but a high level of accuracy. In the case of the former hypothesis it was found that, although rural councillors had a high level of congruency, they were quite inaccurate in predicting the concerns of residents. One might conclude from this, as was suggested, that a high congruency level was indicative in this particular case of a low level of understanding of the problems of Friary Ward. Rural councillors greatly underestimated the public concern for the parking problem facing residents, while they overestimated substantially the interest of residents in the Friary Scheme. It should be noted, however, that they did accurately estimate the concern of residents over extraneous traffic, and a small number did identify the problem of commercial expansion into residential areas. The d score of 2.3% suggests that they were just as likely to overestimate as underestimate the cognitions of residents. The high C-score of 15.8% provides further support for the conclusion that rural councillors were co-orientationally inaccurate, thus confirming the hypothesis above that rural councillors, while displaying a high degree of congruency, have a poor predictive ability.

Perhaps surprisingly, the urban councillors fared little better with a C-score also of 15.8%. Unlike rural councillors who had high congruency but low accuracy, urban councillors have both low congruency and low accuracy and therefore one must reject the hypothesis put forward above. The d-score shows that the councillors tended to overestimate residents' concern for many of the issues they identified. Like the rural councillors, they inaccurately suggested that the residents were concerned over the Friary Scheme. They also believed that the residents considered the area to be blighted. As blighting is a relatively sophisticated concept, one might expect fewer residents to isolate this as an issue. In suggesting that the residents feel the area is worn out, they show a great deal of insensitivity, and it is consequently not surprising that their perceptions of the concerns of residents are inaccurate. It should be stressed that, although the C-score indicates relatively poor levels of accuracy by the urban councillors in two instances (residents' parking and extraneous traffic), they do have a high awareness of residents' problems. Their accuracy is therefore partial and relates only to those issues for which FWRA has generated much publicity. The significant correlation
coefficient (rs = .855, p < .05) indicates that the urban councillors are accurate only in the relative priority they give to the issues they think residents consider important.

The Perspectives of FWRA Members and Non-Members

The conclusions reached in the subsection on the coorientational accuracy of residents are not dissimilar to the conclusions drawn here (Table 6.25). Both FWRA members and non-members took the sceptical stance that councillors would be concerned with those issues of low concern to residents, while those issues which residents considered important would be ignored by the councillors. The residents were, however, inaccurate in their presuppositions. Because the residents concentrated on the negative aspects of councillors' concerns, it is not surprising to find that few councillors 'agreed' with the perceptions of both groups. It remains to be seen in later chapters whether the perceptions of residents, although coorientationally inaccurate, are fair evaluations of the policy outputs of Guildford Borough Council in terms of their environmental planning priorities.

The Perspective of the FWRA Committee

The FWRA committee's ideas as to the concerns of councillors are, in two cases (Table 7.26) quite different from the expressed concerns of the councillors. In the issue of highway improvements, it is difficult to see how the conclusion can be drawn that the FWRA committee is inaccurate in its perception of councillors' concerns. Clearly, in coorientational terms, it is inaccurate, but the evidence presented so far, particularly in Chapter 5, would suggest that highway improvements and their consequences have been a fundamental concern of councillors over the last thirty years. The amount of change to the built environment brought about by road planning schemes undertaken during the duration of the research for this thesis is further testimony to this fact. This again raises questions concerning the validity and efficacy of the coorientation technique for eliciting data on the social construction of reality by different urban groups; this will be tackled in the concluding chapter (Chapter 10).
### Table 7.25  Accuracy: FWRA Members and Non-Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA members' perception</th>
<th>Councilors' cognition</th>
<th>Non-members' perception</th>
<th>Councilors' cognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway improvements, improved traffic flow</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing trade to Guildford</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of suitable housing</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition and redevelopment</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = -385
\( d = 6.2\% \)
\( C = 15.1\% \)

### Table 7.26  Accuracy: FWRA Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FWRA Committee Members' perception</th>
<th>Councilors' cognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway improvements</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development Scheme</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending too much money</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Perspective of the Local Authority Officers

The officers fared better than the councillors in the accuracy of their perceptions of the residents' environmental cognitions (Table 7.27). Unlike the councillors, they did not think (accurately) that the residents would be especially concerned with the Friary Development Scheme. In this respect both the FWRA committee members and the officers were the most accurate perceivers of the 'real' concern expressed by residents over this issue.

SUMMARY

Residents possess a poor ability to predict how councillors see the Ward. However, it is suggested that although the social reality for residents is not the same as for councillors, it does not necessarily mean that their perceptions are inaccurate. When measured against the policy outputs of the Council, their alternative reality may approximate more closely the 'real' state of affairs than the councillors are prepared to accept. The accuracy/reality dilemma is discussed further in Chapter 10. FWRA members, perhaps surprisingly, are less accurate than non-members in estimating what councillors consider to be the problems of Friary Ward. One explanation for this may lie in the finding presented at the beginning of this chapter; FWRA members are no more likely to contact the Council than non-members about problems affecting themselves or the Ward. The problem posed over the accuracy/reality dilemma applies equally here. Unlike the residents generally, the FWRA committee did predict that councillors would think that the Friary Scheme was an issue among residents; but overall, the committee's perceptions are coorientationally inaccurate and reveal a different reality to the one many councillors would like communicated.

The ability of councillors to predict the issues concerning residents is considerable. Such a finding contradicts Prewitt (1970) who, according to O'Riorden (1977, p.165) argues that politicians "are not generally perceptive of public opinion, especially on social issues." O'Riorden goes on to assert that "few citizens have any notion as to how their elected representatives
Table 7.27  Accuracy: Local Authority Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Officers' perception (%)</th>
<th>Residents' cognition (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents' parking</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blighting</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraneous traffic</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Development</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rs = 0.896  
d = 0.5%  
c = 10.4%
are protecting their interests." (ibid). No evidence is presented in support of this statement. In terms of the data presented here O'Riorden's claim is not as straightforward as it first appears.

The two hypotheses put forward in the congruency section were only partially confirmed. It was hypothesised that rural councillors, although possessing a high degree of congruency would have a low level of accuracy. This hypothesis is confirmed as rural councillors are unable to predict the problems of residents. However, the complementary hypothesis that urban councillors would possess low congruency and high accuracy is not supported. The issues which urban councillors accurately predicted extended only to a minority of issues and reflected those issues which FWRA had publicised extensively. The local authority's senior officers perceive more accurately than the elected members the problems facing residents, and quite rightly believed that residents would not be particularly concerned with the Friary Development Scheme.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The coorientational similarity findings produce a 'classic' example of how the views of the (silent) majority of the public accord more with those in power than they do to the views of a minority group (FWRA). For many politicians this finding only supports what they have always believed to be the case. However, such a conclusion on the politicians' part is also often taken to include the assertion that, "... the majority point of view carries the prestige of truth and norm ..." (Moscovici, 1976, p.12). In this way the views of interest groups such as residents' associations are seen to be unrepresentative of the community and unworthy of anything more than tacit acknowledgment (It is not being suggested here that such a relationship exists between FWRA and Guildford Borough Council). However, under such conditions, it becomes very easy for those in power to ignore the wishes and demands of minority groups because they do not have the sanction of the majority.

There is a danger of interpreting the functional model of social influence in terms of the forces of conformity and conservatism being pitted against
the forces of change. However, it is more helpful to assume that change is taking place all the time, and the function of the forces of conformity and conservatism is to control change for the maintenance and benefit of those in power. The functional model should be interpreted in these terms. Otherwise it becomes very difficult to explain the activities of a residents' association such as FWRA which, rather than seeking radical change, is in many ways trying to slow down or stop radical change in the direction which the Council desire (cf. Chapter 9). FWRA is not against change, as is the case with some conservation and preservation groups, but wishes change to take a different course - a course which is more consonant with their interpretation of the environment and their aspirations for the future. The different interpretations and aspirations are plainly revealed in the coorientational data in this chapter.

These findings suggest that each of the urban groups does not share an ubiquitous interpretation of the world. Only in those cases of high coorientational accuracy is this not the case. For example, the worlds of the councillor and the officer are closer to each other than they are to those outside the Council.

The different perspectives of urban and rural councillors is an important theme. It has already been shown in Chapter 6 that the rural influence in the Council is in disproportionate strength to its electoral support. This has serious repercussions since neither the interests (as will be illustrated in Chapters 8 and 9) nor the perspectives of rural councillors are similar to those of the inner-urban residents. Furthermore, rural councillors are unable to empathise with the inner-urban residents. Consequently, their superior voting and representative power is a crucial factor in the politics of Guildford.

The coorientational scores reveal that the councillors convey and the residents receive one particular view of reality from the Council. However, what differentiates FWRA members from non-members is the interpretation they give to the reality conveyed: an alternative interpretation based on their different interests, values and aspirations.

Councillors are more likely to believe that residents hold the same views as they do, than is the opposite case. This is presumably not a surprising
finding since if this were not so the representative role of councillors would be critically called into question. Theories drawn from both political science and psychology are used to provide a more rigorous explanation of this condition.

The accuracy/reality dilemma is an important issue which confronts the efficaciousness of coorientation as a psychological methodology. According to coorientation criteria it was found that residents are not particularly accurate in predicting the concerns of councillors. However, it was suggested that, when measured against the policy outputs of the local authority, their perceptions may in fact be seen to be accurate. Two explanations can be preferred consequent upon such a conclusion: either councillors are not aware that what they do and what they think they do in Council are different, or the councillors are trying to convey a false reality.

One might not expect that councillors would say that the economic growth strategies of the Council are a problem for the residents of Friary Ward. Should they do so, this would imply that the Council is the direct cause of those problems. The type of problem councillors articulate is in many cases one step removed from the actual cause of the problem; it is a consequence rather than a cause. This further raises the problem, especially with regard to coorientational similarity and accuracy, of the comparison of environmental and political constructs at different levels of abstraction and sophistication. This topic will be returned to in Chapter 10.
Footnote

1. It would have been possible to organise the analysis of the coorientational relationships around environmental issues and problems, rather than around the perspectives of specific groups, each taken in turn. However, attention in this thesis focuses on the orientations of different urban groups to urban problems, rather than the urban problems per se.

Comparatively little attention is given to the coorientational relationships of the local authority officers. It was felt that, because of the small sample size and the mixed nature of the group (cf. Chapter 3) a detailed statistical analysis of officer responses might not truly reflect the 'officer perspective'. For this reason it is suggested that the local authority officers' responses be regarded as indicative of a general orientation.
THE INTERESTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

How Guildford is Governed

Guildford is fortunate in being governed by a Town Council composed of men who are mostly old residents in the Borough, and who have, by their conduct of municipal affairs, earned the respect and gratitude of the burgesses generally.

The policy of the Town Council may be described as "Progress tempered by Prudence." The motto of the Onslow family (Festina lente) seems to be adopted by them, and events show that this is a wise one. The Town Clerk's lucid statement of the advantages enjoyed by residents in the town and the comparatively moderate cost to the ratepayers tends to show that Guildford has been and still is well governed and that her revenues are wisely expended.

'Guildford Today' *

* The Official Handbook of the Guildford Chamber of Trade, 1912
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INTRODUCTION

An argument was put forward in Chapter I for adopting what has been termed a 'cobweb' research design. It was emphasized that a reflexive research design must be constructed which permits changes in the direction and focus of the research in the context of the findings of the research. The research design should also be flexible enough to incorporate changes in the perspectives of the researcher and the interpretations he or she places on the research findings. The existence of this chapter is testimony to the adoption of such a research strategy.

The issues which were examined in Chapter 7 emerged out of the discussion and questions posed in Chapters I and 3. As a consequence of the analysis in Chapter 7, two further questions have emerged which warrant close examination as they are crucial to the resolution of the three major research questions which form the central theme and focus of this thesis (cf. Chapter 3). Firstly, although residents are coorientationally inaccurate in predicting the articulated concerns of councillors, are they actually accurate in perceiving the true interests of Guildford Borough Council. One such interest is seen to be the promotion of a policy of economic expansion with minimal attention being paid to the detrimental effects of such a policy to the lives and environment of inner-town residents. My own involvement with FWRA in an action research capacity would support such a conclusion as will be illustrated below.

Following on from the first question is: whose interests does the Council serve? The generally accepted answer of the public as a whole is questioned in the context of two forms of evidence: a brief historical account of a major speculative shopping and office development (the Friary development) in the town centre (and within the boundary of Friary Ward); and the answers to two questions in the questionnaire interview concerning the interests and purpose of Guildford Borough Council.

The chapter is concluded with a discussion of the theoretical issues and problems which the analyses raise in the context of a number of commonly held assumptions concerning the independence and neutrality of local government in policy-formulation and conflict resolution.
SUPPORTING AN IDEOLOGY OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Commercial Expansion: Structure and Infrastructure

It was suggested by many residents in the last chapter that Guildford Borough Council has an overriding concern for attracting businesses and shoppers into Guildford, regardless of the detrimental consequences for residents in the inner-town area; in short, Guildford Borough Council supports and promotes an ideology of economic growth. In this and the next section, the evidence in support of such a claim will be tested. My interpretation of recent planning and political decisions will provide an introduction to a case study of speculative commercial development: the Friary Development Scheme.

Compared with many surrounding towns Guildford has an advantage in attracting shops and shoppers, in that the attractiveness of the town in environmental terms makes Guildford a highly desirable place to establish a business. The Council has done much to retain the attractiveness of the High Street by placing strict controls on shop and office fronts and on signboard advertising. Furthermore, every encouragement has been given to bring 'quality' shops to Guildford, such as Heals (the first branch outside London). But the expansion of the business area at the expense of residential property has been a major cause of dissatisfaction between the residents and the local authority. Not only have houses been taken over and used as offices, but the existence of houses in zoned commercial areas has meant that planning permission for change of use is virtually automatic. This, in turn, has meant that the value of such houses is far in excess of their 'real' domestic value. Consequently, it becomes impossible for individual house purchasers to compete with commercial firms for such property.

While the Council can do little directly to attract business to the town, the provision of infrastructural support to commercial development is very much within the local authority's power, and it is this which has affected residents more than anything else. To attract shoppers, the town must provide easy road access and parking facilities on arrival. To this end, Guildford Borough Council has built three large multi-storey car parks, and three large surface car parks. There are also a number of smaller parking areas. The York Road extension (College Road link) has now been completed, and Onslow Street has been
completely rebuilt to facilitate traffic movement around the Friary development. Because the car parks are among the most expensive in the South of England, visitors to Guildford town centre continue to look for free parking in the surrounding residential roads. In an attempt to force the shoppers into the car parks, waiting restrictions of two hours are in force in many of the residential roads. This rebounds particularly hard on the residents as the Council refuses to implement a Residents' Parking Scheme (cf. Chapter 9). Add to this the noise and pollution of traffic and the advantages of economic expansion become less attractive.

Despite the recent savage cutbacks in public expenditure in all areas of Council activity, Guildford Borough Council is still planning to build a fourth multi-storey car park (with supporting pressure from several national shopping chains), even though this will involve considerable public borrowing, high loan charges and the necessity of charging very high parking fees in order to recoup the costs. In answer to considerable public criticism of this proposal, it is maintained by the councillors that trade must be encouraged if the town is not to die. While one might sympathise with this view, there is no evidence to suggest that Guildford will suffer decline in the near or distant future. Currently, Guildford has one of the most highly rated shopping streets in the South-East including Central London. The only consequence of not building more car parks is that the number of shoppers coming into Guildford might level off as a threshold of absorbing such large numbers is reached. The Council seems to see no limit to the numbers that can be attracted into the town, despite the numerous letters in the press which continually ask how much more traffic the town can absorb. One of the possible sites for the fourth multi-storey car park involves demolishing a theatre only rebuilt by the Council within the last few years. Several councillors have been so vociferous in their support of this proposal that one Councillor Parke was dubbed in the local newspaper as Councillor Bernard 'Car' Parke. One is forced to conclude, similarly to Saunders in his study of commercial development policy in Croydon, that "Never, either then or since, has the Council leadership doubted the assumed equivalence between commercial profitability and the 'public interest' (which it asserts is keen to defend) ......." (Saunders, 1979, p.13)

A Rationale

There are perhaps a number of reasons why Guildford has actively encouraged commercial growth policies. Being committed to a low rate policy, the more
the Council can shift the rate revenue from the private household sector to the commercial sector the more it sees itself gaining electoral support. One councillor recently maintained (at a Council meeting) that 17% of the Borough's ratepayers (principally non-domestic) provide 45% of the Rates. Secondly, the assumption is held by the Council that the more money that is attracted into Guildford, the wealthier Guildford will be. This is, of course, true provided that those who make profits reinvest them in the town. This is not the case. Because of the high commercial rates in the High Street, it is only the large national and multi-national companies which can afford to lease property. There are now only one or two 'local' traders left in the High Street. All the shops are part of regional, national or international chains. Consequently, profits which are made in Guildford are reinvested in new shops in other parts of the country or even abroad (e.g. Habitat; Marks & Spencers). The necessity of charging high rates in the new Friary development too means that only national (e.g. Fenwicks) and international stores (e.g. C & A Modes) will be able to afford the high location costs.

Another reason behind the pursuit of an economic expansion policy lies within the political philosophy of the dominating party on the Council. Conservative Party policies traditionally favour private enterprise and capital development. For one final reason, one has to look towards the position and status of Guildford in a County-wide context. Guildford is generally considered to be the County town of Surrey, especially with its Cathedral and University. Yet it does not possess the administrative functions of a County town. Paradoxically, the County Hall for Surrey is in Kingston-upon-Thames, which is in the administrative area of the Greater London Council. For many years Guildford has tried to obtain the removal of the County Hall to Guildford, and it was proposed to build a new County Hall on the site of part of Stoke Park. However, a pressure group arose (the Save Guildford Association) to specifically fight the proposal. They collected £10,000 to finance their campaign and eventually fought the Borough Council in the House of Lords, where it was found that the Council, in proposing to build on Stoke Park, were contravening a Guildford Act passed in Parliament in the 1920's. Other sites have also been proposed for the County Hall, not least of which was the Friary Site before MEPC bought the land.

Guildford Borough Council has constantly sought to persuade Surrey County
Council that Guildford has the status and economic vitality to be the County town of Surrey. It cannot truly take that title until the administrative and political centre of County power resides in Guildford. The enhanced status of Guildford will be projected onto the Guildford councillors own position in the town, and as a result Lively's contention (1) will be seen to be a correct one.

The Friary Development Scheme

It is impossible to discuss the economic growth policies of Guildford Borough Council without some discussion of the history of the Friary development scheme. Little attention has been paid to this speculative office and shop development in this thesis so far, because as was shown in Chapter 7, despite being situated in Friary Ward, it is not considered to be a problem by the majority of the residents, except that its existence typifies once more the desire by the Council to develop the commercial sector of the town, with the inherent consequences for residents. The history of the Friary development scheme and the public participation exercise which was described by one angry writer to the 'Surrey Daily Advertiser' as "completely sham and worthless" and "cosmetic eyewash", could itself form the subject of a chapter. My purpose here is to briefly outline its history, the participation exercise and its significance in terms of the theme of this chapter: the ideology of economic growth as pursued by the Council.

The MEPC purchase

The Friary site comprises 4.8 acres on the edge of the shopping centre of the town and lies wholly within Friary Ward. Originally the site of a Dominican Friary dissolved in 1538, its more recent use has been that of a brewery. The Friary Brewery was in existence for over a century, and the last owners were Friary Meux Ltd. In 1960 Friary Meux proposed to move to another site, and Guildford Borough Council contemplated purchasing the site, to be used primarily for the new County Hall but also to contain some replacement shopping, businesses and car parking. Despite the later conclusion that the site was too small for the new County Hall, it was still agreed to go ahead with the purchase for the sum of £2 million. Just before contracts were exchanged, MEPC (Metropolitan & Estate Property Company) a property development company involved in speculative developments throughout Britain, Europe and North America, put in a bid of
£6 million for the site and gained control of the land in late 1972. In the meantime the Council had approached a number of developers asking them to submit plans if they were interested in developing the site for the Council. MEPC bought the site on the basis of the plans they had put forward and which had received approval in principle from the Council.

The problem of planning permission

It was not until 5th April 1976, two years after outline planning permission had been granted, that detailed planning permission was given. Within this two-year period, allegations were made against Guildford Borough Council of amateurism in allowing MEPC to buy a prime development site in the centre of town where any revenue generated by the development would be exported out of the town. Criticisms too were made of the design of the office, shop and hotel development both by members of the public in the participation exercise, the Guildford Society, FWRA and a number of other town interest groups, and the West Surrey Branch of R.I.B.A. The R.I.B.A. branch described the development as "a deplorable island" and "anti-people". A letter sent by the branch to the Council stated "No attempt has been made to integrate the new development with the adjacent areas and the town as a whole" (Surrey Daily Advertiser, 11th August 1975). The chief criticisms made by all these groups was that one side of the site was bounded by what was euphemistically described as a 'bastion wall' but which quickly became labelled as the 'Berlin Wall'. The office block proposed for the northern end of the site was to tower over the spire of the adjacent St. Saviour's Church (the only church spire in Guildford). Finally, the plot ratio of 2:1 was to be greatly exceeded providing a very bulky appearance. Minor changes were made to the design which involved reducing the height of the office block and breaking up the bastion wall. However, it was quite apparent from the participation exercise that few people in the town wanted the development at all. The Council itself made the point that the majority of the comments received from the public related to the principles of the scheme, which were settled at the outline planning permission stage and therefore were deemed irrelevant to the consideration of detailed planning permission.

Despite the fact that detailed planning permission was eventually granted in
1976, it was still a further two years (six years after MEPC had purchased the site) before building began. The old Guildford Corporation had originally applied for the 200,000 square feet O.D.P. (Office Development Permit) and this had been granted. However, there were a number of important constraints on the permit. For the first five years of tenancy, the offices had to be occupied by local government or local undertakings. Furthermore, the Council stipulated that neither the office buildings nor the proposed hotel on the site could be started before tenants had been found. MEPC found it impossible to fulfill all these conditions.

A compromise solution was found; MEPC giving way on more of the pressure groups' demands provided that the Council would ease its restrictions. Ayley reports that when representatives from the Guildford Society and the Guildford Labour Party had visited the Secretary of State for the Environment, they learnt that Guildford Borough Council had unsuccessfully asked for a change in the O.D.P. (Ayley, 1978, p.33). "The Guildford Society believed that the Council and the developers were attempting a private agreement and that their asking for public opinion on the project was purely a public relations exercise." (ibid). Guildford Borough Council clearly had an interest in the scheme being completed as quickly as possible, for not only was it losing rates, but as part of the agreement it had come to with MEPC it was losing rent as well from some of the users.

The Council made a Modification Order in June 1977, which meant that the developers could carry out the scheme in two main phases: the shopping centre and the bus station to be built in the first phase, and the offices in the second phase. By this time, the plan to build a 40 bedroom hotel had been dropped as no hotelier could be found. (This is to be replaced by sixty local authority flats). This, Ayley maintains, was as much a victory for the developers over the Council as it was for the local Labour Party: the hotel was included in the original proposal at the Council's insistence. (ibid, p.36). Some offices are being built in the first phase but, as at August 1979, according to the local authority, no tenants have yet been found for them. Many of the changes in design which have occurred since the original plans were put forward have been due to economic circumstances as much as public pressure. A world economic recession generally and the collapse of speculative property development activities has meant that MEPC has had to compromise in order to salvage any of its financial investment.
Seven years after purchasing the site it has still not been built, although work
is currently in progress.

Who plans the planners?

The Friary Ward Residents' Association was one of the interest groups which
submitted proposals for the site in the participation exercise. FWRA, realising
that it could do little to influence the alteration of the basic design, proposed
alterations in the arrangement of various parts of the scheme. FWRA suggested
that by relocating the bus station on the western side (Onslow Street) of the
complex, as opposed to the eastern side (Commercial Road), there would be
a less complicated traffic flow for buses and cars alike, and the south end of
the complex could be pedestrianised to afford easy foot access to the main
shopping area in Guildford. Such a solution would obviate the criticism that
the development is not integrated with the rest of the town.

The then Chairman of FWRA (along with a committee member of FWRA and
myself) put forward this proposal to the Area Engineer of the Surrey County
Council S.W. Area Highways Office, and outlined the problems associated with
the MEPC plan. What transpired at this meeting came as a considerable shock
to the FWRA representatives. Mr. D. F. Bristow, the Area Engineer, said that
he could think of many advantages of retaining the bus station on its Commercial
Road site, although he did not articulate one. It became apparent that the Area
Highway Office had not even considered an alternative site for the bus station
despite the fact that the traffic problems it is to cause by its siting could only
be solved by a contra-flow bus lane which cuts diagonally across a dual carriage-
way causing all traffic to stop. Mr. Bristow said that FWRA were not the first
to think of the proposal, but said it so many times the statement became
unconvincing. Then all was revealed. Mr. Bristow said that "As a planning
authority we are stuck with it in Commercial Road. If the architects were to
put it on the Onslow Road side, then we would have to look at it afresh." This
suggested that the highway authority had no say in where the bus station was to
be sited despite the fact that the site is to be a major traffic generator. This
was confirmed when the Area Engineer later said "We had no part in the decision
of where the bus station should go. As far as our responsibilities are concerned,
we were presented with outline planning permission. We must produce the best situation we can out of the things that are fixed."

Discussion

The history of the Friary Development shows that commercial development and expansion in Guildford has proceeded in spite of the efforts of the Council as much as because of them. The inner-town environment which has been drastically changed, if not ravaged, over the past ten or so years, can be seen to be a product of the ideology of economic growth which fuels Council decision-making. But it would also appear that the Borough Council and the County Council have been quite impotent (or have chosen to be so) in the face of business interests. A combination of public pressure and economic circumstances forced the Friary site to remain undeveloped for some six years after the purchase of the site by MEPC. There is little to suggest that any of the hold-ups in development were caused by positive Borough Council action in trying to get a better deal for the residents of Guildford. It is true that benefits have accrued to the town through the actions of the local authority (e.g. the bus station; sixty units of Council housing), but they were in many ways as much forced upon the Council as on MEPC. It is not difficult to believe that, given a free hand, Guildford Borough Council would have allowed building to have begun several years before it actually did get under way.

In Saunders' study of commercial development in Croydon (op.cit) which has many similarities with Guildford, Saunders suggests Croydon business leaders maintained important contacts with the local authority. But more than this, "these relationships were also significant in reinforcing a mutuality of values and world views between the local business community and the leaders of the local authority" (ibid, p.11). The communication and relationships between business and local government have not been studied for this thesis and therefore I am not in a position to say how influential local and national business interests are in shaping Council policy. However, one might hypothesize that in this overwhelmingly Conservative dominated authority a mutuality of values and world views between business interests and local authority leaders exists. In such circumstances there does not need to be the conspiracy between politicians and businessmen which cynics of
local government are keen to identify. Consequently Council policy does not develop in response to business influence, but rather stems from within the Council itself. Business interests in the town do not have to pressurise the local authority, because either those interests are actually represented on the Council, or if they are not, the leading councillors and officers empathise closely with the pursuance of such policies. The built environment is ready testimony to the economic orientations of the leading councillors on Guildford Borough Council.

THE INTERESTS GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL SERVES

Each of the urban groups interviewed was asked whose interests they thought the local authority served, and what is the purpose of Guildford Borough Council. The responses to these two questions will provide quantitative data for the support or refutation of the idiosyncratic interpretation of Guildford Borough Council's policy above.

Whose Interests?

It was quite clear on interviewing residents that very few see Guildford Borough Council as the neutral arbiter that is suggested by pluralist theory. Only 10% of the residents said that the Council served all sections of the community (Table 8.1). This provides a marked contrast ($X^2 = 51.4, p < .001$) with both councillors and officers of whom well over half maintained that the Council served all in Guildford. Therefore, despite the fact that officers and members of the local authority considered themselves to be serving impartially the Guildford community, few residents in Friary Ward shared their belief. The residents saw the Council as serving three specific interest groups. The largest proportion of residents (27.7%) maintained that the local authority was serving the interests of commerce and property developers. This attitude supports the claim made by residents in Chapter 7 that the Council is solely concerned with economic growth. FWRA members, who have long campaigned against the enthusiasm with which the Council pursues and supports commercial expansion regardless of the environmentally detrimental effects, were particularly vociferous in this category (31%).
Table 8.1 "Whose interests do you think the local authority is serving?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>IWRA members</th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>14 (10.2%)</td>
<td>23 (68%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private householders/owner occupiers</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who live in suburbs/rural areas/better areas</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (16%)</td>
<td>14 (10.2%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council itself</td>
<td>18 (24%)</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
<td>27 (19.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council tenants</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce/developers</td>
<td>19 (25%)</td>
<td>19 (31%)</td>
<td>38 (27.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobody</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (4.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatives</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups (sports; old people; poor people; visitors; those who make most noise)</td>
<td>11 (15%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>16 (11.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not me/not Friary Ward</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (2.9%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>13 (21%)</td>
<td>26 (19.6%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One resident in five maintained that the Council sought only to serve itself (1). This was often expressed in terms of either "they are only councillors for what they get out of it" or the local authority is "an unnecessary over­manned bureaucracy ...." Non-members of FWRA were more likely to give this reply than were members.

The rural/urban difference, which emerged forcefully in Chapter 6 in terms of electoral representation, reappears here in the consciousness of the residents. Nearly one FWRA member in six (16%) maintained that the Council served those who lived in the suburbs and rural areas, and those who lived in the 'better areas' which, for these residents, was synonymous with the suburbs and rural areas.

The picture built up here by the residents splits wide open the theoretical pretension that governments, or at least this particular local government, are unbiased, neutral arbiters which curry no favour with any section of society. The councillors would no doubt argue with the residents over their conclusion, but even accepting the view that the residents of Friary Ward have a particular perspective, these findings point to a residential population which feels basically alienated from the local government which exists to protect its interests. Rather than seeing the local authority as superordinate decision­makers looking down over the battlefield, residents, as arena theory suggests, see the Council as one interest group amongst many pressing its own interests and the interests of those organisations and activities which sympathise with the Council's collective ideology.

The Purpose of Guildford Borough Council

These conclusions were partly borne out when residents were asked, "Could you tell me what you think Guildford Borough Council stands for? What is its purpose?" It was clear from the answers that many people interpreted this question as requiring a normative answer. Consequently, a quarter of the residents (Table 8.2) said that the purpose of the Council is "to administer for the common good, with due regard to the individual" or "to enlist public support in identifying and tackling the needs of Guildford". Needless to say, not all the responses in this category were as articulately phrased as these two examples. However, they
Table 8.2 "What do you think Guildford Borough Council stands for? What is its purpose?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To serve the individual and the community</td>
<td>21 (28%)</td>
<td>12 (19%)</td>
<td>33 (24.1%)</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To encourage trade and business</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
<td>21 (15.3%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To administer services</td>
<td>17 (23%)</td>
<td>18 (29%)</td>
<td>35 (25.5%)</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide a better environment/ quality of life</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (7.3%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing - doesn't have a purpose</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
<td>10 (16%)</td>
<td>22 (16.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no reply</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>16 (11.7%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
all focused on the representative democracy function of government. An equal number of residents (25.5%) maintained that local government exists to administer services and to run the town as efficiently and economically as possible. At one level these two functions become interdependent, for as the Herbert Commission (1960) pointed out, the function of local government is two-fold: "to do for people what a group of persons, elected according to law by a majority of the citizens but on election becoming representative of them all, conceive to be good within the limits of their legal power." (para. 229). What one group of elected citizens might consider to be for the public good, another group might not. The governmental function and service function are intertwined. Therefore, half the residents' responses fell into these two orthodox categories, while over two-thirds of the councillors' responses also fell into this group. If the officers of the Council were convinced of anything, it is that they too should be performing or facilitating these functions, but one-third of the officers interviewed seemed not at all sure of the purpose of local government. Local government reorganisation not only caused organisational havoc but response havoc too!

While a half of the residents focused on the normative orthodox functions of local government, another third were more critical. An equal number of FWRA members and non-members (16%) expressed the opinion that the purpose of Guildford Borough Council is to exist only for itself. As far as others are concerned, it has no purpose. One person suggested it was "to destroy people's morale". Another 15% believed that the Council exists to encourage trade and business, maintain the status quo, and to make Guildford attractive to those bringing in money. Again, the emphasis moves away from the traditional normative position to one in which the local authority is seen as giving a disproportionate amount of attention to specific sections of the community.

The findings above, and the conclusions of Chapter 7, show us that far from being seen as a disinterested body of town burghers, Guildford Borough Council, like any other group, is perceived by residents to have its own interests and pursue its own ideology. The ideology, according to residents, is one of economic growth, involving the continuous encouragement of more shops and offices to be established in the town. While such an objective is laudable, residents felt
that they were very much at the blunt end of the policy, absorbing most of the costs without reaping the benefits.

THEORETICAL ISSUES

Central Government and Local Politics

There is a tradition within the writings on British local government (cf. Dearlove 1973, pp. 11-21) that local authorities are the administrative wing of central government. From this it might be argued that local government is hardly worthy of study, except in organisational terms, because to understand the actions of local government one has only to understand the prevailing policies and principles of central government. As Clarke writes, "Local government is the application of those principles to the peculiarities of local fact" (1969, p.1). Two arguments are put forward to support this position. Firstly, local authorities depend increasingly on central government financial support. Seventy per cent of a local authority's income and eighty per cent of its expenditure is out of its own control. The second argument focusses on the desire by central government to ensure a minimum standard both quantitatively and qualitatively of public services. Therefore, Parliamentary Acts and Ministerial circulars emanate daily from Whitehall to control local government services and maintain equality of provision throughout Britain.

But Dearlove (op.cit) provides considerable evidence to suggest that, rather than being passive victims of central government directives, local authorities initiate and maintain their own policies often directly in opposition to the wishes of the national government. The Clay Cross Council saga provides an obvious if exceptional example. Aside from areas where there is a statutory duty upon local authorities to do the will of central government, the word coming down from Whitehall is often in the form of advice or guidance to which local authorities can choose to respond or not, and which is rarely backed up by sanction.

In many ways the 'agency' approach towards local government is the product of seeing local government simply as the provider of services. Much that local
government does, however, is purely political in the sense that it is enabling or obstructive. The policies it creates and the decisions it takes may draw upon its own resources in only a minor way (e.g. the administrative costs of processing planning applications). Nevertheless the decisions taken are crucial as they distribute and redistribute urban resources and capital throughout space. The decision to allow office development in preference to factory or leisure developments is a political one which may only be minimally influenced or determined by central government. The policies created and maintained by local authorities are therefore important, spatially distinct and worthy of examination.

**Ideology and the Social Construction of Reality**

The study of the policies and principles of local government raises a number of interesting questions. It was impressed upon me by a number of councillors interviewed that they considered themselves to be the representatives of all their electorate; that is, once the elections are over, party differences are forgotten and the Council acts on behalf of everyone regardless of political persuasion. At the individual level this is likely to be true: a councillor will attempt to help any individual with a particular difficulty. However, at the collective level, this cannot be the case for otherwise there would clearly be no need for political parties; and the criteria for election would be personality-based rather than interest-based. While the elected member singularly seeks to represent the individual, when he becomes part of a collective body within the Council he represents certain interests, ideologies and particular views of the world. He sees that he has been elected as the advocate of those ideologies.

Such a perspective is supported by Uli Windisch who writes, "Elements of ideological nature always and inevitably underlie all collective action. Without an ideological argument or point of reference, neither collective action nor political or social mobilisation exists. Ideology is the element which acts as a mediator for the desires, aspirations and plans of social groups. How can one conceive of collective mobilisation without ideological arguments?" (1978, p.205).

Furthermore, it is important to remember that an ideology always exists in relation to the social reality in which it appears. As Windisch goes on to maintain,
despite existing in relation to that reality, it nonetheless reconstructs, transforms, corrects and rectifies that reality. In Chapter 7 the social reality of councillors and residents with respect to the environmental problems of Friary Ward was assessed, using the coorientational model. In analysing coorientational accuracy it was found that the residents were not accurate at predicting the concerns of councillors and neither were their perceptions of councillors' concerns congruent with their own cognitions. Residents took the perspective that councillors were concerned overwhelmingly with the economic growth of Guildford, regardless of the environmentally detrimental consequences for the inner-town areas.

The evidence presented above suggests that, although the residents are coorientationally inaccurate in predicting the concerns of councillors, when their perceptions are measured against a critical analysis of Council policy, their interpretation of Council activity appears to be reasonable. Critics of the coorientation model have argued that the model reduces conflict to a question simply of communication. While a strict adherence to the coorientation model might well lend one to take the analysis simply to the point of identifying misunderstandings and communication blockages, it is possible to see coorientation as a means of highlighting value and ideological differences between groups, provided the coorientational analysis is reinforced by supplementary forms of analysis.

If the coorientational findings are to be accepted at face level, then the implications for participation are that the communication channels between residents and the Council need only be improved for the differences to be resolved. However, it will be argued in the next chapter that it is necessary to introduce an ideological element into the discussion because one can only see the differential success of the Friary Ward Residents' Association in terms of ideological conflict which has not been ameliorated by the facilitation of communication between the two groups.

Arbiter and Arena Theories of Government

There is one further aspect of Council policy-making which bears examination. If councillors abandon party differences on election, then the claim that councils
are the unbiased arbiters of urban conflicts could be sustained. However, it has already been argued that councils are far from being the puppets of central government and have considerable scope to form their own policies based on preferred outcomes, interests and perspectives on the world. Furthermore, it is not the case that politics are abandoned as soon as the Returning Officer declares the election results.

It is important to understand the role and position of local government in urban conflicts. There is a tendency to assume that local government sits as neutral arbiter in disputes between groups. The logic of the argument is that, as government takes the decisions, it is unthinkable that it could be biased in any way. Like judges, it listens to the evidence put forward by the interested parties and then makes a decision based on that evidence. The legal analogy is particularly apt as many political conflicts are solved by legal means (Dobbelstein and Geller, 1975). The function of local government according to an arbiter theory of government is to draw up the ground rules for the conflict, paying particular attention to issues such as which groups and what modes of action are legitimate, and ensuring the enforcement of the rules.

However, a more radical and clearly more satisfactory model of the operation of government is provided by 'arena theory' (Lively, 1978, pp.194-200). In this the government has an equivalent status to any other group in inter-group conflict; in other words, the government is seen as an interest group like any other. In the context of the discussion over the last few pages this would appear to be a more realistic perspective. To these arguments might be added the observation that the State is intervening more extensively and critically over the complete spectrum of urban, social, political and economic activities. But the State intervenes not only as a judge, but as a provider and user, and therefore becomes an interested party like any other. Furthermore, local government is not composed of disinterested individuals divorced from the socio-economic context in which they make decisions. Many of them represent, or have an interest in, those very activities for which they are taking decisions. Although the decisions are taken by politicians, as Lively points out, "........ they are the end products of a process in which politicians are merely one group of political actors in a contest with other political actors." (1978, p.191).
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The accuracy/reality dilemma identified in Chapter 7 is resolved in this chapter. Although the residents are coorientationally inaccurate in predicting the concerns of the elected members, when their perceptions are measured against a critical analysis of Council policy, the residents' interpretations of the councillors' priorities appear to be relatively accurate. Therefore, while the residents' images and interpretations of Council activity are to some extent distorted, they do contain a considerable amount of truth.

The case study of the Friary Development Scheme is used to illustrate how an ideology of economic growth propagated by Guildford Borough Council is actually made manifest. Other examples are provided in Chapter 9. In the case of the Friary Scheme, negotiations by the Council with MEPC were rarely directed towards providing real benefits for the people of Guildford, except in the dubious form of more shops and offices. There is every reason to believe that Guildford Borough Council wanted to see the site developed as quickly as possible in order to hasten the financial returns for both themselves and MEPC. Consequently, one is led to conclude along with Lively that "... public benefits are not the object but a by-product of entrepreneurial actions." (op.cit., p.195).

Apart from illustrating forcefully that local Councils are far from altruistic organisations, the history of the Friary Development Scheme also tells us something very important about the relationship between itself and other interest groups, especially those whose interests they see themselves supporting. In the protracted negotiations over the Friary site, the Council lost control of the situation. When pitched against a transnational company such as MEPC the Council did not possess the expertise, experience or resources and were soon out of their depth. It is arguable that, in their eagerness to engender more economic growth and capital expansion, the Council was hoisted with its own petard.

While central government is in a position to control the activities of local authorities by means of financial sanctions, local authorities should not be seen to be simply agents of Whitehall. Councils can and do create their own policies which are determined by the political persuasions of the dominating party. Although
councillors represent all their electorate at an individual level, this cannot be the case at a collective level. Councillors see themselves as being elected as the advocates of particular interests and ideologies, and it is this which determines decision and policy-making and maintenance. Finally, it was agreed that an arbiter theory of government which is commonly assumed in pluralist writings provides an unsatisfactory explanation of the relationship between local government and the various interest groups in society. Given the nature of the conclusions immediately above, it is not unreasonable to suggest that local government is an interest group like any other, partly because it is composed of fallible individuals who support and promote particular ideologies and interests themselves, but also because it is a provider and user itself of a wide range of urban social, political and economic services.

In the context of the arguments put forward above it is concluded that although the Council is elected by an electorate which shares its world, the Council's interpretation of that world differs from this particular group of residents. As was argued in Chapter 2, the ideology which is created out of the Council's social reality is dependent upon the vested interests which the same Council sees itself serving. These interests are seen by residents to fall into three categories: commercial; rural; and the Council itself. Three pieces of evidence support the assertion made by residents. Firstly, a critical analysis of Council policy (presented in this and the next chapter) concludes that Guildford Borough Council actively supports and promotes an ideology of commercial expansion. Secondly, the strength and importance of the rural influence was highlighted in Chapter 6. It should be noted, however, that within a borough such as Guildford where the dominance of the controlling Conservative Party is so great, there is some difficulty in disaggregating the rural influence from the Conservative influence. Finally, a number of logically and politically coherent arguments are put forward in this chapter supporting the notion that the Council, amongst others, serves its own interests.

The importance of each of these interests lies not just within themselves, or in the obvious direct effect they have on political decision-making. It
will become apparent in the next chapter that interests and ideology are important factors in determining not only the success of participation but also how much participation is allowed and what form that participation takes.
Footnote

(1) According to Lively, the logical answer to the question 'What interests do politicians serve', and 'what groups do they represent?' is their own interests and themselves; "... the traditional answers of the general interest and the whole community are theoretically unavailable since there is no general interest that can be set against group interests and since the pluralist depiction of the electoral process precludes the possibility of politicians acting habitually in this way" (1978, p.195). Lively goes on to argue that the interests they serve are their own, with their concern being essentially to accede to or hold office. "In the political as in the economic market, public benefits are not the object but a by-product of entrepreneurial actions." (ibid).
It should be as it is ".... in the Army. You have got to have Generals and Privates. Privates work through companies, companies through battalions - you have a strict hierarchy. I think you should go through a chain of command, otherwise you just have a rabble. You must have responsibility. I think all this that the people want participation is a lot of cock. All they want to do is complain. They want public participation but they don't want the responsibility for it."

Guildford Borough Councillor
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INTRODUCTION

With the growth of interest in and practical experience of planning participation exercises over the last decade, there has been a parallel development in academic studies of participation. Unfortunately, this trend has often been matched by a tendency to ignore the different urban contexts in which participation takes place, the objectives and purpose of participation, and a number of other questions which participation raises. It is often assumed that the purpose of participation is obvious and can therefore remain undefined or ill-defined. Many participation studies are replete with assumptions which remain unchallenged and reveal the concept to be problematic. Furthermore, its application will not be solved by the development and proliferation of 'techniques'. The emphasis in the literature on techniques and means of communication reduces a political issue to one of technology (Skeffington, 1969; Fagence, 1977; Sewell and Coppock, 1977). Sewell and Coppock argue that "the level and form of public participation will hinge in part on the answers to six critical questions." These are: "who should participate? Who is likely to participate? How much participation is possible and desirable? On what issues and at what stages in decision-making is public participation desirable? What weight should be attached to the views of well-organised, articulate interest groups as against the views of the unorganised public? How can meaningful views on regional and national issues be obtained?" (op.cit., pp.7-11). These are critical questions, but only after a number of other questions, which Sewell and Coppock take for granted, have been confronted. For example: who is to decide these issues? What is the role of the State? How much participation is allowed? Is it possible to reconcile the conflicts inherent in the simultaneous existence of representative and participatory democracy?

Fagence finds it distressing "particularly from the viewpoint of the participation, and the students of the subject (that there is a) lack of consensus on the definition of participation." (1977, p7). One can understand his concern. Cole, for example, sees participation as a product of two schools of academic thought: the sociological, which concentrates on the loss of community in society as a whole; and the political, which has
focused on the effects of non-participation on the individual's psychological and educational development (1974, p.2). Participation has been seen by some as a problem of administrative organisation and therefore changes can be effected by organisational solutions focusing on the employment of "specialists who have included psychologists, sociologists and geographers" (Sewell and Coppock, 1977, p.5). Strauss argues that participation, however defined, is simply a means of reducing power differences (1963).

Three Assumptions and the Nature of Intergroup Relations

Clearly there is a need for tougher thinking on the nature of the reasons for and the purpose of participation. Discussions I have had with those who have been working in the field of participation (planners, politicians, geographers, political scientists) reveal that many now consider the subject passé. The "suck it and see" approach left for many a nasty taste in the mouth. Stormy public meetings counterbalanced by apathetic responses to surveys have resulted in many practising planners believing that participation exercises are just not worthwhile. However, the success of participation cannot be understood without a clear conception of its function. In this chapter, three major assumptions, often made by writers and politicians as to why there is a demand for participation, are examined in relation to the attitudes and activities of the members and non-members of the Friary Ward Residents' Association and the elected members and officers of Guildford Borough Council.

The three assumptions are that:

1. The participatory demands of residents' groups are issue-specific.
2. The demand for participation is a demand for the improvement of public services
3. The demand for participation is a demand for the decentralisation of decision-making

It should be stressed that these are not the only assumptions found in participation studies. One common criticism of participation voiced by politicians and planners as well as academics (Kohl, 1975; Sills, 1975; Hendee, 1977) is that those who participate are rarely representative of the
community as a whole. More specifically, it has been suggested that participation is one further means by which an articulate middle-class population can influence government decision-making in their favour. Even in predominantly working-class areas, it is argued, community groups are dominated by the middle-class sections of the population.

Each of these assumptions is worthy of examination. However, I have selected the above three as being representative of the type of assumptions found in participation studies. The Friary Ward Residents' Association is not atypical in either its nature or activities, and therefore provides a highly suitable vehicle for testing the validity of these assumptions. It must be emphasised that the assumptions are tested against the activities of a residents' association. The conclusions cannot necessarily be applied to other types of participating groups such as a tenants' association or an amenity/conservation group, whose objectives and support might be very different.

The final section of this chapter examines the intergroup relationships in participation, focusing in particular on the political and ideological determinants of those relationships, and the consequences of these relations for the success of participatory strategies adopted by groups such as FWRA.

THE PARTICIPATORY DEMANDS OF RESIDENTS' GROUPS ARE ISSUE-SPECIFIC: INTRODUCTION

This first assumption claims that groups such as those found participating in urban planning arise in response to a single, environmental issue (Blackhall, undated; Sewell and Coppock, 1977, p.7). The examples cited are groups formed in response to road or redevelopment proposals. This may be the case for certain types of groups (e.g. action groups) whose history is often short, but is not valid for all groups.

Downs even goes to the lengths of justifying such an hypothesis by formulating a model which he calls the "issue-attention cycle" (1972). Five stages are identified: (1) pre-problem, (2) alarmed discovery - euphoric enthusiasm, (3) realisation of cost of significant progress, (4) gradual decline of intense public interest, (5) post-problem stage. While such a model may on first inspection appear to provide a useful classification of the stages through which public interest and activism passes, it raises more questions than it answers. Apart from building group failure
into the model, it cannot take into account those individuals and groups who engage in participation because they believe it is an efficacious and democratic act in itself. If costs and benefits, winning and losing, were the prime consideration for groups, then it is doubtful whether participatory activity would extend much beyond the single-issue. But for many, participation is a principle - a belief that it creates an inherently more equitable form of decision-making.

The issue-specific argument is borne out of a reductionist rationale (cf. Chapter 2) for political behaviour. It reduces what for many is an ideological activity into an attempt to secure personal environmental benefits. Milbrath provides the type of psychological explanation that would typically be used in political psychology to support such arguments. As a need is satisfied and a drive reduced, "the behaviour ceases until new need for expressive consumption arises." (Milbrath, 1965, p.12)

THE DEMAND FOR PARTICIPATION IS A DEMAND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES: INTRODUCTION

The third assumption might be called the consumer perspective, and can be dealt with briefly. It treats participation as another aspect of consumerism and assumes that people participate in order to bring about an improvement in the provision of public services (Aleshire, 1969; Eisinger, 1972). The following quotation from Sewell and Coppock can be interpreted as an example of participation as consumer protection: "It is neither useful nor possible to consult every individual on every issue that may interest him. The challenge is to find the array of issues where inputs from legitimate interests would lead to higher levels of social satisfaction." (op.cit., p.8).

Such participation would involve complaining about the existing provision of services (e.g. inadequate refuse collection) or petitioning for the introduction of new services (e.g. extension of library opening hours). Ratepayers' associations can be grouped into this category as their raison d'être is often one of pressurising local government to reduce, improve or expand services with no change or preferably a reduction in the rates. Their goal is ultimately economic rather than democratic.
This is one of the most common statements to be found in the participation literature and takes two forms. It is assumed from the outset that residents' groups principally desire the decentralisation of decision-making power to the neighbourhood level. It is rarely questioned as to whether improved communication, for example between the government and the public, would satisfy the 'discontent'.

Group activity is interpreted in terms of ladders or scales of increasing power, regardless of whether the individuals or groups see themselves on such ladders. For example, Yates (1972) sees participatory activity ordered in terms of increasing local autonomy and power "from stationing officials in neighbourhoods to giving neighbourhood control over fiscal resources."

Arnstein's (1969) famous "ladder of participation" has eight rungs ranging from manipulation to citizen control. Fagence uncritically accepts Arnstein's premises when he writes that in categorising citizen participation as citizen power, Arnstein reveals "the central issue of the participation debate, viz the locus operandi of power to bring about or forestall change." (op. cit., p.122). Power may be the central issue of the participation debate as far as outsiders such as academics are concerned and the ladder provides an appropriate classificatory schema of such activity. But such a schemata may not help us to understand why urban residents wish to participate. Participation may be about power, but it may also be about a number of other issues.

The conflict between the different perspectives of those who participate and those who write about participation is well illustrated by a quote from O'Riordan. "The demand for participation is ultimately a demand for some sharing of power. Even at the conceptualising stage, the actively committed citizenry are not entirely altruistic in their motives. They wish to shape the destiny of their community to conform to a pattern which they would like to see." (O'Riordan, 1977, p.165). But have such activists ever said otherwise?

It was suggested in Chapter 2 that the demand for participation may
reflect a desire by citizens solely to be better informed about government
decision-making. One can well imagine many situations, similar to Paris' residents' meeting (1979), where conflict between residents and the local
authority is not just a question of communication, although in this particular
case it was defined as such by the Planning Department. However, there may
be some instances where conflict is the product of poor communication and
misunderstanding. Even when it is not, it does not preclude the possibility
of defining participatory behaviour by criteria other than community control.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN PARTICIPATION: INTRODUCTION

It was suggested at the beginning of this chapter that the majority of
studies on participation have avoided such critical questions as: What is the
purpose of participation? How much participation is to be allowed? This
final section seeks to critically assess the nature and success of participation
in Guildford. Before constructing the framework for such an assessment, it
is useful to examine briefly the origins of participation in this country for the
questions it poses concerning the objectives of participation.

Origins of Participation

The temporal origins of popular participation can be traced back to the
eighteenth century (Thompson, 1968; Wootton, 1975) if not before (Cohn, 1970).
Public participation in planning can be dated at least to 1846 when twenty-
seven men in South Devon formed the Sidmouth Improvement Committee "for
the purpose of proposing plans for the general improvement of the place ...."
(Barker, 1976, p.19). However, one has to wait until the middle of the
twentieth century for government endorsement of participation (Town and

The real springboard for participatory activity in Europe came in the
latter half of the 1960's (Nelkin, 1977; Chamberlayne, 1978). The years
1968/69 are significant in this country. The enabling legislation which made
public participation an integral part of the planning machinery at both local and structure plan level was passed in 1968 (Town and Country Planning Act). People and Planning (The Skeffington Report, 1969) was the first government publication to advise local authorities how they might encourage the active participation of the public "at the formative stage in the making of development plans for the area." (op.cit., p.1). Since that date a considerable amount of research has been undertaken on participation, often sponsored by the government; while on the other side of the fence, public interest has grown and community groups have proliferated.

There is some dispute as to the intellectual origins of contemporary participatory activity, fuelled in part by the varying emphasis given to its temporal origins (either an historically well-established populist social movement or the product of recent government initiatives). Three major sources have been identified. Firstly, it is seen as a grass roots reaction to the increased planning in and of society and the supposedly increased alienation felt by individuals to the centralisation of decision-making (Lemon, 1974; Gyford, 1977; Nelkin, 1977; Sewell and Coppock, 1977). Probably the majority of writers subscribe to this view. Cole, however, suggests an alternative source: "Before it became public policy", participation "like much social legislation, was associated principally with the academic and intellectual community" (1974, p.2), an opinion shared by Groombridge (1972, p.58). A third view is that the inspiration for participation came from central and local government (Paris, 1979), which have positively encouraged and in many cases sponsored participation. Chamberlayne (1978) argues that it has been seen by central government as a means of improving local government in a number of areas: the breakdown of communication between local councils and their public; the inefficiency of services; the failure to respond to new problems and the upsurge of protest over plans from specific sections of the public.

Four Perspectives on Participation

The origins of participation beg certain questions concerning its function.
If participation originated through popular action, then its objectives might be very different from those of a movement introduced and fostered by government. For example, a populist origin may suggest the participation debate is concerned with the decentralisation of decision-making. Government may see participation as a form of consumer protection, token decentralisation or even manipulation. Obviously, each origin is not mutually exclusive and it might be argued that the statutory introduction of participation was solely a reaction to and affirmation of a developing social movement. The simultaneous desire for participation by both planners and planned, government and governed appears at first paradoxical, but may be explained by examining the different political ends each saw it serving.

Paris (1979) usefully divides participation into four 'perspectives' which might be seen to reflect the different rationales that liberals, radicals and government give for adopting and explaining participatory structures. The first two perspectives are derived from a pluralist critique of society (cf. Chapter 2). Pluralism allows for participation but the right of decision-making rests firmly with the government who are seen as neutral arbiters above the claims of competing interest groups.

**Co-operation**

The first perspective emphasises that the role of interest groups is to co-operate with government and to assist it with its decision-making. Such a stance obviously lays great emphasis on techniques, as the role of interest groups is to input information into the decision-making machinery so that decisions can be made more efficiently and effectively. Of course, for the system to operate properly conflict will be reduced to a minimum and decisions will be the product of a negotiated consensus. Skeffington reflects such a perspective. "... one cannot leave all the problems to one's representatives. They need some help in reaching the right decision, and opportunity should be provided for discussions with all those involved." (op. cit., para. 7).

**Concession**

The second pluralist position suggests that through grass-roots pressure, interest groups have forced local government to be subject to outside
influence. Participation in this instance must be regarded as a concession from the government, because it is the government who holds the power and takes the decision to allow groups outside to engage in political persuasion.

Incorporation

In contradistinction to the liberal-pluralist perspectives, Paris suggests there are two radical perspectives on participation - those of incorporation and control. However, before these two radical perspectives can be understood, and Paris does not specify this condition, one has also to alter quite dramatically one's theory of the State. Within a pluralist philosophy the State exists as a body, ipso facto; it is an object which 'sits above' the people and acts as an arbitrator between the competing claims of interest-groups. It courts neither allegiance nor favour. However, it was suggested in the previous chapter (Chapter 8) that the State can be conceptualised as an interest group with its own ideology, competing for influence and power like any other group. Saunders maintains that the State is not a 'thing' as suggested by pluralists, but rather a relation (1979). A Marxist analysis, for example, would inform us that it is a relation between those in government and the dominant class interests, such as those representing urban finance capital. Consequently, it would be argued, State intervention in social movements is necessary to maintain the position of the State. Two radical interpretations of participation can now be made. The first suggests that grass-roots demands are not so much concessions but rather a means of incorporation; popular protest sucked in and redefined by those in power so that the aspirations and demands of interest groups are transformed and made congruent with those of the prevailing State ethos.

Control

The final perspective offered is most forcefully expressed by Cockburn (1977). In this, participation is sponsored by government as a means of control. In the late 1960's, while genuflections were made towards increasing public participation in a wide variety of government services, such as planning, education, health and social services, there was a parallel movement towards 'corporate management'. As Cockburn asks "Do corporate management and
community development pull in opposite directions - or are they the tough and the tender aspects of one principle: management?" (ibid, p.2).

Rather than a decentralisation of power, participation is seen by the State as a means of control. Such a perspective requires that the initiative and maintenance of participation rests firmly with the local authority. However, it becomes difficult to use such a rationale when the initiative and maintenance of participation lies with sections of the public. Such a criticism does not necessarily invalidate Cockburn's critique of participation in Lambeth, but rather points to the importance of examining the context in which such sponsorship occurs.

At the time of Cockburn's study, Lambeth Council was securely under the control of the Labour Party. As Cockburn herself states, there is an assumption generally made that the Labour Party represents the true interests of the working-class and that, when the Labour Party is in power, this is synonymous with popular power. There is thus an expectation that the Labour Party will democratise public institutions and make them more accountable, democratic and responsive to public demands. In Lambeth, neighbourhood councils and their advice centres were established in addition to a Consumer Advice Centre, Citizens Advice Bureau, Community Law Centre and Town Planning Advice Centre - all of which were sponsored by the Borough Council. Lambeth Council also supported a Community Relations Committee, wary as it was of racial strife. It might be argued that the Labour Party found it necessary in the light of these expectations to sponsor such participatory organisations. As to whether such sponsorship was also seen as a means of controlling the public is a different question, although from Cockburn's evidence, this would certainly appear to be the case.

Further studies should provide evidence as to whether such expectations are held in other staunch Labour-controlled districts. Chamberlayne's examination of participation in four London Boroughs (1978) suggests that in some cases they are. Islington, for example, set up a variety of participatory and advice bodies. Furthermore, her study in Newham and interviews carried out by myself in other Labour-controlled authorities suggest that participation is used as a means of control; many Labour councillors are antipathetic to participatory ideals, preferring strong centralist control in...
order to ensure the dominance of the Party line.

THE PARTICIPATORY DEMANDS OF RESIDENTS' GROUPS ARE
ISSUE SPECIFIC

It was suggested at the beginning of this chapter that interest groups arise in response to single, environmental issues. Their history is short and their life-span is determined by their effectiveness or success in pressing their demands. While such a conclusion is undoubtedly correct in some cases, it is by no means universal. The history of some participatory groups, such as FWRA, reflects a complex evolutionary process which parallels neither in development nor outcome the process model put forward by Downs (op.cit).

1968 - 1974

The concerns of FWRA are many and various and have been since its inception in 1968. The assumption that interest groups arise in response to one particular issue and then decline is found not only in much of the participation literature but amongst politicians and planners. In my interviews with both groups, it was alleged that the FWRA was formed solely to fight the proposed Church Road Link Road (later to become, through pressure from FWRA, the College Road Link). Furthermore, it was suggested that, after that particular battle, the then chairman of FWRA, Mrs. Dorothy Welfare, resigned and left the area. It was said by one councillor that she was a "professional trouble-maker".

Mrs. Welfare and a number of others on the early FWRA committee were concerned with the way the Ward, in their eyes, was physically deteriorating, and what she described as the unconcerned attitude of the Council to this deterioration. Indeed, the Council was seen as instrumental in its decline, by reason of the various activities which were taking place. In many cases the committee were concerned that it was neither informed nor consulted about the Council's plans. The Residents' Association was formed in order to have a greater say in the future planning of the Ward. It was not formed
solely to protest at the Church Road Link, as it was in existence before the plans became public. FWRA's remit in the early days was broad, ranging from giving assistance to flood victims, initiating petitions to the Council for a reduction in the rates because of the "noise, filth and vibration" along the residential roads to organising a public meeting to which officers and councillors were invited to answer questions from the residents. The Church Road issue emerged at the end of 1968 when the FWRA wrote to the Council requesting information on the road proposals for the area. In 1969, the proposals were widely discussed and became the basis of some acrimonious correspondence between the Residents' Association and the Council. A number of councillors still remembered this in 1976, charging FWRA with the responsibility for causing delays and altering the route.

However, the Residents' Association did not decline immediately after they had won their battle with the Council. FWRA was a broadly based association concerned with the whole Ward, which was reflected in the twenty-two committee members and helpers living in all parts of the Ward who formed the Association's workforce. In 1970 the Association played a part in the participation exercise organised by the Council in connection with the declaration of the Stoke Fields GIA. It continued to function for several years after 1970 and then became moribund with just one General Meeting a year. In 1974, largely through the efforts of a young Polytechnic lecturer who had recently moved into the Ward, it was revived.

1975 - 1979

I have observed the Association closely since its re-formation, and it has continued to focus on all aspects of planning and housing in the Ward. The major campaigns and issues which it has taken up have been for the introduction of a residents' parking scheme, the halting of office expansion into the residential areas, concern with the Friary Development site, and the new and widened roads through the Ward and general environmental improvements. Such issues necessarily affect everyone and therefore cannot be said to reflect the sectional interests of one section of the population or the committee alone.
The Residents' Association is currently seeking Parish Council status, which can be seen as an attempt to expand its democratic and representative role and extend local influence over Ward planning.

DISCUSSION

There were a number of times when FWRA could have drifted into obscurity or even out of existence. In many ways, what emerges as a more interesting question than why groups decline is how do groups survive, especially those such as FWRA, which have been in existence for ten years or more? One answer to this is that the activists in such groups believe that the residents should have a greater part to play in Ward planning. Participation is seen to be something more than just one issue; it becomes part of a political ideology, at the centre of which is a belief that everyone should have the opportunity to play a part in shaping their environment. This is the subject of the next section. One of the problems with the issue-specific argument is that it ignores the ideological component which for many participatory groups is an important motivational force behind their continued existence.

It would be misleading to ignore the fact that some groups are issue-specific and do not last long. Indeed, one such group was formed in Friary Ward to campaign against the continued use of a particular road as a short cut for traffic from outside the area. The Markenfield Road Action Group printed posters and tried to organise a street demonstration at which it was intended to block the road by a continuous stream of pedestrians crossing from one side to the other. However, the police persuaded the group to hold their protest in a pub car park which fronts onto the road. In return the police undertook to look jointly with the highway authority into the possibility of creating a cul-de-sac or instituting weight restrictions on its use. Nothing came of this. Despite the fact that "a spokesman for the residents said protests were only just beginning" (Surrey Daily Advertiser, date unknown), the Action Group was a spent force within months. However, its demise was more complex than the Downs issue-attention cycle suggests. Firstly,
the Action Group decided to join forces with FWRA in the belief that strength in numbers would lead to enhanced effectiveness. It was made clear to the Action Group that road alterations could not be considered in isolation from environmental improvements in the GIA and the future road planning programme for this part of Guildford. Therefore, to team up with FWRA, which represented the whole Ward and was concerned with similar issues in other roads, would strengthen their position.

Secondly, the decline of the Action Group as an autonomous body came about not simply because it achieved no success, but because it was led to believe that the police and the local authority would "do something" about their demands. The Action Group did not appreciate that any traffic improvements in Markenfield Road would be contingent upon other major road improvements. Therefore, the solution to their particular problem could only be conceived of in the long term, whereas the group was looking for, and became dispirited with, the lack of short-term improvements. But the police tried (successfully) to defuse the situation by incorporating their demands and minimising the effectiveness of their protest. Both of these factors contributed to the relatively quick demise of the group.

The conclusion of this section is that, while the history of some participatory groups is short, and the probability of this is increased when the interests of such groups are narrow rather than broadly-based, their decline is not as straightforward as many critics maintain. The Markenfield Road Action Group is testimony to this. As for groups such as FWRA, their history is long though this does not mean that they necessarily achieve continual success in their demands. Often they achieve no result at all in the sense that a campaign has to continue over a period of several years. The issue of residents' parking has been on the agenda of FWRA meetings and the subject of communication with the Council for at least four years. Groups such as FWRA continue to campaign for residents over a wide range of issues, because they believe that they have a right to play a role in the planning of their environment. In Chapter 2 it was argued that explanations of group involvement and participatory activity based on a reductionist stance using reinforcement theory or the satisfaction of needs and drives are not very helpful as they cannot cope with situations where groups are not successful yet their
members continue to seek more participation. The issue-specific criticism is particularly prone to failure in the case of those participatory groups which seek involvement in a wide range of environmental issues and do so because they believe, in however unsophisticated a way, in a participatory approach to decision-making.

THE DEMAND FOR PARTICIPATION IS A DEMAND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES

The third assumption commonly made about participatory groups, especially Residents' Associations, is that they are solely interested in pressurising local government to improve public service provision. Participation becomes synonymous with consumerism and consumer protection.

Survey Results

Residents' views

It is a notable feature of the replies to the questions in the following section that little or no emphasis is placed by the residents on the 'consumer protection' role that the Residents' Association might play. In their answers to such questions as "why should there be more participation", and "why did you join FWRA?" (Tables 9.10; 9.12) none of the residents said that they wanted to pressurise or petition the local authority to provide better services, to reduce the rates or to provide new services. Neither was it seen as the purpose of the FWRA (Table 9.16) to engage in such pursuits. The question then arises - do the practices of FWRA accord with residents' articulated attitudes? Comparatively little attention has been paid by FWRA over the last few years to the 'consumer' aspects of local government. One could well imagine a situation where the majority of an association's contact with the local authority revolved around complaining about the quantity and quality of road sweeping. Such communication has been minimal.

An evaluation of local authority services

A second approach to this issue is to examine the residents' evaluation
of local authority services; in particular noting differences in the evaluations of FWRA members and non-members. It is not assumed in this approach that there is an inconsistency in evaluating services highly but, at the same time, still wishing to see improvements in the provision of those services. Figure 9.1 lists eight services provided by either Guildford Borough Council (arts and recreation; housing; rubbish disposal; car parking; planning) or Surrey County Council (education; highways and transport). "Quality of the environment" is not a service as such but can be regarded as the responsibility of all levels of government.

Residents, councillors and officers were asked to evaluate the provision of each service on a scale of very good (1) to very bad (5) (Figure 9.1). Table 9.1 shows that on only one service do FWRA members evaluate Council services lower than non-members. In seven of the eight categories FWRA members' evaluations are higher, while in three cases they are significantly higher: arts and recreation ($t = 1.63, p < .05$), rubbish disposal ($t = 1.83, p < .03$) and planning ($t = 1.68, p < .05$). It is not being suggested here that as FWRA members' scores are higher, they are satisfied, as if the non-members' scores are the norm or rule against which other groups' scores are measured. FWRA members' scores might be higher yet they still seek improvements. Neither do these results 'prove' that FWRA members do not see participation in consumer terms. However, given the evidence presented earlier and the higher, and in three cases significantly higher, evaluation of local services, this seems unlikely.

It is not the intention here to compare in detail the evaluation of public services by councillors and officers with those of the residents of Friary Ward, as this does not bear significantly on the assumption under examination. However, tables of the statistical analysis carried out on the data are reproduced in Appendices 9.1 - 9.2, as they reveal interesting and significant differences between the residents, the elected members and officers' evaluation of public services.

DISCUSSION

The most convincing evidence for the rejection of this assumption comes
Figure 9.1 Diagrammatic Representation of the Mean Evaluation Scores of Eight Local Authority Services by Non-Members, FWRA Members, Councillors and Officers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 69</td>
<td>n = 56</td>
<td>n = 30</td>
<td>n = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; recreation</td>
<td>mean 2.64</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 0.93</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing provision</td>
<td>mean 3.84</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 0.88</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>mean 2.97</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.04</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish disposal</td>
<td>mean 2.52</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.08</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and transport</td>
<td>mean 3.42</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.77</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>mean 3.42</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.26</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning in general</td>
<td>mean 3.61</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 0.88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the environment</td>
<td>mean 2.82</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean of means:**
- FWRA members: 2.98
- Councillors: 2.32
- Officers: 2.14

**Standard deviation of means:**
- FWRA members: 0.46
- Councillors: 0.53
- Officers: 0.50
from data presented in the last section, and the actual communication FWRA
has had with the local authorities over the past five years. The evaluation of
services data does not in itself provide conclusive evidence on this issue;
however, this data, in conjunction with the other evidence, suggests that if
FWRA members did see participation as a consumer protection measure,
then this element would have been revealed more forcefully in the results.
There is no attempt on my part to make the broad conclusion that participatory
groups are not concerned with public services provision. It is important to
take into account the type of participatory group. Ratepayers' associations
are generally good examples of groups whose remit is largely consumerist
in principle and practice.

It was argued by Sewell and Coppock that the art (or should it be craft?)
of participation lies in finding "the array of issues where inputs from legitimate
interests would lead to higher levels of social satisfaction." (op. cit., p. 8).
Such a view is surely at variance with the participatory ideal. One might
seek participation because it will lead to "higher levels of social satisfaction"
(whatever that is). This reduces participation to a form of marketing analysis.
Instead, one might engage in participatory strategies because of a belief that it
is a more democratic and just form of decision-making. If one goes out to
seek "legitimate interests" (Who defines legitimate? Who or what are
legitimate interests?), then it can never really be participation, because it
is an unequal relationship (cf. concluding comments in the following section in
this chapter on the genetic model and participation). The evidence presented
so far in this chapter supports the notion that FWRA participates
because of its conviction in participation as a democratic value. Consequently,
the consumer approach, as advocated here by Sewell and Coppock, and a
democratic/ideological approach to public participation are antipathetic.

THE DEMAND FOR PARTICIPATION IS A DEMAND FOR THE DE-
CENTRALISATION OF DECISION-MAKING

It was argued at the beginning of this chapter that the assumption made
by some writers that the demand for participation is a demand for the de-
centralisation of decision-making, has rarely been tested. In this section
the assumption is confronted and tested directly with the aid of data collected during questionnaire interviews, and indirectly from a survey carried out on behalf of FWRA (1978) into residents' attitudes towards the establishment of a Parish Council. A further aspect of the decentralisation assumption recalls one of the major questions posed in Chapter I. Rather than wanting the decentralisation of local government, do groups simply wish to be better informed about government decision-making. This issue is addressed in this section (as it is again in Chapter 10).

**Should There be More Participation?**

When residents were asked whether they thought that there is enough participation in planning matters, the overwhelming majority replied negatively (Table 9.2). A similar proportion said that they would like to be able to participate more (Table 9.3). There was little difference between members and non-members of FWRA in their answers to these two questions. A question such as this does not take one particularly far, especially as probably only a small proportion of those desiring more participation actually use the opportunities currently available for participating to the full in environmental planning. But the direction and force of the response might well be indicative of a dissatisfaction between public aspirations and needs and local authority planning provision.

The elected members and officers were asked the slightly different question of whether they thought the public should have more participation in planning matters (Table 9.4). The majority of councillors and officers thought that there should not be more public participation. One of the recurring themes throughout this thesis is what can be termed, the urban/rural difference. This has taken a number of forms, but regardless of its nature it has had a crucial effect on the environmental politics of Guildford. Chapter 6 showed important rural electoral and representational anomalies on Guildford Borough Council. In Chapter 7 it was revealed that rural (and urban) councillors were not very accurate in their attempts to coorientate with the residents of Friary Ward. Given the nature of these findings, the attitude of rural councillors towards participation becomes critical. For example, it might be hypothesised that
Table 9.2 "Do you think that you have enough participation in planning matters?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>FWRA committee</th>
<th>All FWRA</th>
<th>All Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>20 (14.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58 (78%)</td>
<td>39 (76%)</td>
<td>10 (91%)</td>
<td>49 (79%)</td>
<td>107 (78.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/NA</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.3 "Would you like to have greater participation in planning matters?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>FWRA committee</th>
<th>All FWRA</th>
<th>All Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56 (76%)</td>
<td>42 (82%)</td>
<td>10 (91%)</td>
<td>52 (84%)</td>
<td>108 (79.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16 (22%)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>23 (16.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/NA</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4 "Do you think that the public should have greater participation in planning matters?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21 (62%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/NA</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
if some rural councillors found it difficult to coorientate with residents, they might believe it to be worthwhile to foster participation as an aid to their decision-making. The same hypothesis can be applied to the urban councillors. They believed that their environmental cognitions were not congruent with those of the residents: this might encourage them to support more participation.

As can be seen in Table 9.5 there is a marked difference between urban and rural councillors in their attitudes towards more public participation ($X^2 = 6.768, p < .01$). One might trace this to party allegiance, as the majority of rural councillors are members of the Conservative Party. The other party members are grouped to form an opposition in Table 9.6. Again there is a significant difference between the two groups (Fishers Exact, $p = .003$) with only a small percentage of Conservative members in favour of more participation. Returning to the hypotheses posed above: rural councillors believed that they understood well the problems of Friary Ward residents (high congruency) and therefore there would be little need to encourage participation. On the other hand, urban councillors did not believe that they saw the problems similarly to residents (low congruency): this might lead them to support the extension of participation. These are clearly not the only motivations behind councillors' attitudes, and it would also only be speculative to posit a direct causal link between their perceptions of residents' concerns and their attitudes towards participation. Account must also be taken of the Conservative Party members' attitudes towards political control and decision-making, which are the subject of the final section of this chapter.

Modes of Participation

In order to come closer to testing the second assumption, residents were asked what form more participation should take. This was an open-ended question and consequently the obligation lay with residents' to suggest various participatory modes and activities. Respondents could give more than one answer. It can be seen from Table 9.7 that the majority of residents focused on the communicative and consultative function of participation (more
"Do you think that the public should have greater participation in planning matters?"

**Table 9.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban councillors</th>
<th>Rural councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>3 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>15 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19 (79%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.6**

**Table 9.7** "Participation: in what way?" (Residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>FWRA committee</th>
<th>All FWRA</th>
<th>All residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More opportunity to influence Council</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (17%)</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation at policy-making stage</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>6 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Councils</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>12 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in decision-making</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More publicity and information</td>
<td>12 (21%)</td>
<td>11 (26%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
<td>26 (24.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More consultation with local communities</td>
<td>22 (39%)</td>
<td>9 (21%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
<td>36 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means by which views can be put forward</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>6 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properly constituted groups</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **n**                              | **56**      | **42**       | **10**         | **52**   | **108**       |
publicity and information; more consultation with local communities; means of putting views forward). Members and non-members of FWRA lay equal emphasis on this strategy. One felt talking to many residents that they were expressing a certain frustration at not being able to communicate effectively with the Council. Even when residents did complain about something, action was not always taken to remedy the situation. For such residents, action is the most important criterion if participation is to mean anything.

A smaller, but not insignificant number of residents adopted what might be considered a more radical approach. Their response came closer to the assumption being tested in this section. These residents looked towards a greater opportunity to influence decision-making. Their suggestions varied from relatively sophisticated ideas such as the establishment of a Neighbourhood Council and involvement at the policy-making stage, to the more general argument that residents should somehow be 'involved' in decision-making. Two residents in five, even when unprompted, put forward the idea of greater community control over planning decisions affecting the Ward. There was not a substantial difference between the attitudes of FWRA members and non-members to the notion of increased residents' involvement in planning matters, although an examination of Table 9.3 reveals that FWRA members tended to be more in favour of this strategy than did non-members.

As only a third of the elected members said that there should be more public participation, the responses to the question on the ways in which they might participate are necessarily limited (Table 9.8). The majority of the councillors emphasised improvements in communication, rather than the devolution of powers. Three councillors remarked that the public have considerable powers at present under existing legislation, which they rarely use to their potential.

Communication: Passive - Active - Interactive

The emphasis given by residents to the communication aspect of participation not only bears on the assumption being tested in this section, but also to the major research questions discussed in Chapter 1: the demand for participation is as much a demand for the improvement of
Table 9.8  "Participation: in what way?" (Councillors and Local Authority Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Participation</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More opportunity to influence Council</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation at policy-making stage</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Councils</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More publicity and information</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More consultation with local communities</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means by which views can be put forward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups better organised</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By using powers public already possesses</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properly constituted groups</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n 11 6

Table 9.9  Direction of Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of Communication</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>FWRA committee</th>
<th>All FWRA</th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council to public</td>
<td>27 (59%)</td>
<td>14 (45%)</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
<td>20 (49%)</td>
<td>47 (54%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public to Council</td>
<td>17 (37%)</td>
<td>15 (48%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
<td>33 (38%)</td>
<td>7 (64%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Council interaction</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n 46 31 10 41 87 11 6
communication between the public and the planners, as a demand for the decentralisation of decision-making. As a hypothesis this is difficult to 'test' in the orthodox scientific sense, as it is not a straightforward either/or situation: the two demands are not mutually exclusive. At best, one might only explore what residents mean by participation and gauge how much emphasis they give to improved communication between themselves and local government, as opposed to devolved powers. The data in Table 9.7 reveal that considerable emphasis is given to improved communication. The communication element was broken down into three sub-groups in order to reach an enhanced understanding of the different forms of interaction (Table 9.9). The first group emphasised communication primarily from the public to the Council: complaints and petitions to the Council about environmental problems makes up this category. The second sub-group emphasised communication in the opposite direction: respondents maintained that the Council should give more publicity to their plans, provide more information about their future proposals, and carry out surveys to ascertain residents' needs and problems. The final category places emphasis on reciprocal communication where continuous interaction between the local authority and the public is encouraged.

The majority of residents adopted the passive position of suggesting that there should be more communication from the Council to the public (Table 9.9). A small, but by no means insubstantial proportion of residents maintained that the public should be more active in putting forward their observations and opinions to the Council, a view supported by nearly two-thirds of the responding elected members. The most interesting proposition is the last category. Very few respondents from any group said that there should be constant interaction between residents and the local authority. This is perhaps indicative of the progress made in disseminating and applying participatory ideas and practises to the day-to-day running of local government. While interaction may occur on particular participation exercises, few residents (mainly FWRA committee members) and only one councillor said that participation should involve constant interaction. Hampton (1977) too devises a three-fold classification or 'schema' of communication, which bears a close resemblance to the model put forward here. In Hampton's schema, communication techniques can be divided into those concerned with information
dispersal; those concerned with the collection of information; and those concerned with promoting an interaction between planners and the public.

The three modes of communication can be conceptualised not only as a progression from a passive, though active, to an interactive state, but also from a functional to a genetic model of social influence and change (cf. Chapter 2). As can be seen in Table 9.9, the model of influence adopted by the majority of residents accords closely to Moscovici's functional model (cf. Figure 2.1), in which influence or the source/target relationship is hierarchical and the mode passive. For those residents who suggested that there should be more public-to-Council communication a more active stance is being adopted. The interactive mode is clearly the most sophisticated. Presumably such a mode would possess attributes similar to Moscovici's genetic model of social influence and change (op cit). The decreasing numbers falling into the increasingly sophisticated communication modes (and the special nature of those people) suggests that there is a developmental sequence through which participatory concepts of communication grow. This idea is discussed more fully in Chapter 10. The remainder of this section is devoted to an extended discussion of the decentralisation issue, with particular attention being paid to the attitudes and activities of the Friary Ward Residents' Association.

Justifications for Participation

Until now emphasis has been placed upon the communicative function of participation. Support has been given to some form of decentralisation of decision-making, but the evidence has not been particularly convincing. Another way of approaching the decentralisation/communication issue is to ascertain why, as well as whether, people wish to participate. Interestingly, when residents were asked why there should be more participation, the communication aspects were largely ignored and the responses moved markedly towards positions sympathetic to the decentralisation argument.

The residents' responses to the question "Why should there be more public participation in planning?" can readily be divided into two categories, the pragmatic and the classical. (Table 9.10). 'Pragmatic' responses are those where the reasoning centres on the immediate benefits participation may bring; thus residents feel that an increase in participatory practices will
Table 9.10  "Why should there be more public participation in planning?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>FWRA committee</th>
<th>All FWRA</th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People will know what is going on</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>7 (6.5%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public is affected</td>
<td>28 (50%)</td>
<td>27 (64%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>31 (60%)</td>
<td>59 (54.6%)</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less likely to make mistakes</td>
<td>6 (11%)</td>
<td>0 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (7.4%)</td>
<td>8 (7.4%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater degree of social responsibility</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (6.5%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of individuals and communities</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More democratic</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>6 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More accountability</td>
<td>19 (34%)</td>
<td>14 (33%)</td>
<td>7 (70%)</td>
<td>21 (40%)</td>
<td>40 (37%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get environment we want</td>
<td>19 (34%)</td>
<td>9 (21%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (19%)</td>
<td>29 (26.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| n                                           | 56          | 42           | 10             | 52       | 108           | 11          | 6        |
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enable them to exert a greater control over their environment. The 'classical' responses concentrate on more abstract issues such as the greater degree of social responsibility that participation brings, the development of individuals and communities and the more democratic nature of decision-making. It is termed classical as the reasoning accords most closely with classical liberal theorists of participatory democracy (Pateman, 1970).

The 'pragmatic' arguments

The responses of residents fall mainly into the pragmatic category. The three most commonly cited reasons for wanting participation provide empirical support for the three justifications given by Stringer as to why people should wish to participate (1974). It should be stressed that Stringer does not put forward these three justifications with the intention that empirical support should be found for them. They are for him "key-stones to a set of philosophical axioms which are I believe to be of great value in trying to understand human affairs." (ibid, p.185). They are useful in this context, given their philosophical underpinnings, in providing a framework for assessing contemporary pragmatic arguments for increased popular participation.

Stringer argues firstly that individuals are becoming increasingly aware of their personal powers to manipulate their lives and environment, and concomitantly have become increasingly aware of the attempts made by others to do the same. Ironically, the authority of those in power to manipulate is conferred by those whose lives and environments are being manipulated. Over half the residents said that they should be able to participate in planning matters because it is they and not "the planners" who are ultimately affected by the decisions. The argument was often expressed in terms of "no one knows the needs of residents better than the residents themselves"; "councillors don't understand the problems as well as residents" and "cannot appreciate the strength of opinion." The reasoning given here supports the coorientational finding that residents have little faith in the ability of councillors to perceive and understand their problems, even though such a perception is inaccurate. FWRA members were more likely to cite this as a justification for participation than non-members, but even in this case one in every two non-members agreed that, as they were affected by planning decisions, they should participate in
them. Those councillors in favour of more participation gave this, more than any other reason, as a justification.

The second reason given by Stringer is that individuals, in response to the continual changes affecting their lives and environment, are increasingly trying to predict and anticipate the future. A quarter of the residents interviewed said that more participation is desirable because it would ensure a more congruent relationship between their aspirations and the built environment. Friary Ward would become "a better place to live in" and "white elephants .... like the Friary Scheme" would not be built. One resident just said "I've seen Nottingham"; this was the only justification he needed. As an argument for more participation, this wish to anticipate the future was more common amongst non-members. Not one councillor or officer sympathised with this view.

The final argument put forward by Stringer is that each individual has his or her own personal view of the world; it is this which is affected by planning proposals. Empirical support for this justification is provided by just over one-third of the residents, who said that "the Council tend to be a special group having special views." Residents felt that members of the Council don't see the world the same way as they do and only participation would ensure that these views are taken into account. Several residents suggested that participatory decision-making would ensure that there was more accountability. One resident preferred the view that participation would reduce the amount of alienation between the planners and the planned. Both members and non-members of FWRA placed considerable emphasis on this justification for participation, and it formed the second most commonly cited reason for members and equal second for non-members, a view not shared by the elected Council members. The committee members of FWRA give this reason more than any other for wanting participation.

The 'classical' arguments

These three justifications provided the majority of responses from residents (81%). The remaining arguments for more participation were articulated only by a small number of residents, and it is into this category that the 'classical'
justifications fall. A discussion of these findings falls largely outside the present purpose. It is sufficient to say that the responses given in Table 9.10 bear close comparison to the justifications for participation put forward by Rousseau and J. S. Mill: the psychological development of individuals and communities; a greater degree of social responsibility; a more democratic political system (cf. Chapter 2; Pateman, 1970).

The councillors' arguments for supporting more participation reflected their conception of participation as being merely consultation and communication. Just under half the councillors who said that there should be more participation maintained that people simply like to know what is going on, or as one councillor expressed it: "If people are involved, they are less likely to grumble." Another third of the elected members felt that one is less likely to make mistakes with public involvement.

As the history of participation in the Ward lengthens, the classical benefits will, if Rousseau is right, assume greater importance for more people. The type of pragmatic justifications which the majority of residents gave are those which have immediacy and provide the most instant returns. They are, to use Pateman's term, indicative of an individual's own impulses and desires. With time and more participation, the individual should move away from being the private citizen, responding with pragmatic justifications, to the public citizen, responding with the type of classical justifications argued here. It should not, however, be assumed that the classical justifications are the 'right' ones, while the pragmatic reasons are an unimportant stage through which one passes. In some participation studies (e.g. Cole, 1974, p. 129; Fagence, 1977) the 'classical' justifications become normative in that it is assumed that such justifications are, or should be, the reasons for participation. The importance of Stringer's rationale is that the three reasons he gives for participation have a contemporary relevance, are grounded in the everyday lives and perceptions of individuals and are "key-stones to a set of philosophical axioms" which are no less relevant or significant than those of Rousseau or J. S. Mill. The pragmatic through to classical justification of participation (as with the functional through to genetic model of social change) may be an important element in a developmental model of participation.
Within these responses residents give for seeking greater participation the conclusion can be drawn that the assumption fares much better than hitherto: the justification for more participation revolves around the central notion that a greater control over the planning decisions which affect the environment will result in a closer relationship between residents' environmental aspirations and the reality of the built environment.

Participation: The Arguments Against

By contrast to the decentralist arguments put forward by residents in favour of increased participation, the elected members and officers of Guildford Borough Council who maintained that there should not be more participation adopted a position favouring the centralisation of decision-making. Their answers to this question (Table 9.11) can be grouped into two categories.

The first category relates to the efficient functioning of the local authority: participation "delays matters". One elected member said "I don't think you would get anything done if you had people objecting all the time." The emphasis on objecting gives some insight into how many councillors conceptualise participation. The efficiency argument was also expressed in terms of "someone has to take decisions." This is the tough aspect of the management principle (Cockburn, 1977).

The second cluster of arguments deal with the skills and responsibilities of those who work in local government. This takes several forms. Firstly, it is argued that it is the elected members' responsibility to take decisions, that is why they are elected. As one Conservative councillor said of a Liberal member: "Councillor ------ made a song and a dance about public participation in Council and he got a sharp answer. He's there to represent the people and if the people feel they are not being represented, then he's not doing his job. The people who howl for public participation are not keeping their ear close enough to the people." Secondly, it is claimed that planning decisions are technical and therefore require skills and expertise not possessed by the 'average man'. "The public don't have enough information or knowledge", "they don't know the problems" are frequent arguments used by the opponents of participation. One councillor thought that the public should "take the
Table 9.11 "Why should there not be more public participation in planning?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for No Public Involvement</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>FWRA committee</th>
<th>All FWRA</th>
<th>All residents</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delays planning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(71%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample opportunity at present</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups are parochial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors' job</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need professional expertise</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public are negative - only complain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrepresentative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(43%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not worthwhile</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council do enough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too old</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not my concern</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
advice of those who can look further ahead"; while a senior officer in the Housing Department remarked, "I don't think ordinary members of the public realise what life will be like in twenty years' time. I don't think the ordinary public realise what they are trying to question."

Many councillors (and officers) therefore spoke in favour of centralised decision-making. However, some councillors went so far as to speak against decentralisation. Three councillors maintained that residents' groups tend to be parochial and that one needs a broad overview in planning. I asked one rural Conservative councillor what he thought of the idea of Neighbourhood Councils. His reply was "It's no good setting up a load of belly-aching cells where they are all destructive and only there to complain and not do good deeds." I then asked him whether he thought Parish Councils are like this. To this he replied, "In the rural areas you find a slightly different type of person. They are concerned with keeping the area nice." (my emphasis). Presumably this differentiates them from inner urban residents who are concerned with making the area nice.

Joining the Friary Ward Residents' Association

It was shown in Chapter 2 that many writers have taken a reductionist stance in trying to account for why people participate (Lipset, 1960; Crawford and Nadditch, 1970; Gurr, 1970; Berkowitz, 1972). Yet when FWRA members were asked why they joined the Association, there were few individualistic explanations of FWRA membership in terms of personal needs and satisfactions. The majority of respondents explained their actions in terms of the political efficacy of acting through groups (Table 9.12). Just under three-quarters of FWRA members spoke of the political and community reasons for joining such an organisation. Only a third of the members gave what might be considered more personal reasons, suggesting that the reductionist stance taken by many writers needs to be re-evaluated.

When FWRA members were asked why they thought some people did not join the Residents' Association (Table 9.13) interestingly, they did not give the 'opposite' reasons from those that they had given to the earlier question. The respondents resorted to the reductionist position found in the literature.
**Table 9.12**  "Why did you join FWRA?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>FWRA Members</th>
<th>FWRA Committee</th>
<th>All FWRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hope to have greater say in the future of the area</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better to act as a group</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>16 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with its aims</td>
<td>10 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I live here</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's voice needs to be heard</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone to turn to</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ No reply</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.13**  "Why do you think some people do not join FWRA?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>FWRA Members</th>
<th>FWRA Committee</th>
<th>All FWRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't have enough interest in the area</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>16 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too busy</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't want to commit themselves</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No perception of benefits</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynical</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of deference</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathetic</td>
<td>18 (35%)</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
<td>27 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical constraints</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ No reply</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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For example, just over two in every five members said that other residents did not join the Residents' Association because they were "apathetic" or "lazy" and were quite prepared "to let others do the work for them." Twice the proportion of FWRA committee members gave this reason. The other main reason given was that non-joiners "don't have enough interest in the area."

Non-members of FWRA were asked why they had not joined FWRA and why they thought some residents did join the residents' association. The majority of non-members explained why they had not joined largely in terms of ignorance and constraints (Table 9.14). Unlike the FWRA members, who explained their reasons for joining largely in community or political terms, the non-members resorted to a personal if not reductionist analysis.

Non-members were only able to make a limited number of suggestions (often derogatory) as to why some residents joined FWRA (Table 9.15). The majority either said that they did not know, or they did not give a reply. Three out of the four reasons indicated that non-members thought members had something missing from their lives or possessed some form of psychological deficiency. One resident said: "Some people always go to that type of meeting", while others remarked that some people like to get involved and "like to feel useful to the community." There were, however, a number of non-joiners who appreciated that people might join the Residents' Association in response to beliefs and values.

From these results, three conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, the reasons members of FWRA gave for joining were of a different nature both from those reasons members gave for other residents not joining, and from those non-members gave for not joining FWRA. They were also of a different nature from the reasons which non-members suggested residents had for joining. The majority of reasons given by these last three groups were reductionist in that explanations of membership and non-membership were couched in terms of individualistic psychological needs, deficiencies and personality traits. The second conclusion is that the reasons members of FWRA themselves gave for joining the Association were largely ideological - a belief that community and political action by a voluntary group can secure neighbourhood improvements. To a certain extent some non-members were able to step
Table 9.14  "Why have you not joined FWRA?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only lived here a short time</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of time</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't know about it</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven't felt need</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical constraints</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laziness</td>
<td>22 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/No reply</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.15  "Why do you think some people join FWRA?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-interest</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid of approaching anyone themselves</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To put point of view to the Council</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people like to get involved</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/No reply</td>
<td>58 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
outside a reductionist analysis and recognise the ideological basis of group membership. This suggests, and it only represents a tendency, that group membership is seen by many joiners and some non-joiners as an ideological statement. Non-membership is not seen similarly. Thirdly, the evidence above suggests that membership of this particular residents' association is seen as a positive move towards participatory influence and decision-making.

The Aims of the Friary Ward Residents' Association

All the residents were asked what they considered to be the aims and purpose of FWRA, regardless of whether or not they belonged. One reply stood out more than any other as being for many residents the heart of FWRA activity. Just under half of the residents said that the purpose of FWRA was to pressurise on certain issues and "to wield as much influence for the good of the Ward as possible." (Table 9.16). This is an important objective for FWRA members (63%) and one which differentiates them markedly from non-members (35%) \( (X^2 = 10.83, p < .001) \). FWRA members primarily see the Residents' Association as a pressure group whose purpose is to influence the Council in terms of planning policy towards the area and the distribution of resources.

Some of the other 'aims' could be incorporated into the purpose given above, but each of the different responses conveys its own flavour which would be lost by collapsing the data. Only a very small proportion of residents (and FWRA members) see the Association simply as a channel for communication between the local authority and the residents. Except in the case of FWRA's pressure group role, there is very little difference in the perceived aims of FWRA between members and non-members.

The evidence presented so far suggests quite strongly that, for the majority of FWRA members, and a substantial proportion of non-members, participation is about power, decision-making and the right of residents to determine the shape and future of the environment in which they live. The evidence, then, is tending to confirm the assumption being tested in this section. A two-pronged attack, however, was launched to test the truth of this assumption.
Table 9.16 "Do you think you can tell me what you think the aims of FWRA are? That is, what is their purpose?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>FWRA members</th>
<th>FWRA committee</th>
<th>All FWRA</th>
<th>All residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To look after needs of residents</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
<td>18 (13.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate voice for views of residents</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pressurise</td>
<td>26 (35%)</td>
<td>32 (63%)</td>
<td>7 (64%)</td>
<td>39 (63%)</td>
<td>65 (47.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community association</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel of communication</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>7 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research into problems</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure fair play</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
<td>16 (11.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservationist function</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>20 (27%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>23 (16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from direct survey evidence, indirect evidence was obtained from a survey carried out for FWRA into residents' attitudes towards the establishment of a Parish Council for Friary Ward.

A Parish Council for Friary Ward

In June 1978, Friary Ward Residents' Association, in common with other amenity and residents' groups in Guildford, received notification from Guildford Borough Council that it was intending to carry out a review of both the parished and unparished areas in the Borough in accordance with two recent Government Circulars (121/77 and 33/78) and the Report No. 286 of the Boundary Commission. FWRA was invited to submit its comments on whether it would like to see a Parish Council representing the residents' interests.

The Residents' Association felt that it was important to take a wider sample of opinion than was possible through the machinery of the General Meeting, in line with the recommendations of the Boundary Commission's report that inhabitants of areas under review be given adequate opportunity to express their views (op. cit., p. 3 - paras. 2 and 3). It was decided by FWRA to initiate a survey of households in the area to determine the support for the proposal. Twenty-nine per cent of the households in the Ward were interviewed (November 1978); only one third of the respondents were FWRA members. The survey analysis and report is reproduced in full in Appendix 9.3. However, the results, as they bear on the assumption under analysis, are summarised here.

Residents were asked whether they thought the interests of the local community were adequately represented. Opinion here was divided equally (Appendix 9.3, Table 7). However, when the answers to this question are examined in relation to whether or not the residents wished to see a Parish Council in Friary Ward, it is found that over two-thirds (71.7%) of those interviewed who thought that the interests of Friary Ward were represented still wanted to see a Parish Council established. Four in five residents (77.8%) who thought that the interests of the Ward were not represented said they would like a Parish Council in Friary Ward. The desire for a Parish...
Council comes not solely from those who feel that the residents' interests are not represented. One further finding related to this issue is instructive. Just under two-thirds (64.1%) of those who said the interests of the community were not represented were non-FWRA members as compared with only a third (35.9%) of FWRA members. It is primarily the non-members of FWRA who feel that the interests of the Ward are not represented.

Residents were further asked (a) whether they thought there is need for a Parish Council, and (b) whether they personally would like a Parish Council to represent the interests of residents (ibid, Table 9; Table 10). The replies to both of these questions show unequivocally that residents favour the establishment of a Parish Council. Again, the difference in attitude by members and non-members of FWRA to this issue is marginal: with four-fifths of the FWRA membership (80.3%) saying they would like a Parish Council to represent the community's interests, as compared with just under three in every four non-FWRA members (71.5%). Therefore, the support for a Parish Council does not come solely from the members of the Residents' Association; it has the backing of all sections of the community. It was made clear to residents that the establishment of a Parish Council would bring about a rate increase. Nevertheless, a significant proportion of the population (70.5%) still thought it worthwhile (ibid, Table 11).

The results of the Parish Council survey show convincingly that there is widespread support amongst this inner-city population for some decentralisation of decision-making. Such an attitude is found not only among members of the Ward's Residents' Association, a body which one might expect would give its support to such a proposal; it also gains favour among the non-joining sections of the population. A further important observation is that a Parish Council is considered desirable by those people who are satisfied with the current level of representation. The establishment of a third tier of government at a community level is viewed as a right and proper extension of democracy, perhaps leading to a more sensitive reflection and representation of community needs and aspirations.
DISCUSSION

Does the demand for participation represent a demand for the improvement of communication between the local authority and the public, or does it represent a demand for the decentralisation of decision-making powers to the neighbourhood level? It was shown earlier that this is not simply an either/or question. Even if it was, it would be extremely difficult to test in this form. The approach used in this section has been to examine the relative strength of feeling in relation to both of these questions.

Firstly, it must be emphasised as a baseline for subsequent discussion that the majority of residents believed that there should be greater participation in planning. The elected members were not as supportive of the idea, least of all the rural members who, it will be remembered, not only represent areas which have a disproportionate amount of representation on the Council Chamber, but who themselves have a poor coorientational ability in predicting the environmental concerns of inner-city residents.

The evidence in this section points overwhelmingly to the conclusion that residents wish to have greater participation because they would like to have more control over the future planning of the environment. Residents argued that it is only just, as they are the people affected by planning decisions. Furthermore, they suggested that they have a different view of the world, and especially their world, from that of planners and councillors (a conclusion supported by the coorientation data in Chapter 7) and therefore participation would ensure that their views are taken into account. It was also argued by residents that they have views as to what the environment should be like in the future; participation would result in a closer congruence between their aspirations and the future environment. While these views suggest that residents desire more decision-making responsibilities, if not actual control over the future planning of the Ward, they are of course also not inconsistent with an improvement in communication between the public and the Council.

Three main arguments were put forward by the elected members for not extending public participation in planning: It delays matters and is inefficient; those in power possess professional skills and a long experience in planning
matters; groups are parochial. Councillors therefore did see the extension of participation as involving a decentralisation of decision-making. While some councillors were prepared to admit more communication, the overwhelming majority were against an increase in community decision-making. An extension of participation in these terms for councillors exposes more than ever the paradox of the simultaneous existence of participatory and representative democracy. It has been suggested elsewhere that the legitimisation of local participation is a threat to politicians at all levels, as it would in essence remove their legitimacy (Lemon, 1978, p.327).

Much stronger evidence in support of more community power comes from the data collected in answer to the questions of the aims of FWRA and the reasons residents gave for joining the Association. FWRA members see the purpose of the Association as one of pressurising the Council on certain issues and wielding as much influence for the benefit of the Ward as possible. Very little attention is given to FWRA simply fulfilling a communicative role with the local authority. In respect of the reasons residents had for joining the Association, emphasis is given to the sort of advantages that group activity and action brings. The ideological arguments in favour of community action come across forcefully: residents believe that community and political action will secure neighbourhood improvements. Membership of this particular Residents' Association is seen as a move towards participatory influence and community power. The ideological element was totally absent both in the reasons non-members gave for not joining FWRA, and those suggested by members for non-members not joining: reductionist reasoning was adopted by both of these groups.

The most convincing evidence in support of the argument for decentralised community powers comes from the Parish Council survey conducted for FWRA some two years after the author's interviews. Residents gave unequivocal support to the idea of a Parish Council in Friary Ward to represent their interests, even if it were to mean an increase in the rates. Although opinion was equally divided as to whether the interests of residents are adequately represented, over two-thirds of the residents who thought the interests of the Ward were represented still wanted to see a Parish Council established.
Another significant finding was that there was very little difference in attitudes towards the establishment of a Parish Council between FWRA members and non-members. It is desired by both equally.

**INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN PARTICIPATION**

The final section of this chapter examines intergroup relations in participation, focusing in particular on the political and ideological determinants of those relations. This follows on from the discussion of ideology (Chapter 2) and its importance to an understanding of the interests local government seeks to promote and support, and its relation to other interest groups (Chapter 8). In this context, a critical assessment of the function of participation is made, along with an evaluation of the success of the participatory strategies employed by FWRA.

The framework for this analysis is provided by Paris's four 'perspectives' on participation ('co-operation'; 'concession'; 'incorporation'; 'control'). It should be recognised that these four perspectives are not definitive: for example, participatory intergroup relations could be examined from the perspective of degrees of conflict (cf. Kramer, 1969). It was suggested above that the success of participatory exercises cannot be evaluated without looking at the origins of participation and the purpose for which participatory structures were established in this country. The objectives of participation can be expected to vary according to whether one believes that its origins lie in popular action or central government initiatives.

**Origins of the Friary Ward Residents' Association**

The Friary Ward Residents' Association was formed on the 28th October 1968. Consequently it dates from a time when there was an explosion in the growth of community groups. FWRA began its life as a grass-roots organisation. As was shown in the first section, it did not originate through one specific issue, but rather through a growing realisation among residents that change in the Ward was inevitable and imminent, especially after the plethora of planning proposals for the Ward which had been put forward since
1945 (cf. Chapter 5). A group of residents decided that if there should be change, residents should be involved in the decision-making. It is probable that those residents who formed FWRA, like many other people all over the country living in similar urban areas, were becoming increasingly aware of what they could do as members of the public in influencing State and market organisations. To attribute the origin of any association solely to one particular cause (grass-roots activism; intellectual debate; government initiatives) would be erroneous. The individuals who form such groups must consider the efficacy of such action, and such considerations will be, to a limited extent, dependent upon their knowledge of what other individuals and groups have done and said (including government and 'intellectuals') and how successful they have been. The enabling environment in which groups operate is a factor to be considered along with personal and group powers. As, basically, a grass roots organisation FWRA has since its inception remained autonomous, dependent upon the annual subscriptions of its members, and occasional fund-raising events such as jumble sales. It has not been 'sponsored' in any way, unlike some participatory groups found in other studies (Cockburn, 1977) and consequently it has been able to remain independent of the local authority.

From Paris .......

In the remaining pages of this chapter, the success of FWRA in pressing for environmental improvements and halting those planning developments seen to be detrimental to the residential environment will be critically examined using Paris’s four perspectives on participation: co-operation, concession, incorporation and control. The most important point to make at the outset is that FWRA’s activities and success (and failure) cannot be understood within any one particular perspective. One must look to each perspective to explain the differential success and failure of FWRA in different issues at different points in time. The fact that one perspective is not applicable at all times for even one group, let alone a townful, suggests that the nature of the interest group, the nature of the Council and the issues which bring them together must all be taken into account.
The success and failure of participatory groups can still only be understood in the context of Paris's four perspectives, if a further factor is taken into account; the communication style which relates the group to the Council. In this respect John Dearlove makes an extremely useful contribution to the participation debate when he discusses the categorisation of pressure groups in Kensington and Chelsea by councillors as 'helpful' or 'unhelpful' (1973). The success of interest groups in achieving their aims is dependent upon three factors: the worthiness, reliability and helpfulness of the group in the eyes of the Council; the policies the Council feel they should or should not be pursuing; and the style in which interest groups present their requests and demands. Therefore, the acceptability and image of the interest group, the ideology of the Council and the method of communication are crucial factors determining the success of an interest group. It will be seen in the following discussion that, in Guildford too, each of these factors plays an important part in the influence process and that the location of the FWRA in any one of the four perspectives is dependent upon the operation of this categorisation process.

In terms of two of Dearlove's criteria it would not be inaccurate to say that the officers and members of Guildford Borough Council see FWRA as "helpful", gauged by the correspondence between FWRA and the local authority. The Residents' Association has always attempted to make constructive comments when objecting to planning proposals. When objections are made to plans, the Association ascertains why such proposals are being put forward and then, where possible, suggests alternative proposals which are considered more acceptable to the residents. This often involves a considerable amount of research. In one case the chairman of FWRA searched through the literature on cost/benefit analyses to find out whether any studies had been carried out on the economics of residents' parking schemes, an exercise which was not part of his daily work, and which had to be done in his spare time. Councillors put considerable weight on such informed comment and are influenced by "those who know their stuff", despite the fact that one
senior Planning Committee member told me, "You can have a situation where a person may have knowledge to the last detail but at the end does not carry the day because he lacks basic common-sense. And a person can stand up and win because he has the feel of the situation." In supplying objections based on detailed considerations and many hours' work, the FWRA has acquired considerable respect in the Council's eyes. FWRA does not only object to proposals, but actively supports by letter those which are considered to be in the interests of residents.

Secondly, FWRA can be considered helpful in terms of the style in which they communicate their objections and proposals. FWRA have never favoured petitions, street demonstrations or racy headline-catching interviews with the press. Such tactics in Guildford lead to antagonism and failure. The communication between FWRA and the Council is quiet and tends to be at an interpersonal level. The chairman is particularly active in this respect, having frequent meetings with officers of both Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council. FWRA has also had a continuous and positive relationship with the Ward councillors.

It is not the intention of the preceding paragraphs simply to provide an eulogy to FWRA, but to show that FWRA basically 'plays the game' and is considered 'helpful' by the Council. By Dearlove's criteria, FWRA does all it can to present an acceptable face to the Council in order to influence Council decisions and policies. However FWRA can have only minimal influence over the third criterion that Dearlove identifies: the policies the Council believes it should or should not be pursuing. In this instance it is a question of whether the prevailing political ideology of the local authority will either permit or resist policy changes when confronted with FWRA pressure. It will be seen that the ideology of the controlling party is a crucial factor in determining the success of FWRA's attempts to influence policy and decision-making.

**Participation as Co-operation**

There have been many instances when FWRA has actively co-operated
with the local authority by canvassing local opinion on issues and then feeding this information into the decision-making system. For many officers and councillors in the local authority this is participation, although a more accurate description might be consultation. Such activities should not be decried and do play an important role in making residents' views felt. But it is little more than this. Two examples can be given of FWRA co-operation with the Council.

A FWRA car park

Several years ago, before work was started on the College Road link a plot of land which was to be used in the road widening became available through building demolition. As there was to be a time period of over a year between demolition and the road construction, FWRA suggested, and it was accepted, that this land be leased to the FWRA at a low rent for residents' parking. It was the Council's proud claim that this was the first time in Britain such an agreement had been worked out between a Residents' Association and the local authority. Whether or not this is the case, as a scheme it did serve to benefit all concerned: the residents who were ensured of a guaranteed parking space off the road; and the Council who derived some rent from the leasing of the land, not to mention goodwill and the provision of a short-term palliative to a much longer-term deep-rooted problem.

Widening of Stoke Road

The second case of co-operation is of a quite different nature. For over thirty years plans have existed to widen Stoke Road, one of the main roads into the town centre. Periodically the proposals are resuscitated, but then gradually pushed to one side as mounting costs make the scheme prohibitive. In 1978, another plan was produced by Surrey County Council, the focus of which was a complicated traffic management scheme relying on numerous limitations on right-hand turns into and out of Stoke and Woodbridge Roads, road widening in Stoke Road and some property demolition. The residents generally supported the restrictions on right-hand turns into the residential roads despite the inconvenience to themselves, because it would reduce substantially the amount of through-traffic. This it will be remembered, was one of the chief problems articulated by residents in the coorientational
data (Chapter 7). An exhibition was staged illustrating the proposals by means of diagrams, maps and a sophisticated tape-slide programme. The planners were rewarded with a large attendance, but a substantial number of residents (including FWRA) criticised the scheme, especially as it related to Stoke Road. The Guildford Area Partnership Highways Sub-Committee (composed of Borough and County Councillors) too rejected the scheme, partly because of residents' objections and partly because of the out-of-date traffic projections on which the plan was based. The County Council was asked to re-submit the proposals. It has been suggested that the County did not want the Stoke Road part of the scheme implemented for a number of reasons (cost; engineering; and administrative). The residents' objections provided considerable support for a decision they wished to take themselves but felt constrained, through a number of other pressures (environmental; political) from doing so.

Discussion

Co-operation, as a participation strategy, was used for the benefit of the local authority and the residents. In the case of the car park, one can interpret the co-operation as a simple form of exchange. The local authority exchanged the land (which was being used in the short-term) for rent and goodwill. The Stoke Road Scheme represents a more complex form of exchange. In this, it can be argued that the residents did not realise they were co-operating with the Highway Authority: It is rare that transport planners and the public unite in a participation exercise to defeat a road proposal.

Participation as a Concession

The second perspective treats participation as a concession from government. As long as urban community groups have no powers of their own, then it might be thought that such a perspective is necessary if one is to be able to explain the success of participatory group activity. Two examples demonstrate this perspective: the proposal to build a link road between Artillery Terrace and Drummond Road; and the campaign by FWRA to halt the
incursion of office and commercial development into residential areas.

Drummond Road link

The history of a new link road between Drummond Road and Artillery Terrace goes back to the creation of the Stoke Fields GIA in 1969. The purpose of the road was to aid accessibility to Drummond Road, which is classified by the Fire Brigade as a high risk fire area. The transport planners also saw the road as improving internal circulation within the GIA. However, it was not until November 1976 that an application was lodged with Guildford Borough Council by the Highways Department of Surrey County Council for specific planning permission. The Friary Ward Residents' Association submitted a three-page objection to the proposal and, in addition, two alternative proposals to the County Council scheme.

On 29th December, 1976, the Planning Committee of Guildford Borough Council met to discuss FWRA's objection and to decide whether Guildford Borough Council had itself any objection to the proposals. Councillor Basil Banks (Liberal, Holy Trinity) supported FWRA and pointed out to the Committee Chairman that if local residents did not want the scheme, then the other proposals put forward by FWRA should be examined. Three councillors stood up and suggested that the local residents' views should be taken into account. Only one councillor spoke for the County Council scheme. The Planning Committee Chairman overrode the objections of both FWRA and the councillors who supported FWRA and lead the Committee to make no objection to the proposal. The Planning Committee did, however, make two conditions, one of which was that "the County Engineer and the Borough Planning Officer will meet the Friary Ward Residents' Association to explain (my emphasis) the purpose of the proposals before the County Council make a final decision."

From both FWRA's objection and the Committee meeting it was clear that FWRA understood the situation and the planning context better than the councillors.

A meeting was eventually arranged between officers from the County Council, the Borough Council and FWRA. The author was one of those representing FWRA. The meeting allowed all concerned to express their views without the limitations normally imposed by a formal committee meeting.
The meeting was especially beneficial for FWRA as it allowed the FWRA representatives not only to put across their objections verbally, but also to argue the issue with council representatives. The meeting resulted in the clarification of a number of points on both sides, and in the light of these, FWRA slightly amended their objections (Appendix 9.4) before submitting them to the Surrey South-West Divisional Planning Sub-Committee meeting (13th April 1977). One fundamental point to emerge from this meeting was that FWRA could not agree with the planning officers that there was a need for the road, and a 'Catch-22' situation resulted. In the agenda for the Guildford Area Partnership Highways Sub-Committee meeting (27th June 1977) it stated:

"The original intention under the General Improvement Area Scheme, in view of the closure of three existing junctions by the principal road proposals, was to provide better accessibility to the area, both for residents and service vehicles - milk deliveries, refuse collections, etc. It is recognised in so doing that traffic in the present cul-de-sacs will increase but there will be compensating advantages to other sections of the area.

The link road meets the need for a secondary means of access in emergencies, should the main Artillery Road access be blocked.

The link is seen solely as serving the residential areas it connects and there is no intention to encourage through-traffic. It is far less advantageous and more tortuous than the principal road proposals so that motorists having no business in the area will not use it as a "short cut". The link road would not be opened until the principal road scheme (College Road link between Stoke Road and Woodbridge Road) is operational for through-traffic." (GAPH. Sub-Comm., 7 3.1-3.3).

At the meeting held between FWRA, Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council, it was agreed by the County Council that if there should be an increase in traffic, the area would suffer as outlined in FWRA's objections (Appendix 9.4). However, the planning officers maintained that there would not be an increase in traffic. In response FWRA then questioned the purpose of building the road as no need had been shown to exist.

The planning application was considered again at a meeting of the South-West Surrey Divisional Planning Sub-Committee (13th April 1977). After a number of councillors had spoken out against the proposal, the Chairman of the Sub-Committee said that he thought the application was premature. The Committee decided to defer a decision and refer the matter back to the Guildford Area Partnership Highways Sub-Committee with a view to shelving
the scheme until the College Road link was complete (Surrey Daily Advertiser, 16th April 1977).

On the 27th June 1977, the proposed link road came up for discussion at the Guildford Area Partnership Highways Sub-Committee meeting. The committee had to decide either:

(a) to adhere to the previous decision for a full vehicle road link to provide for convenient delivery and other services to the Community, or

(b) to rescind that decision and approve the construction of a pedestrian access with facilities for fire, ambulance and police vehicles to use it in emergencies." (GAPH Sub-Comm. 7.6.2)

The committee recognised the objections of the residents, in particular how a need for the road had failed to be demonstrated. It decided to support the proposal put forward by FWRA to provide a pedestrian access which could also be used by emergency vehicles.

FWRA won its objection. A number of factors contributed to this victory. Firstly, before the application was discussed at each committee meeting, copies of FWRA's objections and proposals were sent to the members of each committee in order that they would be fully informed of FWRA's views, rather than relying on the summaries of the objections compiled by the planning officers for the committee agenda. Secondly, the objections which FWRA put forward were on grounds of planning, transportation and engineering. It was argued above that councillors put great store on informed opinion. Finally, although FWRA objected to the plan, it tried to take a constructive attitude by suggesting alternative proposals. Eventually, one of these proposals was accepted by the Area Partnership Highways Sub-Committee.

In terms of two of Dearlove's criteria, FWRA was 'helpful': they put forward informed views within the framework of a positive attitude towards the plans, as it was realised that a link of some sort had to be constructed, and in a style of communication acceptable to the Council (no street demonstrations, etc.). As for Dearlove's third criterion, this particular issue impinged little on the policies that Guildford Borough Council thought it should or should not be pursuing. Consequently, the Council did not have to make it a policy issue, and thus were prepared to concede the residents' demands.
Office incursion into Friary Ward

The incursion of offices and commercial developments into residential areas has long been a major concern of FWRA. Why such a situation exists is explained in Chapter 8. It has occurred primarily through (a) the conversion of houses into offices, and (b) the demolition of houses and the erection of new offices and shops. Such incursion has predictably taken place at the town centre end of the Ward, at the interface between the residential areas and the commercial centre. It has also occurred on the major roads leading out of the town centre on Stoke and Woodbridge Roads in Friary Ward. Such developments have acted as fingers protruding far ahead of the town's leading edge of commercial expansion. FWRA has long pressured the Council to halt the conversion of the large turn-of-the-century houses into offices. This has been difficult as in many cases the land is zoned under the Town Map for commercial use, and therefore planning permission for change of use is virtually automatic. These large houses, however, provide exactly the type of accommodation (one and two bedroom flats/bedsits) that is needed in an area such as Friary Ward.

Continuous pressure from FWRA (and other organisations, e.g. Guildford Labour Party) has gradually resulted in a shift in policy. In a recent case, a Language School bought a house and began to use it for offices and teaching purposes without seeking planning permission. When the proprietors of the School were eventually forced to apply for planning permission, the Council opposed the conversion with the support of FWRA. In other cases, the Council is now trying to make potential office users move into purpose-built offices of which there are a considerable number vacant in the town. In a number of cases where residential accommodation has been built as part of an office development (e.g. a caretaker's flat, or a number of flats for private letting as in the case above Habitat in North Street), FWRA has consistently and strongly opposed their conversion into offices. When such planning applications have gone to appeal, the objections, lodged by the Council and endorsed by FWRA have been upheld by the Department of the Environment Inspectors.

In another case, several property development companies had, over a number of years, bought houses in Martyr Road (Rank City Wall; County
and District Properties Ltd.) with the intention of developing the properties for commercial use. Again FWRA continually wrote to the local authority objecting to a change from residential to office use. FWRA's position was made all the more difficult by the poor condition of some of the houses, a few of which were arguably beyond rehabilitation. For several years the local authority has refused planning permission to convert the properties to offices. The story to date is that another property development company (Collingwood Ltd.) has bought most of the houses and is currently converting them into one and two-bedroom flats for private sale. Most of the remaining properties have been bought by Guildford Borough Council and are in residential use.

Discussion

Pickvance warns us of over-emphasising the part played by pressure groups in changing local government policies (1976, p.203) and cites Dennis (1972), Davies (1972) and Ferris (1972) as examples of those who have fallen into this trap. In the case of the Martyr Road properties, there were a number of factors internal to the local authority which were by no means insignificant, as there were equally important national considerations. When the property development companies bought these houses there was a boom in land and property speculation. The market crashed and it no longer became economically feasible to redevelop, at least not with the profit expectations that were predicted in the early 1970's. The above-national average rise in residential property prices in Guildford has also made speculative housing developments economically rewarding. Furthermore, since the late 1960's central government has laid particular emphasis on rehabilitation rather than redevelopment and has offered local authorities considerable capital incentives for adopting rehabilitation programmes. In the last five years academics and central government have highlighted 'the inner-city problem'. Local authorities have been reticent to promote policies which could be seen as disadvantageous to groups who are already characterised as 'the disadvantaged'. FWRA was undoubtedly instrumental in influencing Council policy, but it is also unlikely that FWRA would have been successful without this enabling social, governmental and economic environment. It could be argued that FWRA's policy happened to be consonant with that of the local authority. Although the
policy was the same, the reasons why each group supported such a policy were quite different.

Participation as Incorporation

Guildford Womens' Aid: a refuge

Examples of attempts by the local authority to incorporate and redefine the aspirations and demands of the Residents' Association are difficult to find, although this does not mean it is non-existent as a practice in Guildford. A 'text-book' example can be found in the campaign by the Guildford Women's Aid group to make the Council provide a refuge for battered women. Guildford Women's Aid generated much publicity in the local press ('unhelpful'); squatted in empty properties (largely Council-owned) in an effort to pressurise the Council ('unhelpful'); and projected a radical image ('unhelpful'). Furthermore the Council refused to believe that the battering of women and children could possibly happen in Surrey. If it was not seen to occur then it was not possible to have a policy towards it ('unhelpful'). If it was recognised in any way, it was defined as a welfare or criminal problem and thus the responsibility of the Social Services Department or the police. When eventually enough evidence was presented to the Council to show that battering did exist, even among the well-heeled section of Guildford's population, the Council agreed to provide a refuge. However, it was on the condition that it could be used by the Council for the temporary housing of homeless and single-parent families. Guildford Borough Council refused to recognise that family violence was (and is) a problem demanding particular attention and special solutions, not least of which is a temporary protective refuge for the victims. Guildford Borough Council totally incorporated the demands and wishes of the Guildford Women's Aid by redefining not only the problem but also the solution. Incorporation took place at every level from the 'Management Committee' which was set up to oversee the scheme, to the actual provision of accommodation.

When Guildford Borough Council has not agreed with FWRA's proposals, control rather than incorporation has been the strategy used to manage the situation.
Participation as Control

In discussing Cockburn's critique of participation in Lambeth, it was suggested that the controlling political party on the Council is a crucial factor in the way in which participation is conceptualised and used. The expectation in Lambeth that Labour Party politics is synonymous with popular control led to an equal expectation that the Labour Party would favour and encourage popular participation in decision-making. However, the reality was very different from the expectation as participation was, according to Cockburn, used as a means of controlling public demands for greater influence in local authority affairs. But what is the status of such arguments in a local authority dominated by the Conservative Party, where there are few expectations concerning decentralised community power? Can participation still be used as a means of controlling public demands for and involvement in local authority planning?

In Guildford there is no sponsorship of participation. When Councillor Mrs. M. Walls, Chairman of the Personal Services Committee, was asked by a Liberal councillor whether the Council was considering actively promoting tenants' associations, she replied, "If tenants wish to form their own associations they are perfectly free to do so. They are not there to be organised by anyone." (Surrey Daily Advertiser, 3rd April 1975). This does not, however, necessarily mean that participation is not used as an important element in urban management.

Two issues, more than any other, have dominated the activities of FWRA: the introduction of a residents' parking scheme, and the incursion of offices into residential areas. Both of these issues are inextricably tied up with the discussion in Chapter 8 on the ideology of Guildford Borough Council and its preoccupation with attracting commerce and business into the town. Over the next few pages the efforts of FWRA to put pressure on the Council to establish a residents' parking scheme are discussed. It will be demonstrated that Dearlove's criterion of policy consonance between the community group and the State is a crucial factor in determining the success of the community group in achieving its aims. Where policy consonance is absent then participation is used as a means of urban management. The second case concerns the application by FWRA to acquire Parish Council status.
Residents' car parking scheme

Every road in Friary Ward has restricted parking (single and double yellow lines) interspersed with parking bays. These parking bays can be divided into two types: those in which there is a two-hour parking limit and those which allow unlimited parking. This situation also exists in the other residential areas of the town which border the commercial centre. Each day there is competition for parking spaces between residents, shoppers, factory and office workers. This problem is particularly acute for those residents in the two-hour zone who have to continually move their cars. Few residents have the option of off-street parking such as garages.

The FWRA adopted its positive and constructive approach by researching into residents' parking schemes in operation in London and Surrey in order to find one which might be applicable to Friary Ward. The committee then drew up a scheme which it believed would be acceptable to the Council. FWRA requested that those with parking permits should be allowed to park all day in a two-hour bay, thereby avoiding the constant requirement of finding a new parking space every two hours. The residents were prepared still to compete for space, but considered that once they had found a space in their road they should not be required to move.

The Council made it apparent that if a residents' parking scheme were to be introduced, it would have to be 'economical', i.e. it would have to pay for itself and this meant charging a cost-effective rate for each permit. Further discussions were had with the Council to ascertain how much this would be. The Chief Constable of Surrey County Constabulary insisted that if a residents' parking scheme were to be introduced it would need at least two additional traffic wardens to police it. It should be pointed out that the scheme FWRA was proposing did not even apply to the whole Ward, but only to those roads with two-hour parking bays (about seven roads in the Ward, although presumably other roads outside the Ward could also be included). The demand for two extra traffic wardens was inexplicable as the scheme applied only to those areas which were currently being policed by traffic wardens, and therefore no extra work should have been entailed. As far as the police were concerned, it was another means of increasing their force of traffic wardens at the residents' expense. This would add
substantially to the cost. Furthermore, the Council insisted that the residents would have to pay all of the costs of introducing the scheme (e.g. traffic wardens, advertising, changes in the traffic regulations, signposting, administration). They also insisted that all the costs would have to be paid in the first year, and could not be spread over, say, a five year period.

Despite these considerable constraints, FWRA said that it would be prepared to carry out a survey to find out how many residents were interested in a scheme. It had to be made clear to residents that the cost would be dependent upon the number of participants. FWRA nevertheless had to give some indication as to the probable cost; and suggested, conservatively, between £10 and £15 per annum. The response to the survey was poor, with many residents complaining that the cost was too high. With the response that FWRA received, the per capita cost would have been higher still. The scheme was abandoned. In this exercise in participation, the Council set the ground rules with which FWRA were to operate. By not getting the support necessary to pay for a residents' parking scheme the failure was placed firmly at the door of the residents. With the Council (and the police) setting the rules, this could never be participation. It turned into a win or lose game, which the Council were unprepared to lose.

A number of councillors and officers were supportive of the idea of a residents' parking scheme, agreeing that residents should receive some positive discrimination. The councillors in favour tended to be from urban wards (Liberal and Labour) while the chief opposition came from rural (and Conservative) councillors. It will be remembered from the coorientation data (Chapter 7) that rural councillors were much less cognisant of the parking problem than the urban councillors, and were unable to predict accurately the concern of residents over this issue. The views of one Conservative councillor convey the general attitude of what might be termed the 'anti-residents'-parking group' and their lack of coorientational ability: "You will always have a parking problem. No resident anywhere has a divine right to park on the road or anywhere. If he has a motor car the resident should have off-street parking. It should be a condition. They pay less rates. If a resident has free parking, the ratepayers and taxpayers subsidise them. They pay less rates also - they get it both ways."
Why then, considering the 'helpful' stance FWRA projected, was the scheme defeated? Guildford Borough Council has in recent years built three large multi-storey car parks in the town costing a substantial sum of money, the majority of which had to be borrowed. Furthermore, there are a number of other 'surface' car parks. These car parks, as stated above, form part of the infrastructural support to the commercial and business sector the Council has been fostering. In order to repay the high loan charges on the money borrowed to build the car parks, Guildford Borough Council has been forced into making very high car parking charges, much higher than the surrounding towns. Such charges have received a bad 'press'. If a residents' parking scheme were introduced in the inner town residential areas, it would reduce to a negligible amount the free parking available to those people who live in the suburbs, the rural areas and beyond. Such an action would force shoppers and office workers into the expensive car parks, which favour, by their pricing policy, the short-term rather than long-term motorist, and would damage both Guildford's image and its attractiveness as a shopping and commercial centre. It is suggested that the Council wishes to create a delicate balance between attracting people to the town with the possibility of free parking and channelling shoppers once into the town into the numerous car parks if free spaces cannot be found. Such a view is held by a number of FWRA committee members.

The application for Parish Council status

An even more revealing case of 'control' is exemplified when the Friary Ward Residents' Association submitted an application for Parish Council status. Since the 1894 Local Government Act provided for every Parish with over 300 population to have its own Council, urban areas have had unequal representation vis-à-vis rural areas. This has meant that urban areas have been underrepresented at a grass-roots, parish level. Recent Government Circulars (DOE, 121/77; DOE, 33/78) and the report of the Boundary Commissioners (Report Number 286) emphasise quite forcefully the need to examine the representational needs of urban areas. The 1972 Local Government Act made provision for the establishment of Parish Councils in urban areas. Therefore, an anomaly which has existed for 85 years is now able to be corrected.
The Friary Ward Residents' Association decided to seek parish status for the old Friary Ward (not Friary and St. Nicholas). It was hoped that by doing so a Parish Council could be established which would bring representative government down to a grass-roots level. It was strongly and rightly emphasised by the Boundary Commissioners that the establishment of a Parish Council should wholeheartedly reflect the will of the residents of the areas to be parished. Indeed the Clerk and Solicitor to Guildford Borough Council, David Watts, wrote in a letter to the Friary Ward Residents' Association, "The Council will also need to be conclusively convinced that any desire for the establishment of a Parish Council in a presently unparished area is truly representative of the whole of the residents in such an area." (24th October, 1978). Every encouragement was given to the Residents' Association to canvass the residents' opinions. In a later letter David Watts wrote that the Policy and Resources Committee "considered it desirable, before the Council gave any detailed consideration to the proposals ..., affected local residents and associations be canvassed" (24th November 1978). To this end the FWRA conducted a comprehensive survey of residents in November 1978 to ascertain whether or not they wanted a Parish Council.

The results of the Parish Council survey can be obtained in Appendix 9.1 where the full report is reproduced. The results can be summarised as follows: just under one-third of the households in Friary Ward were interviewed (454 interviews), representing the young and old, males and females, owners and tenants of property, members and non-members of the FWRA, and those who have lived in the Friary Ward for under a year to those who have lived in the Ward all their lives. Three-quarters of those interviewed (72%) said that they would like to see a Parish Council representing the interests of the residents, while slightly fewer residents (69%) said that there was a need for a Parish Council. The results satisfied the criteria of the Policy and Resources Committee and the Boundary Commissioners.

On the 14th March, the Policy and Resources Committee rejected the proposal to recommend the establishment of a Parish Council in Friary Ward by twelve votes to one. Therefore, having encouraged a survey to gauge the true feelings of the residents, the Committee completely disregarded the findings because they did not coincide with their own preferences. According
to one of the council officers there was not one request from any councillor to obtain a copy of the ten page report which was available (fifty copies) from the council offices. Only a summary of the report's findings was included in the Committee's agenda. The arguments in the Council Chamber against the establishment of a Parish Council in Friary Ward revolved around four issues: the cost; the unsuitability of Parish Councils in urban areas; the 'all or nothing' nature of the procedure, i.e. you cannot only have one Parish Council in the town; the similarity of Residents' Associations to Parish Councils thereby making Parish Councils unnecessary in urban areas. Each of these arguments are objections on principle. Had the FWRA known that its application was to be objected to on these grounds, there would have been little point in carrying out a survey. If the FWRA had discovered that only 40% of the residents wanted a Parish Council, Guildford Borough Council might well have reasonably maintained that not enough residents wanted it and therefore the application was unrepresentative. However, three-quarters of the residents said that they did want a Parish Council and therefore the Council had no alternative but to object to the application on principle.

But even on the matters of principle the councillors' arguments can be seen to be ill-founded, if not biased. In terms of the cost, it was shown that 70% of the residents said that it would be worth the penny-in-the-pound rate increase. If the Council would argue that the whole borough contributes to the Parish rate, then it is surely unfair that the urban areas subsidise rural Parish Councils?

The second argument was that Parish Councils are not appropriate in urban areas. This was the whole point of the Boundary Commission's Parish Review. The 1972 Local Government Act suggested that urban areas should be considered for emparishment, ridding an inequality which has existed since the nineteenth century.

Thirdly, it is not an 'all or nothing' situation. It was made quite clear by the Boundary Commissioners that no area would be forced to have a Parish Council just because others desired one. It would be entirely possible to parish some areas while leaving others unparished.
Finally, it was argued that if a (good) Residents' Association is in existence there is no necessity for a Parish Council. This is the most serious example of obfuscation. Residents' Associations and Parish Councils are very different bodies. Parish Councils have a right to be consulted on all planning applications; they can on their own initiative do anything they think will be in the interests of their constituents that is not the statutory responsibility of some other council; they can levy a rate which can be spent on environmental improvements not provided by the Council; and finally, they have the power to speak for their community. It is often argued that Residents' Associations are not representative of the community, a charge which cannot be levelled at Parish Councils.

The most serious consequence of the decision of the Policy and Resources Committee and eventually the full Borough Council in not recommending to the Boundary Commissioners that a Parish Council be established in Friary Ward is that it has questioned the status of participation in Guildford. The Council asked for the residents' opinions on an extremely important issue of democracy. When the Council found itself in disagreement with the opinions of the majority of residents, it was forced into controlling the situation by changing the rules and disregarding the residents' application on matters of principle. This, despite the fact that the principles and criteria for application were beyond the concern or jurisdiction of Guildford Borough Council.

Discussion

Paris's four perspectives are useful in helping us to understand the purpose and success of participation, but it should be recognised that the interaction between a local authority and an interest group cannot always be explained by reference solely to one perspective. There are instances when participation will take the form of co-operation with (temporary off-street parking; widening of Stoke Road) if not a concession from, the local authority (Drummond Road link; rehabilitation of houses). At other times participation will be used as an element in urban management to incorporate the demands of pressure groups (Guildford Women's Aid). Finally, participation can be used as a straightforward means of control (Parish Council application; residents' parking scheme). Paris does not tackle the possibility of this situation. Consequently, one needs to find an explanation
of why this might be the case. Dearlove's criteria for successful participatory activity provides one possible, and convincing, explanation. The 'helpfulness', method of communication and informed nature of FWRA's approaches to the Council were, it is believed, crucial factors in the success of FWRA’s attempts to influence the Council. It must also be recognised though that in several cases FWRA’s policy stance was congruent with that of the Council. In some instances, economic circumstances forced the Council to adopt policies which were in essence no growth/conservationist in orientation which accorded quite closely with the position FWRA was currently adopting.

FWRA’s pressure on Guildford Borough Council was not always successful, however 'helpful' it tried to be in its communication and relationship with the local authority. In these cases FWRA’s policies were diametrically opposed to those of the Council. This would suggest that the consonance of policy between the community group and the local authority is the overriding factor in success for participatory groups. 'Helpfulness' and communication style may only play an important part after policy conflicts have been resolved.

It was shown in Chapter 8 that the 'arbiter' theory of government is not particularly useful as it cannot account for those governments which support particular ideologies and thus become interest groups themselves. Party politics would have no place in elections if this were not the case. If one is to accept, as the last chapter concludes, that governments do support particular interests, then it becomes possible to accept the more radical critiques of participation, which view participation as another technique of urban management. Indeed, the existence of incorporation and control as participatory strategies supports the notion of interest-dominated governments.

Finally, it was suggested at the beginning of this chapter that the urban context in which participation takes place can be critical in determining the type of public participation which takes place, and is allowed to take place. One contextual element is the nature of the ruling political party. It was argued that Conservative Party domination results in different participatory expectations than when the Labour Party controls the local authority. As a consequence 'control' is exercised differently in Guildford than it is, for
example, in Lambeth. However, it is demonstrated that control nevertheless still takes place; only the way in which this form of urban management is effected is different.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In the context of the Friary Ward Residents' Association, two of the three assumptions introduced at the beginning of this Chapter are untenable: FWRA is not issue specific and residents do not participate because they believe that such participation will result in the improvement of public services. It is clear that if assumptions such as these are to be made, then it is necessary to differentiate between the types of groups which seek more participation (e.g. tenants' associations; 'cause' groups; amenity/conservation societies; ratepayers' associations).

However, in the case of the third assumption the evidence is not so indisputable. According to both the interview survey and the Parish Council survey, residents want more public participation and more decision-making powers. Few councillors share such an objective, which can be seen as a threat to their legitimacy. One of the justifications for more participation given by residents is that they see and interpret the world differently from the elected members. This is borne out by the coorientation data and analysis.

In answer to a number of questions in the survey, the ideological arguments in favour of community action come across forcefully; residents believe that political and community action will secure neighbourhood improvements. Membership of FWRA is seen as a move towards participatory influence and community power. The strength of the ideological element is made all the more significant by the type of reason given by non-members for not joining, and the reasons suggested by FWRA members as to why people do not join the Association. These groups totally ignore the ideological reasoning behind joining a pressure group. The most convincing evidence came from the Parish Council survey where over two-thirds of the residents interviewed said that there should be a third tier of government in order that their views and interests could be better represented.

The desire for an increase in community power is not of course inconsistent
with a desire for improved communication between local government and the public. When asked what form participation should take, many residents suggested an improvement in communication. Clearly for some, this is considered sufficient. These residents would be satisfied if they were both informed more about Council planning activity, and if there were more obvious and encouraging means by which they could put their views forward to the elected members. However, a substantial number of residents articulated a desire for what is best described in laymen's terms as more say in the planning matters as they affect their streets and neighbourhood. It should be pointed out that where participation is supported by the elected members, it is seen to be synonymous with enhanced information dissemination.

These results may appear to be inconclusive: the demand for participation represents a demand for both improved communication and greater community power. The assumption is difficult to test if framed in terms of either/or, as the reasons behind the current demand for participation are complex. One can only try go gauge the strength of feeling for each issue. Another strategy is to slightly rephrase the question and ask "would the current demand for more participation be satisfied simply by an improvement in communication?" For some it probably would be, but one is forced to conclude, given the analysis presented above, that for many it would not. For many people, joining a residents' association is an ideological statement.

There appears to be no obvious relationship between councillors' co-orientational awareness of issues and their willingness to act on the residents' behalf. In the case of through-traffic in residential roads, the elected members and officers showed an awareness of the problem and ultimately acted. Given the conclusions of the last chapter, one might have expected that FWRA would not have been particularly successful with regard to the incursion of office and commercial developments in residential areas. However, a number of factors external to the local situation (changing Central Government policy; world economic recession) conjoined to act in FWRA's favour. While FWRA has been relatively successful in stopping office incursion, the policy of economic growth remains with its detrimental consequences for residents in the form of increased traffic, pollution and parking problems for residents. In the case of the problem of residents' parking, the elected members were
very aware according to the coorientation data of this issue, yet all attempts by FWRA to get a residents' parking scheme established have been thwarted by the Council.

Even when these issues are examined in the context of the differential awareness of urban and rural councillors (Table 7.17) there is no obvious correlation between the success (or failure) of FWRA in achieving its aims and the coorientational ability of councillors and officers. From this one can conclude that participation is not simply a problem of communication. This conclusion provides a second perspective on the communication/decentralisation of decision-making debate. Despite the fact that FWRA have continually communicated their case for the introduction of a residents' parking scheme, and the Council are aware of the residents' parking problems, FWRA have not achieved their objective. Prevailing Council policy is a crucial factor in the resolution of the conflict. This conclusion also supports the argument put forward in Chapter 8 that local government is an interest group like any other body, whose interests may conflict with those of specific urban groups. When conflict does arise, the resolution of that conflict may not take the form of co-operation or concession. Incorporation or control by those in power might be seen as an alternative strategy; a strategy which is best labelled 'urban management'.
Footnote

1. The attractiveness of Guildford as a shopping centre is partly reflected by the following figures "..... in 1973 the total number of vehicles passing through the borough car parks averaged 1,150,000, while for a comparative period in 1974, excluding December, that number had increased to just over 1,200,000" (Surrey Daily Advertiser, 3rd February 1975).
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INTRODUCTION

In this final chapter the salient issues and findings from the previous nine chapters are discussed. The first section deals with the principal methodological issues which have emerged as a consequence of the research, for example, coorientation, action research and the nature and scope of political psychology. The latter half of the chapter reviews the major findings of the thesis, and relates them to the theoretical issues discussed in the first three chapters.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Coorientation

Coorientation and power

Coorientation is not without its methodological problems, especially when removed from controlled experimental situations and placed in a real-world setting. In Newcomb's (1953) original coorientational model, it was assumed that the two people coorientating to an object or situation were basically equal on a variety of dimensions such as an equal access to information, and an equal power relationship. In environmental planning this is rarely the case as the public are unlikely to possess the same information as planners and have equal access to communication channels. The more technological the planning issue (e.g. the decision to build nuclear power stations), the less plausible is the assumption of ceteris paribus.

One of the consequences of the ceteris paribus condition being relaxed, is that projection may become a critical factor in influencing group responses (cf. Chapter 3). Projection, it will be remembered, occurs when a person projects his own evaluation onto his coorientational partner's presumed response. This would seem to be a problem regardless of the quantitative technique used to measure coorientational responses; the statistical method simply reveals its existence. Councillors projected their interpretation of the problems of Friary Ward onto the presumed cognitions of residents. Interestingly, a reciprocal relationship did not exist: residents did not presume to anything like the same extent that councillors see the problems of the Ward.
similarly to themselves. Various explanations were put forward in Chapter 7 accounting for this phenomenon. It would seem then that the position and relationship one coorientating individual or group has vis a vis another (in this case the representative role which elected members believe they should be fulfilling) is an influential factor affecting their response.

The power relationship can also be seen to be a crucial variable in what I have termed the accuracy/reality dilemma. It was found that when the residents' perceptions of councillors' concerns were checked against the policy outputs of the Council, there was a disparity between Council actions and the councillors' articulated cognitions. Two points emerge from this. The responses of councillors and residents on this issue represent different levels of conceptualising the problems of Friary Ward. The elected members were content to list the physical problems as they perceived them; their perceptions reflected the effects of the social, economic and political system on the Ward. The residents however maintained that the social, economic and political system is instrumental in causing their problems. The conceptualisation of problems at different levels of abstraction and sophistication can make the analysis of coorientational data difficult. The second point follows on from this. In coorientation one should only be concerned with the relationship between how one group sees the world and how they think another group, significant to themselves, understands the same world. However, there is a strong, and valid, temptation to assess the coorientational cognitions and perceptions against an 'objective' reality as defined by the researcher.

Coorientation and groups

Although coorientation was originally devised to examine the orientation of two individuals towards an object, it has been extended as has been seen in this work to include coorientation towards groups or collectivities (Grunig and Stamm, 1973). This raises the problem of reification. Reification assumes one can see a group or any human phenomena as a unified and concrete entity. The 'man in the street' is as much a victim of reification as is the 'general public', as they are both seen as 'real' things or facts of nature. The reification of groups or collectivities implies that individuals see such groups as homogeneous and uncomplex entities. Consequently,
it has been usual in coorientation research to ask individuals to make summary judgments about groups in terms of central tendency. This has been the case in this research. This results in an increase in the homogeneity of variance and suppresses the range of differences. One way around this might be to use the degree of reification as a variable. Each person would be asked to estimate the proportion of people in the group who hold any one position regarding the coorientational object, rather than the average position. The less the variance of this perceived distribution, the more valid the reification assumption becomes. In some respects though, the 'degree of reification' may be a meaningless concept for as Berger and Luckmann imply (1967, p.82), reification is an either/or phenomenon, a collectivity is real or is not real for individuals.

Another aspect of the problem of reification concerns the labels we give to collectivities and communities. The labels used must not only be psychologically meaningful to the groups involved, but they must also quite clearly denote who is to be included within the group and who is excluded. In the Guildford study, the labels denoting each group (Guildford Borough councillors and officers; members and non-members of the Friary Ward Residents' Association) presented no ambiguity and were meaningful for all parties.

Coorientation and consensualism

One criticism that has been levelled at coorientation is that it is consensualist. Because it is set within a communications rationale, it is sometimes suggested that the model implies that intergroup differences are the product of misunderstandings; it only remains to effect improvements in communication for intergroup conflicts to be resolved. From the analysis in the preceding chapters, it should be apparent that the importance of the coorientation technique lies in its facility to identify conflicting interpretations of the world. It has been shown in Chapters 8 and 9 that the differences between FWRA and the Council cannot simply be reduced to problems of communication; they represent conflicts in values and priorities. Although coorientation identifies the problems, there is no presumption on my part that the seeds
of their resolution lie simply and solely within the communications framework that coorientation offers.

Unlike liberal and radical critiques of urban society, where the epicentre of analysis lies firmly in social, economic and political institutions, the phenomenological approach tries to understand urban problems through the perceptions and interpretations of the individuals and groups experiencing those problems. It might be thought that such an approach is obscurantist, as it avoids examining the cause of inner-city problems. It might even be said to be reductionist by placing the origin of urban problems in the residents themselves, and not in society; that is, the problems exist only in the minds of the residents. Such an assumption is not intended on my part. The analysis of Council policy in both Chapters 8 and 9 should indicate that the social, economic and political context in which residents live is taken to be an important factor in their perceptions. The coorientation strategy recognises that individuals and groups do not operate in isolation, but in relation to the environment and to others who are significant in influencing their construal of the world. In this way, a bridge is constructed between the attitudes individuals hold concerning the environment, the social, economic and political context in which attitudes are formed, and the environment itself.

Action Research

Process

It was maintained in Chapter 1 that, in order to understand intergroup perceptions and behaviour, it is necessary to observe their development over time. For this reason an action research strategy was adopted, to parallel the more conventional data collection techniques. Process models and their complementary research methodologies are notable by the absence in political psychology. The collection of information by such methods is costly, involving a considerable expenditure of time by the researcher. For example, the data used in the analysis of the four participation perspectives (Chapter 9) was collected over a period of up to four years, and necessitated attendance at not only FWRA committee meetings and general meetings, but
also Council meetings, and special meetings between FWRA and the local authority officers and councillors. The Drummond Road link road proposal provides one example of an action research strategy. I became involved at every level of the issue from ascertaining local residents' views through to becoming one of the FWRA representatives at the meetings held between FWRA and Borough and County Council officers. In the case of the Residents' parking scheme and the Parish Council issue, I was able to pass on certain skills as a researcher (e.g. questionnaire design and analysis) which aided the community's campaign and provided the research project with information.

Criticisms

Action research, too, is not without its methodological difficulties (Uzzell, 1979). One cannot readily transfer natural science norms and criteria of evaluation, which is commonly done within the social sciences, to an action research methodology. Quantitative data about community groups are often assumed to be the most convincing of evidence for understanding their activities. But in action research one may not necessarily obtain quantitative data. Other types of information, such as that obtained when in attendance at meetings between Council officers and the Residents' Association, may be more relevant and informative.

Another important issue concerns interviewer 'effects' (Bridge et al, 1977). It is sometimes argued by critics that by being involved with a group, not only will the community group's activities be affected by the presence of the researcher, but any data collected will be contaminated by the researcher's influence. Whatever type of study is undertaken, there will always be experimenter effects. The important point is to be aware of them, and if possible, control for them. For this reason I did not become involved with the committee of FWRA until I had completed the questionnaire interviews. Much of the data collected using an action research strategy post-dates this period when I was a FWRA committee member between 1976 and 1979. If the researcher is more open with those whom he is studying, and if the community group is aware of both the relevance and implications of the study, then arguably that group is less likely to distort their behaviour or mislead the investigator.
There may be one important cost to be borne by the researcher who becomes an active agent with community groups. In the political setting in which community groups operate, conflict is as likely to be the norm as consensus. This can take the form, for example, of either conflict between the members and non-members of a Residents' Association, or a Residents' Association and the local authority. In situations where conflict is low and amicable relations exist, then access for the researcher to all sides will be relatively trouble-free. This was the case in Guildford where I received friendly and active cooperation with all those groups from whom I sought information. However, if a researcher strongly identifies with a group which is engaged in continuous conflict with other groups, then it is more likely that ready access to and cooperation from other groups will be more difficult, if not impossible. But this has to be balanced against a situation where conflict between groups is at such a level that neither group will permit entry until the researcher does identify with one group or the other (cf. Roy, 1965). If group identification in such situations is necessary, then this casts serious doubt on our self-perception as dispassionate unbiased observers of human behaviour.

A New Political Psychology?

It was forcefully argued in Chapter 2 that the development of political psychology has been retarded by reductionist approaches and the narrowness of the defined subject matter. It is also a characteristic of political psychology that researchers have continued to study political leaders and elites, contrary to trends in other academic disciplines such as history, which have moved away from this area and more recently concentrated on mass movements and popular politics.

In this thesis an attempt has been made to move beyond these limitations, and present a political psychology which accords more closely to the everyday political realities and experiences of individuals and groups. A social rather than reductionist position is taken, with a result that in many instances the unit of analysis is the group in its social, economic, environmental and political context. The subject matter is not confined exclusively to an
examination of individual or group attitudes and behaviour. The expression of attitudes through political action is given equal attention: such action is examined in the larger context of conflicting social worlds and political and economic ideologies.

There has been a tendency for political psychologists to apply mainstream psychological techniques and approaches to their subject matter, regardless of their appropriateness. Had political psychologists developed new approaches and methods such as those used in this thesis, then political psychology might not have remained a fringe interest in psychology for so long. Furthermore there is considerable scope for more extensive applications of psychological concepts to politics especially in field situations. For example, Pitkin can find no political representation theorist who defines representation in terms of activity or behavioural norms (1967, p.112). The use of coorientation to explore the psychological interpretations of the concept of representation is an obvious example emerging from this work of how political psychologists could make a unique contribution to democratic theory.

The Importance of Reflexivity

While the theme of change weaves its way, implicitly and explicitly, through many community studies the changes that the studies themselves go through are rarely acknowledged or documented. It was stated in the Introduction (cf. Chapter I) that a 'cobweb' rather than 'straightline' strategy has been adopted in the research design. The rationale for this might now be more readily apparent and accepted. In community research the parameters and variables analysed are not easily controllable or predictable. Consequently, hypotheses are difficult to set up and even more difficult to test using traditional scientific criteria. For this reason questions and issues became the subject of exploration. The findings cannot be discussed in terms of .01% significance levels, but this does not necessarily mean one cannot draw conclusions from the data presented and analysed.

A flexible approach has been needed to accommodate both changes in my interpretation of participation, and changes within the way I have
construed the issues central to this thesis. For example, when I began the study there was no superficial evidence to suggest that the rural areas exerted undue influence on the town. However, the importance of the rural/urban power difference in the politics of Guildford constantly recurred in the many different types of data I collected: electoral statistics; the analysis of Council Committee composition; and data from my own involvement in the day-to-day activities of FWRA. Consequently, the rural/urban difference was revealed to be a significant factor in participatory politics in Guildford and has emerged as an important theme in the thesis subsequent to the original construction of the research design.

THE CASE FOR PARTICIPATORY POLITICS

Sources of Influence on Local Government

Policy-making and participation

The history of planning in Friary Ward over the past thirty years reveals that the economic expansion promoted by Guildford Borough Council is not the product of recent policy making (cf. Chapter 5), but much longer-term policy maintenance. Consequently, efforts to participate in the planning of the Ward, which ultimately means the planning of Guildford, cannot be directed at seeking a role in the formation of policies. Participation must be directed towards challenging long-established, deeply ingrained practises. The strength of the controlling political party on the Council, and their attendant economic philosophy reduces substantially the possibility of FWRA being in a position to influence significantly the Council's policies. At best, FWRA can only hope to pressure the Council so that the detrimental effects of such policies on the residents and environment of Friary Ward are minimised. In this respect, FWRA can claim some success.

Elections

In the analysis of local authority electoral statistics three major conclusions are drawn (Chapter 6): in recent years there has been a decline in the quality of 'localness' in Council elections; there is a vote/seat bias caused by the 'first-past-the-post' electoral system; rural areas receive
disproportionate representation. Each of these factors is seen to work to the detriment of the urban, and especially low status, inner urban areas. These problems are compounded by the low degree of electorate/councillor interaction (Chapters 6/7), and the poor degree of political knowledge possessed by the residents of Friary Ward (and probably other wards) of their elected members and the political party they represent. Each of these factors, especially the rural bias, is politically significant in effecting the success of inner urban areas getting their views and interests represented and acted upon.

Communication and coorientation

There were a number of differences in the environmental cognitions and perceptions of the urban groups studied which are summarised in Chapter 7. However, those central to the major themes of this thesis are discussed here. Although there is some degree of similarity between the environmental cognitions of residents and councillors, when these are broken down by membership of FWRA, it is apparent that this latter group sees the environment in a different way from both the non-members and the Guildford Borough councillors. It was, however, argued that one should not regard the majority perspective as normative. Each perception reflects, amongst other things, the interests and membership composition of the group from which it originates; it is an alternative rather than a 'correct' or 'incorrect' interpretation of reality.

Apart from concentrating on the physical condition of the area, in contrast to the quality of life which formed the focus of residents' concerns, the councillors' cognitions are closer to those of the officers of the Council than any other group. Such a finding supports the conclusion of other studies which point to the mutuality in views and supportiveness which exists between the legislative and executive sides of government. The environmental cognitions of rural councillors are significantly dissimilar to those possessed by both the urban councillors and the residents.

Residents feel that councillors are not cognisant of their concerns, although they do believe that those councillors who are, give the same priority to certain issues as they do. This lack of faith in councillors is present amongst both FWRA members and non-members. It would seem that councillors attempt to communicate a universal interpretation of reality which is received equally by both residents' groups. The councillors' perceptions also suggest that they believe that there is one objective reality and that
differences in perception are in degree, not kind. Furthermore, they are more likely to believe residents see the world the same way as they do, than vice versa. Such a perspective though for councillors is necessary to reduce ambiguity and protect their legitimacy. Paradoxically, it is found that urban councillors assume a low level of congruency with residents as compared with the high degree of congruency existing for rural councillors. Given these findings, it was hypothesised that, although rural councillors assume high congruency, they are unable to predict residents' concerns. Conversely, it was hypothesised that urban councillors, despite having a low congruency score, would nevertheless be highly accurate in predicting the environmental problems of residents. While the former hypothesis is confirmed, the latter one is not. Urban councillors were only partially accurate in predicting residents' concerns; their accuracy extended only to those issues which FWRA had given extensive publicity.

Taken as a body, councillors are able to predict relatively accurately the concerns of residents on some issues, thereby refuting the allegation of some writers that elected representatives are not particularly sensitive to the tenor of community feeling. The coorientational data suggests that residents do not possess a similar ability. However, when the perceptions of residents' concerns are assessed in the context of the actual policies of the Council, it can be concluded that residents are accurate, although not necessarily 'coorientationally' accurate in the strictest sense.

The interests of local government

What is termed the accuracy/reality dilemma prompted a close examination of the policies and interests of Guildford Borough Council. From the analysis in Chapter 8 it can be concluded that Guildford Borough Council, like all Councils, represents specific interests and ideologies. The Council is able to create and maintain its own policies which are determined by political considerations often independent of Central Government. Furthermore, it cannot be seen as the neutral arbiter in urban conflicts, as pluralist theory suggests, as it is elected as a collective body to represent and promote specific interests and ideologies. Friary Ward residents believe that the Council supports the interests of three specific groups: commercial interests; the rural population; and itself. Various pieces of evidence support the residents' contention that Guildford Borough Council has an overriding
concern for capital expansion. The evidence presented (Chapter 6) concerning the elector! and representational biases in both the Council generally and on the Planning Committee specifically, and the coorientational data concerning the knowledge possessed by rural councillors of inner urban problems (Chapter 7), confirm the inequalities which exist between urban and rural areas. Arguments, variously supported by empirical data, sustain the logic that the Council also promotes and maintains its own interests.

**Participation**

**Three assumptions**

In Chapter 9, three assumptions commonly found in the participation literature were assessed in the context of the attitudes and activities of the Friary Ward Residents' Association for their accuracy. The assumption that the participatory demands of residents' groups are issue-specific is considered unreasonable, as is the assumption that the demand for participation is a demand for the improvement of public services. While it is recognised that there are undoubtedly some pressure groups in existence which seek both these ends, in the case of FWRA and similar residents' associations, such an assumption is untenable. These assumptions serve only to depreciate the value of the ideological component of participatory activity. Evidence is presented throughout this Chapter, especially in the testing of the third assumption, that many individuals participate and favour the extension of participatory practises because they believe that only under such an arrangement can their views, wishes, needs and aspirations be truly represented and acted upon.

**The demand for participation**

The fundamental question is asked: Is the demand for participation a demand for the decentralisation of decision-making, or do groups simply wish to be better informed about government thinking and plans, thereby reducing the demand for more participation to a question of communication? An increase in both communication and community powers is of course not mutually exclusive. However, while many residents did express a desire for improved communication, when asked about their reasons for joining
FWRA, the aims of FWRA, and their attitudes towards the establishment of a Parish Council in Friary Ward, the majority pointed to the community and political benefits of neighbourhood action in securing environmental improvements. This view should be contrasted with the interpretation by the Council of the collective psychology of the residents of this area in the late 1960's (Chapter 5). The residents were then seen to be passive victims of their environment, immune to their surroundings, and "unaware of the possibilities of improvement." (Guildford Borough Council, 1970, para 2.1). Such a picture contrasts strongly with the account of the participatory attitudes and activities of FWRA in Chapter 9, less than a decade later.

The need for participation

As to whether there is a proven need for more participation is another question. It is not a question that can be strictly answered in terms of social, economic or political criteria or indicators. There is a danger of being guilty of the very charge that has been levelled at the elitist theorists of democracy (Chapter 2). The elitist theorists use empirical data to support their arguments for centralised, hierarchical decision-making. Should one use empirical data in support of more participation? If one follows the arguments of Rousseau and John Stuart Mill, then the question must be taken beyond the parameters of positivist debate. It is generally believed that some decisions have to be taken regardless of their popular support, because moral principles are involved. Capital punishment is an obvious contemporary example. With regard to participation, there is empirical evidence which suggests that a move towards a more participatory democracy would lead to a more just democratic and efficacious form of decision-making. In Friary Ward there is strong popular support for such a move.

Communication, perception and behaviour

While the need for more participation is not open to straightforward empirical investigation, the scope for improved communication between the public and the government is. The coorientational data and its associated findings point forcefully to this conclusion. Not only is there a lack of understanding between those in power and the electorate, but the electorate also evince a certain cynicism towards the Council and its activities. While this might not simply be the product of faulty communication, the latter.
condition is unnecessary. The poor level of understanding of inner-city problems by rural councillors is more than inconvenient, it creates serious political inequalities.

There is a second aspect to the communication debate, and this is reflected in the analysis of the coorientational responses. In Chapter 9, the attempts by FWRA to secure a residents' parking scheme were described. If the coorientational responses for residents and councillors over this issue are re-examined (Chapter 7), it can be seen that very few residents (especially FWRA members) believed that the councillors were aware of the parking problem. In the context of their perceptions, the obvious course of action for FWRA was to explain their problem to those who had the power to deal with it. Initially then, FWRA saw the issue as one of communication: if the Council could only be made aware of the problem, then there would be little difficulty in convincing them to adopt a discriminatory policy in favour of the residents. However, the coorientation findings reveal that the councillors were fully aware of the problem, and their response (as detailed in Chapter 9) reflected instead their particular economic and ideological dispositions.

Two conclusions can be drawn. In this exercise in participation, FWRA did not simply want better communication. They wanted action. The active communication of the problem was seen as the most appropriate strategy initially to achieve their aims. The promotion of 'better' communication, however, does not have to be seen as a tactic used by those in power to depoliticise issues (cf. Paris, 1979). Although it was not effective in this particular case, other circumstances can be visualised in which active communication would be a useful participatory device.

The second conclusion is in many ways more significant and relates to the efficacy of using a coorientational approach. In the residents' parking issue, the simple comparison of environmental perceptions by different urban groups would not have provided a great deal of insight into the participatory behaviour of FWRA. FWRA's actions, to paraphrase McLeod and Chaffee, were influenced by their perception of the orientations held by others around them, and their orientation to them (op.cit.). A coorientation methodology is useful, not only for accounting for residents' different interpretations of the
world, but also their actions as a result of their interpretations. A link is therefore forged between environmental perceptions and subsequent behaviour. Participation and intergroup relations.

Finally, in Chapter 9, four perspectives on participation were put forward in order to provide an analytical framework for assessing the differential success of FWRA in achieving their objectives. It was shown that each of the four perspectives (co-operation; concession; incorporation; and control) has a role to play in accounting for FWRA achievements. It was also shown that, although FWRA fulfilled Dearlove's criteria for successful participatory activity, it was not always successful in securing its objectives. In those cases where FWRA were successful, its approach to the Council was, in all senses, 'helpful'. It might also be added that the FWRA position on many of these occasions was consonant with the prevailing policy of the Council. However, on several issues, despite being 'helpful', FWRA achieved little success. From this it is concluded that 'helpfulness' and communication style may only be important after policy conflicts have been resolved.

There appears to be no correlation between the success or failure of FWRA in achieving its aims and the coorientational ability of councillors and officers. This means that it is not sufficient that organisations like FWRA need only communicate their concerns to the Council for action to be initiated. This again suggests that participation is not simply a question of communication and the reduction of misunderstandings: the policy stance of the Council on these issues is critical. This study illustrates that the Conservative Party feel equally at home using control as a strategy in urban management, although the method of control differs from Labour Party dominated local authorities.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

It was argued in the Introduction that inner city problems are not the preserve of the major conurbations. Although Guildford does not face the poverty, high unemployment levels and severe housing stress endemic to those cities in the *Inner Areas Studies* (DOE, 1977), it is subject to many
of the lesser, although not unimportant, physical environmental problems. There are, however, some issues which are as critical in Guildford as they are in the inner metropolitan areas and which should be regarded as inner city problems of equal severity. For example, the role the public play, and are allowed to play, in urban change; the fundamental differences in outlook between the public and decision-makers; the power relationship between planners and the planned; and the extant gap between the wishes, needs and aspirations of residents and their social, economic, political and physical provision.

At the beginning of this thesis, a number of key questions concerning participation were asked. How much participation is allowed? What is the purpose of participation? What is the role of the State in a developing participatory democracy? These questions can only be understood in the context of the social and political relationships which exist between individuals and groups in society. At the centre of these relationships is the question of change: how does change occur? Who initiates change? What is the nature of the social influence process? The functional and genetic models of social change and influence not only provide a useful framework in which to analyse the social and political relations in society which facilitate and allow participation, but the two models also posit certain types of participation.

PARTICIPATION: A MODEL FOR THE FUTURE

The hierarchical relationships implied in the functional model, with its emphasis on leaders and experts, sources and targets, and one reality subscribed to by the majority with which the minority must conform, can only suggest pseudo-participation. In terms of the analysis of participation in Chapter 9, the functional model of change and influence would seem to describe that form of participation which seems either to incorporate or control the aspirations and demands of pressure groups. In this, the purpose of influence is to create a consensus through social control and bring minority groups into accepting an ubiquitous interpretation of reality (cf. Figure 2.1).
The social and political relations implied in the genetic model accord closer to what one might term true participation. In such a framework there are no targets and sources, leaders, experts and followers, linked together in an hierarchical communications system. Instead, all groups participating in society's dialectic are sources of influence and all are subject to change. Communication would take the form of continuous interaction leading to social change. There would not be one accepted interpretation of reality, but many. Presumably these would be the goals of a participatory democracy.

Implicit in the conclusions to some of the findings is that it may be possible to construct a developmental model of participation. It was suggested that there is a developmental sequence in the appreciation of the benefits of participation. The justifications cited by residents initially focused on the immediate, tangible and pragmatic rewards of having a greater influence in urban planning decisions. However, a small number of residents with experience of participation reiterated the sort of justifications put forward by the classical theorists of participation (cf. Chapter 2): the psychological development of individuals and communities; the greater degree of social responsibility; and a more democratic political system.

Following the analysis of the three communicative modes in participation suggested by residents (passive; active; interactive), it was tentatively suggested that as it was those residents who had had more experience of participation who proposed the interactive mode, then a developmental sequence might be at work here too. It was also suggested that the increasing sophistication of the communication modes parallels the move from the functional to the genetic model of social influence.

If one believes, as the classical theorists of participation suggest, that one has to learn how to participate, then participation must be seen in developmental terms. One learns what participation is (and can be) and how to participate: one's constructs concerning participation become increasingly sophisticated, discriminating and diversified. An intellectual leap has been made on my part to link the genetic model with a developmental participatory model of social change.
The developmental/genetic relationship offers a model for the future in two important and distinct ways. It not only provides a rationale with which to explore the development of individuals' and groups' construal of participation; at an action level, it provides a valuable model for encouraging and guiding future participatory activity.
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Appendix 3.1 Questionnaire: Friary Ward Residents

(1) Can you tell me what you consider to be the chief problems of Friary Ward?

(2) Can you tell me what you think the councillors of Guildford Borough Council consider to be the chief problems of Friary Ward?

(3) If you could ask the council to do one thing in particular for Friary Ward, what would it be?

(4) Whose interests do you think the local authority is serving? Could you please tell me who you think benefits most from Council policy and decisions?

(5) Now do you think you could tell me who you think should benefit from council policy?

(6) Finally, do you think that there are any groups or areas which suffer in particular because of council policy, or have any special problems?

(7) Here is a list of services provided by either Guildford Borough Council or Surrey County Council. Could you please tell me whether the authorities are providing a very good, good, fair, bad or very bad service in each of these services in your opinion (Arts & Recreation; Housing Provisions; Education; Rubbish Disposal; Highways & Transport; Car Parking; Planning in general; Quality of the Environment)?

(8) Below is a list of statements about Housing, the Environment, etc., and future directions in which policy could be directed. I would like you to read through each group and write alongside A which of the alternatives you consider to be the most important, accepting that in some cases they are all important. B which of the alternatives you think the Council will encourage over the next few years.

(a) Housing

1. More new houses should be built by the Council
2. More new houses should be built by private developers
3. More new houses should be built at the lower end of the price scale
4. More flats should be made available for renting
5. The present situation should continue
6. Your solution (please specify) to the present housing problem, if you think there is one
(b) **Urban Environment**

1. Encourage more business and trade
2. Enlarge the present shopping and commercial area
3. Build out of town shopping facilities
4. Keep situation as at present, but improve road accessibility
5. Keep situation as at present
6. Exclude traffic totally from the town centre
7. Your suggestion for the future urban environment

(c) **Community**

1. The local Council should take all decisions affecting residents of Guildford, as they are the elected representatives of the people
2. The local Council should consult the residents of Guildford
3. Local residents' associations should be allowed to have a greater influence in local affairs
4. Local residents' groups should be allowed to take decisions about local plans affecting their area
5. Your suggestion

(d) **Transportation**

1. Improve Bus Service
2. Positively discourage cars coming into town centre
3. Positively encourage cars into town centre
4. Exclude through traffic on residential roads
5. Improve roads for cross town traffic
6. Keep system as at present
7. Your solution to present transportation problems

(e) **Employment**

1. No need for extra jobs
2. More need for factory jobs
3. More need for office jobs
4. More need for shop jobs
5. Other needs (specify) - your suggestion
6. More need for jobs generally

(9) **(a)** In this list of pairs of planning issues, could you tell me which one should get preferential treatment from each pair?

**(b)** In column B, I would like you to write how controversial you think each issue is. Please give me a score from 1 to 10; that is, if you think it is very controversial give perhaps 9 or 10, or if you think it is completely uncontroversial say 1 or 2, or some score in between.
(c) Of the residents in Friary Ward, how many do you think
hold the same opinion as you, or have the same preferences
as you on the issues we have just talked about? I would
like you to estimate what percentage of the Ward opinion you
think would agree with you on each issue.

1. Homes or roads
2. Offices or homes
3. Cars or pedestrians
4. Public transport or private transport
5. Unrestricted traffic on roads or restricted
traffic in residential roads
6 Residents' parking permits or retain
present system

(10) Do you think you could estimate what percentage of Ward opinion,
that is Friary Ward, is represented by FWRA? How
representative of Ward opinion is the Friary Ward Residents' Association?

(11) Do you think anyone listens to the Friary Ward Residents' Association, and are influenced at all by it?

(12) Who do you think is influenced?

(13) Do you think you could tell me what you think the aims of The
Friary Ward Residents' Association are - that is, what
is their purpose?

(14) Could you tell me what you think Guildford Borough Council
stands for - that is, what is their purpose

(15) Do you know anyone who keeps up with all the major issues
affecting Friary Ward, and whom you can rely on to give you
accurate information, and keep you in touch with what is
going on?

(16) Do you know anyone around here who is active in trying to get
things done about residents' problems?

(17) Have you ever met him?

(18) Have you ever taken any problems to him?

(19) What is his/her name?

(20) What was the problem?

(21) What did he tell you to do, or what did he do about it?

(22) How satisfied were you with the outcome? (very satisfied; fairly satisfied; fairly unsatisfied; very unsatisfied)

(23) Are there any individuals or groups you have contacted indirectly
in order to get something done. That is, was there a body
you wished to influence or pressurise but thought that it
would be more effective to get someone else to contact
them on your behalf?
(24) Who was that person or organisation you wished to influence?
(25) Through which person or organisation did you act?
(26) What was the issue about?
(27) Why did you not contact that person directly?
(28) Have you personally tried to get something done about any problem affecting you or this area?
(29) Did this problem affect (a) only you or/and your family;  
(b) you, your family and perhaps a few other people around here;  
(c) your street as a whole;  
(d) your whole neighbourhood or area;  
(e) Guildford as a whole;  
(f) Other - specify?
(30) If (b) - (f), did (i) someone else ask you to act on their behalf?  
(ii) you took on the responsibility yourself?
(31) What was the problem or issue?
(32) What did you try to do?
(33) Would you try to contact your local councillor to find out about an issue, or to comment or to complain about something?
(34) If no, why would you not contact your local councillor?
(35) When was the last time you contacted someone from the local authority - either a councillor, or an officer?
(36) What did you contact him/her about?
(37) Did they actually do anything in response to your letter/call?
(38) Did you contact the correct person the first time?
(39) How many times were you referred to someone else?
(40) Did you go to an officer of the Council - e.g. a planner, or housing officer, or did you go to a Councillor?
(41) In the light of your past experiences, who would you contact in future first of all, in order to achieve some action?
(42) How satisfied were you with the way the matter turned out?  
(very satisfied; quite satisfied; quite unsatisfied; very unsatisfied)
(43) Can you name the Councillors for this Ward?
(44) Which political party do they represent?
(45) Here is a list of roles and duties which Councillors and Officers (i.e. planners) do and could perform. Accepting that they are all important, I would like you to read them through carefully and then tell me what you think Councillors should be doing. Tell me the most important first, the second most important second and so on. And then give
me a mark out of ten as to how well you think Councillors perform this duty at present. I would now like you to do the same for the Officers of the Council - list what you think the most important duties are and then give a mark out of ten as to how well they are doing this at present.

-Holding Consultations in local communities to identify needs and problems

Developing new policy proposals for dealing with local problems

Choosing between different ways of tackling local problems

Ensuring that local communities' objections to planning proposals get a fair hearing

Deciding how to spend money that has been allocated in the estimates

Controlling budget expenditure

Receiving and investigating individual complaints

Initiating action to deal with individual complaints

Answering citizens' requests for information

Communicating details of local authority policies, plans and thinking to individuals and groups in local communities

Carrying out surveys and research into local problems

(46) Do you think you have enough participation in planning matters?

(47) Would you like to have greater participation in planning matters?

(48) If Yes - in what way?

(49) If Yes or No - Why?

(50) Generally speaking, do you think you would be better off, worse of, or about the same if there was more public involvement and participation in planning from a (a) political, (b) social, (c) environmental, point of view?

(51) Here are a number of values, or qualities, which some people think are important in life. I would like you to read through them and tell me in their order of importance which you think are the most important for you. That is, write the most important first, the next most important second, and so on, until you have marked them all. (Equality; Freedom; Comfortable Life; World at Peace; Security; Social Recognition; Happiness; Wisdom; Inner Harmony; Self-respect)
With this second set of qualities I would like you to do
exactly the same - rank the most important for you
personally, from I - II. (Self controlled; Broadminded;
Forgiving; Honest; Independent; Intellectual; Logical;
Loving; Responsible; Ambitious; Obedient)

How interested are you in what goes on in this area? (very
interested; quite interested; only a little interested;
not at all interested)

Supposing you had to move away from this area, how sorry or
pleased would you be? (very sorry to leave; quite sorry
to leave; neither sorry nor pleased; quite pleased to
leave; very pleased to leave; don't know)

How many people would you say you know in this area? (many;
some; few; none)

Do you think you know more people outside this area or inside?

Do you feel you play any role in the social, political, educational
or planning life of this area?

Do you think this area is better off, or worse off than other areas
in Guildford, or about the same?

Do you think this area receives more beneficial attention than
other areas, or more detrimental attention; i.e. it suffers from
more demolition, pollution, or about the same?

Do you think that more resources such as effort, time and money
should be spent on this area?

Do you feel there is any community spirit in this area?

If yes, what makes the community spirit here?

Have you any children who go to school: within Friary Ward;
within the local authority area; outside the local authority
area?

Do you think the planners and councillors approve of the residents'
association?

Personal Information

Finally, I would just like to ask you a few personal details. I
remind you this is absolutely confidential. All the
information is categorised into large groups.

Sex
Male
Female

Age
16-24
25-34
35-44
45-49
60-64
65+
(67) Marital Status
Single
Married
Separated/widowed/divorced

(68) Age finished full-time education
14 or under
15-16
17-19
20-21
22 over
still receiving full-time education

(69) Have you passed any recognised examination as part of your education or training? Or did you complete an apprenticeship?
Yes No

(70) If yes, what did you pass?
1. University degree or above
   Professional Institute's final examination
   Higher National Certificate
   Teacher's Certificate in Education
2. G.C.E. 'A' levels
   Professional Institute's Intermediate examination
   State Registered Nurse
3. Full Industrial Apprenticeship
4. G.C.E. 'O' level/General School Certificate
5. O.N.C. or City and Guilds
6. G.S.E.
7. Secretarial Diploma
8. Other

(71) Occupation (present or last job)
1. Name/title of job
2. Industry/business/profession of employer
3. Self-employed
4. Employee
5. Seeking work
6. Retired/sick
7. Student
8. Housewife

(72) Household Composition
1. No. of children 0 - 4 years
2. No. of children 5 - 15 years
3. No. of adults 16 - 59 years
4. No. of adults + 60 years
5. Total in house
(73) Car Ownership
Do you or any members of your household have a car or van available for use
1. Yes one
2. Yes two or more
3. No

(74) Tenure
1. Own or buying
2. Rented from local authority
3. Privately rented - furnished
4. Unfurnished

(75) How long have you lived in Friary Ward?
1. Less than 1 year
2. 1 - 3 years
3. 3 - 10 years
4. 10 - 20 years
5. Over 20 years
6. Born here, and continuous residence

(76) (a) Here is a list of clubs or groups that people might belong to. I would like you to tell me if you belong to any of them at present, either in this area, or as a member elsewhere.
(b) Is it in Guildford or outside Guildford?
(c) Are you a committee member or an official?
(d) How often do you attend meetings - often, sometimes, rarely or never these days?

A Organisations connected with work
(i) Trade Union
(ii) Professional Association
(iii) Club to help workmates
(iv) Business group or club
(v) Social or sports club
(vi) Anything else connected with work

B Public Bodies or Committees

C Organisations connected with politics
(i) A political party
(ii) Other political group

C Organisations connected with education
(i) Organisations for further education
(ii) Military training group
(iii) Youth training organisation
(iv) Nursing or First Aid Organisation
(v) Anything else giving education
E  Religious organisations
   (i) Church club or group
   (ii) Social club
   (iii) Any other religious group

F  Welfare organisations
   (i) Charitable organisation
   (ii) Voluntary welfare organisation
   (iii) Any other welfare organisation

G  Civic or Community groups
   (i) Tenants' / ratepayers' association
   (ii) Parents' association
   (iii) Residents' club
   (iv) Any other civic group

H  Other leisure groups
   (i) A sports team
   (ii) Club for games
   (iii) A dance club
   (iv) Club for hobbies
   (v) Music, drama, jazz or art
   (vi) Motoring association
   (vii) Anything else

I  Any other social club
   (i) Fraternal / ex-servicemen's
   (ii) Women's club
   (iii) A working men's club
   (iv) Club for old people
   (v) Any other social club

J  Clubs not yet covered

K  No clubs or groups at all
Appendix 3.2 Questionnaire: Guildford Borough Councillors and Officers

(1) Can you tell me what you consider to be the chief problems of Friary Ward?

(2) Can you now tell me what you think the residents of Friary Ward consider to be their chief problems?

(3) If you could ask the council to do one thing in particular for Friary Ward, what would it be?

(4) Whose interests do you think the local authority is serving? Could you please tell me who you think benefits most from Council policy and decisions?

(5) Now do you think you could tell me who you think should benefit from council policy?

(6) Finally, do you think there are any groups or areas which suffer in particular because of council policy, or have any special problems?

(7) Here is a list of services provided by either Guildford Borough Council or Surrey County Council. Could you please tell me whether the authorities are providing a very good, good, fair, bad or very bad service in each of these services in your opinion (Arts & Recreation; Housing Provisions; Education; Rubbish Disposal; Highways & Transport; Car Parking; Planning in general; Quality of the Environment)?

(8) Below is a list of statements about Housing, the Environment, etc., and future directions in which policy could be directed. I would like you to read through each group and write alongside A which of the alternatives you consider to be the most important, accepting that in some cases they are all important. B which of the alternatives you think the Council will encourage over the next few years. And, C, which do you think the residents of Friary Ward would like to see.

(a) Housing

1. More new houses should be built by the Council
2. More new houses should be built by private developers
3. More new houses should be built at the lower end of the price scale
4. More flats should be made available for renting
5. The present situation should continue
6. Your solution (please specify) to the present housing problem, if you think there is one
(8) (continued)

(b) Urban Environment

1. Encourage more business and trade
2. Enlarge the present shopping and commercial area
3. Build out of town shopping facilities
4. Keep situation as at present, but improve road accessibility
5. Keep situation as at present
6. Exclude traffic totally from the town centre
7. Your suggestion for the future urban environment

(c) Community

1. The local Council should take all decisions affecting residents of Guildford, as they are the elected representatives of the people
2. The local Council should consult the residents of Guildford
3. Local residents' associations should be allowed to have a greater influence in local affairs
4. Local residents' groups should be allowed to take decisions about local plans affecting their area
5. Your suggestion

(d) Transportation

1. Improve Bus Service
2. Positively discourage cars coming into town centre
3. Positively encourage cars into town centre
4. Exclude through traffic on residential roads
5. Improve roads for cross town traffic
6. Keep system as at present
7. Your solution to present transportation problems

(e) Employment

1. No need for extra jobs
2. More need for factory jobs
3. More need for office jobs
4. More need for shop jobs
5. Other needs (specify) - your suggestion
6. More need for jobs generally

(9) (a) In this list of pairs of planning issues, could you tell me which one should get preferential treatment from each pair?

(b) In column B, I would like you to write how controversial you think each issue is. Please give me a score from 1 to 10; that is, if you think it is very controversial give perhaps 9 or 10, or if you think it is completely uncontroversial say 1 or 2, or some score in between.
(9) (continued)

(c) Of the residents in Friary Ward, how many do you think hold the same opinion as you, or have the same preferences as you on the issues we have just talked about? I would like you to estimate what percentage of the Ward opinion you think would agree with you on each issue.

1. Homes or roads
2. Offices or homes
3. Cars or pedestrians
4. Public transport or private transport
5. Unrestricted traffic on roads or restricted traffic in residential roads
6. Residents' parking permits or retain present system

(10) Do you think you could estimate what percentage of Ward opinion, that is Friary Ward, is represented by FWRA? How representative of Ward opinion is the Friary Ward Residents' Association?

(11) Do you think anyone listens to the Friary Ward Residents' Association, and that they are influenced at all by it?

(12) Who do you think is influenced?

(13) Do you think you could tell me what you think the aims of the Friary Ward Residents' Association are - that is, what is their purpose?

(14) Could you tell me what you think Guildford Borough Council stands for - that is, what is their purpose?

(15) Do you know anyone who keeps up with all the major issues affecting Friary Ward, and whom you can rely on to give you accurate information, and keep you in touch with what is going on?

(16) Do you know anyone in Friary Ward who is active in trying to get things done about residents' problems?

(17) Here is a list of roles and duties which Councillors and Officers (i.e. planners) do and could perform. Accepting that they are all important, I would like you to read them through carefully and then tell me what you think Councillors should be doing. Tell me the most important first, the second most important second and so on. And then give me a mark out of ten as to how well you think Councillors perform this duty at present. I would now like you to do the same for the Officers of the Council - list what you think the most important duties are and then give a mark out of 10 as to how well they are doing this at present.
Holding Consultations in local communities to identify needs and problems
Developing new policy proposals for dealing with local problems
Choosing between different ways of tackling local problems
Ensuring that local communities' objections to planning proposals get a fair hearing
Deciding how to spend money that has been allocated in the estimates
Controlling budget expenditure
Receiving and investigating individual complaints
Initiating action to deal with individual complaints
Answering citizens' requests for information
Communicating details of local authority policies, plans and thinking to individuals and groups in local communities
Carrying out surveys and research into local problems

(18) Where do you learn of residents' opinions?
(19) Do these criticisms, complaints, opinions or comments affect your policy?
(20) Do you change your policy or actions in the light of such comments or criticisms?
(21) Are some groups and individuals within the town more influential in affecting council policy than others?
(22) Are some groups and individuals within the council itself more influential than others in affecting council policy and decisions?
(23) Would you personally take notice of one section of the community more than another? Who?
(24) Why?
(25) When acting on a resident's behalf, and it necessitates contacting an Officer of the Council, do you (a) Write; (b) Telephone; (c) Make a personal visit?
(26) Generally speaking, do you think you would be better off, worse off, or about the same if there was more public involvement and participation in planning from a (a) political, (b) social, (c) environmental point of view?
(27) Do you think the public should have greater participation in planning matters?
(28) If yes - in what way?
(29) If yes or no - Why?
(30) Here are a number of values, or qualities which some people think are important in life. I would like you to read through them and tell me in their order of importance which you think are the most important for you. That is, write the most important first, the next most important second, and so on, until you have marked them all. (Equality; Freedom; Comfortable Life; World at Peace; Security; Social Recognition; Happiness; Wisdom; Inner Harmony; Self-respect)

(31) With this second set of qualities I would like you to do exactly the same - rank the most important for you personally, from I - II. (Self-controlled; Broadminded; Forgiving; Honest; Independent; Intellectual; Logical; Loving; Responsible; Ambitious; Obedient)

(32) Do you think Friary Ward receives more beneficial attention than other areas, or more detrimental attention, than other areas in Guildford, or about the same? (More than other areas; Same; Less than other areas)

(33) Do you think that more resources such as effort, time and money should be spent on this area?

(34) Do you feel there is any community spirit in Friary Ward?

(35) If yes, what makes the community spirit?

(36) Do you approve of the idea of a Residents' Association?

(37) What do you think Residents' Associations can contribute to the effective running of a Local Authority?

Personal Information

Finally, I would just like to ask you a few personal details. I remind you this is absolutely confidential. All the information is categorised into large groups.

(38) Sex Male
Female

(39) Age 16-24
25-34
35-44
45-59
60-64
65 +

(40) Marital Status Single
Married
Separated/widowed/divorced

(41) Age finished full-time education
14 or under
15-16
17-19
20-21
22 over
still receiving full-time education
(42) Have you passed any recognised examination as part of your education or training? Or did you complete an apprenticeship?

Yes No

(43) If yes, what did you pass?

1. University degree or above
   Professional Institute's final examination
   Higher National Certificate
   Teacher's Certificate in Education
2. G.C.E. 'A' levels
   Professional Institute's Intermediate examination
   State Registered Nurse
3. Full Industrial Apprenticeship
4. G.C.E. 'O' level/General School Certificate
5. O.N.C. or City and Guilds
6. C.S.E.
7. Secretarial Diploma
8. Other

(44) Occupation (present or last job)

1. Name/title of job
2. Industry/business/profession of employer
3. Self-employed
4. Employee
5. Seeking work
6. Retired/sick
7. Student
8. Housewife

(45) Household Composition

1. No. of children 0 - 4 years
2. No. of children 5 - 15 years
3. No. of adults 16 - 59 years
4. No. of adults + 60 years
5. Total in house

(46) Do you or any members of your household have a car or van available for use?

1. Yes one
2. Yes two or more
3. No

(47) Housing Tenure

1. Own or buying
2. Rented from local authority
3. Privately rented - furnished
4. Unfurnished

(48) Clubs and Organisations (see Appendix 3.1)
1. All Census material is derived from the 1971 Census:

Small Area Statistics (SAS) (Ward Library)

Census data are available at both household and total population level. The total number of residents and households on which the statistics in this thesis are based are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friary Ward</td>
<td>3,581</td>
<td>1,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford M.B.</td>
<td>54,091</td>
<td>19,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford M.B. + R.D.</td>
<td>113,559</td>
<td>39,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>47,296,176</td>
<td>16,509,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages for Sex, Age, Social Class, Birthplace, Marital Status are based on population totals. Percentages for Car Ownership, Housing Tenure, Housing Conditions are based on household totals.

2. Census Column excludes 0 - 15 age group

3. SAS, 100% Population, Tables 4, 6, 7

4. Information not available at Small Area level

5. Figures are given as a percentage of the sample interviewed, and are thus not comparable with the percentage figures in Col.4. However, in Column 3 (in brackets), the Social Class of all residents is given in a form comparable with Column 4. (cf. Appendix 4.1, Note 3).

6. Demographic data is given for both Guildford Municipal Borough and Guildford Rural District, as since local government reorganisation in 1974, elected members of Guildford Borough Council have represented both urban and rural areas.


8. 'Undefined' includes housewives and retired

* Percentages may not always add up to exactly 100% in every table, due to the rounding up/down procedure.
The Organisational Characteristics of FWRA

The organisational characteristics of FWRA are described, as this influences representation on the committee. The FWRA committee is based on the street representative system. Briefly, the duties of committee members are collecting subscriptions, delivering newsletters and providing a channel of communication between the residents and the committee, and vice-versa. They can also act on the behalf of a resident by taking up an issue or making an enquiry of the Council (or any other authority, e.g. the Water Board), although every encouragement is given to the residents to initially pursue problems themselves. The Committee members can give advice to residents as to the most effective person to whom to write. Many of the problems in this respect stem from an inability to identify the locus of responsibility. If neither the individual resident nor the committee member receives a reasonable response (which is rare), then the matter is discussed at a committee meeting and the Chairman of FWRA then writes to the appropriate authority.

Elections to the Committee are held every year at the Annual General Meeting of the Friary Ward Residents' Association, for membership of the committee. Any member of the Association can stand for election but it has been the usual practise to fill certain positions on the Committee from those members who have had previous experience on the FWRA Committee. These positions are Chairman; Vice-Chairman; Secretary and Treasurer.

An ideal situation would be one in which there is one FWRA Committee representative in each street. This has never been the case in practice, and at best there have only been about twelve people on the committee, each looking after an average of two roads each. Even then there is no way of guaranteeing that the committee members will be evenly distributed throughout the Ward. In view of this, the committee does seek to be a body representative of the residents, reflecting the age, length of residence, form of housing, tenure and social class of the residents insofar as these are spatially distributed in a particular way. By their very nature one is dealing with an exceptional group of people. However, the committee members of FWRA by and large do reflect the socio-economic diversity of Friary Ward and the membership of FWRA.
I consider 'agreement' to be an inappropriate label for this relationship, despite the fact it is unquestioningly referred to as such in all the coorientation literature. Agreement implies an interaction between the two parties. That is, both parties agree that they share exactly the same cognition. Similarity is a more accurate description of the relationship between the two cognitions, as agreement has connotative meanings over and above similarity alone. Furthermore, as the two parties may not have personally interacted, we do not know whether they do agree with each other, although they might agree that their cognitions appear to be similar. There is some support for this view by Pearce and Stamm (1973, p.184), although they abandon the agreement label for another reason. They maintain that, as a member of an interacting dyad, an individual can only know his own perception. He cannot know how the other person really is orientated. The dangers of calling this coorientational concept the agreement variable are readily demonstrated by a quotation from a recent study by Hesse: "Agreement is the extent to which the two actors eventually agree upon the object on which they are both focused" (Hesse, 1976, p.626). Here Hesse is explicitly stating that the two people coorientating are not only personally interacting but also negotiating an agreement between themselves. Yet in Hesse's study itself the two groups (State Senators and constituents) did not personally interact. By Hesse's own definition agreement is not taking place. For this reason the relationship between the two cognitions will be called the similarity variable.

There are two further consequences of emphasising agreement in cognitions rather than similarity. A number of coorientation studies have examined coorientational (dis)agreement and (in)accuracy over a period of time with the intention of illustrating that conflicts are due to misunderstandings in communication, and once such misunderstandings are recognised it just remains to improve the communication system by removing any blockages and malfunctions. Necessarily, such a view is consensualist. However, coorientation does not have to be construed as such. I prefer to see co-orientation as a means of highlighting conflicts which direct one to question...
further whether such conflicts are the product of faulty communication or whether they represent true conflicts caused by competing values and ideologies. It is a method for unearthing conflict. It is an inferential value judgment to suggest that the conflict itself holds the seeds of its own solution.

The second consequence partially relates to the first. One of the intellectual origins of coorientation is the consensus approach of Wirth (1948). However, as Scheff (1967) points out individual agreement definitions of consensus break down in situations of 'pluralistic ignorance'. He writes "The agreement definition of consensus makes no provision for perceptions of agreement, which may be independent of actual agreement and affect behaviour." Similarity might be a less ambiguous label for this relationship as it assumes neither agreement nor perceptual agreement but implies outward similarity in perceptions.
Appendix 4.1

Notes to Table 4.6

1. S.A.S., 100% Population, Tables 6, 7
2. S.A.S., 100% Population, Tables 4, 6, 7
3. S.A.S., 10% Sample, Table 23. Social Class has been derived by transforming the socio-economic groups listed in the Registrar General's Classification of Occupations into a Social Class classification. The transformation is as follows: S.E.G. 3, 4 = S.C.I; S.E.G. 1, 2, 13 = S.C.II; S.E.G. 5, 6 = S.C.III (non-manual); S.E.G. 8, 19, 12, 14 = S.C.III (manual); S.E.G. 7, 10, 15 = S.C. IV; S.E.G. 11 = S.C. V; S.E.G. 16, 17 = Undefined (cf. Pickett, 1974).
4. S.A.S., 100% Household, Table 15 (as a percentage of households
5. S.A.S., 100% Population, Table 9
6. S.A.S., 100% Household, Table 18
7. S.A.S., 100% Household, Table 16 (as a percentage of households)

* cf. Appendix 3.3 for full references to the 1971 Census data
**COUNCILLOR MARGUERITE BATEMAN**

is an Industrial Welfare Officer, married, has a son and daughter. She has lived in Guildford for over 23 years. She was first elected to the former Borough Council in December 1972, and served on the Personal Services and Building and Works and Transport Committee. She also serves on the Guildford Citizens Advice Bureau, Management Committee, and was recently appointed to the Guildford Marriage Guidance Council’s Executive Management Committee.

**COUNCILLOR ROBERT BLUNDELL**

is a local medical practitioner, is married and has a son and a daughter, and has lived in Guildford for over 7 years. He was elected to the former Borough Council in May 1972, and serves on the Personal Services and Policy and Resources Committee. He was educated in state schools and qualified as a doctor from London University in 1962. He is the chairman of Bellfields Primary School Managers.

**COUNCILLOR RICHARD MARKS**

is married with three children. He has lived in the Guildford area for the past twelve years, and is employed by British Rail as a Press Officer. He was first elected to the former Borough Council in May 1972, and serves on the Planning and Building and Works Committees. He is a manager of Sunfield, St. Nicolas and the Girls Grammar Schools.

**LIBERAL COUNCILLORS HAVE...**

- voted against the building of County Hall in Stoke Park.
- opposed the first detailed plans for the Friary site.
- resisted the extension of office development.
- opposed the conversion of shops into building society and insurance offices.
- fought to maintain residential accommodation in the town centre.
- fought against the A3 diversion proposals.
- actively supported the formation of neighbourhood and amenity associations.
- involved their electorate in contributing to Council decisions.
- succeeded in obtaining more effective monitoring of Council finances.

**A LIBERAL COUNCIL WOULD...**

- determine clear priorities for the use of your rate money.
- cut low priority expenditure to concentrate on essential needs.
- save money by helping local groups to carry out improvements to their environment.
- investigate the potential for re-cycling waste materials.
- modernise older houses rather than demolish them.
- drop the plan to build new Borough Council offices.
- establish neighbourhood councils.
- form tenants co-operatives.
- press the County Council for a residents parking scheme and to limit heavy lorries on residential roads.

**COUNCILLOR Mrs M. BATEMAN**

21, Ashendin Road, Guildford
Telephone: 86655

**COUNCILLOR DR. R. BLUNDELL**

40, Farnham Road, Guildford
Telephone: 78130

**COUNCILLOR R. MARKS**

9, Blackwell Avenue, Guildford
Telephone: 76885

Dear Electors,

Three years ago, when we asked for and received your support at the election, we stressed how much our ward suffered from the effects of town centre development, and how vital it was to keep in touch, through neighbourhood groups and the like, with all the new proposals for offices, roads and similar activities.

We have seen in those three years many attacks on our environment, ranging from the demolition of cottages in Chertsey Street to the unacceptable details for the Friary site contained in their first application. Many of those attacks have been repelled by the simple act of participation, by continual consultation between ourselves, individuals, amenity groups and neighbourhood associations, which has prevented the Council with a very clear picture of the desires and needs of the residents of the area. It has at times been a difficult task for us, as we are part of a minority opposition group, but nevertheless, we feel that strong foundations have been laid.

If you decide to re-elect us to continue the battle, there is great hope that we can build upon these foundations. Some of our objectives in the next three years will be to see a start made on the Colne Road link in order to reduce the flow of heavy vehicles in residential roads — all empty houses restored for use — the completion of the Stoke Field improvement scheme — residential parking and a restriction on all heavy vehicles — the temporary car park removed from Guildford Park — regular attention given to landscape areas — new use planning — with your help it can be done, we ask for your support again on May 6th.

Yours sincerely,

MARGUERITE BATEMAN, ROBERT BLUNDELL, RICHARD MARKS.
Guildford Conservative Party Election Handout (6th May 1976)

Appendix 7.2

for ALL the people

Local government is about the provision of services for the community as a whole. It is about integrity, fairness and sensitivity to changing needs. It is about a sense of balance between conflicting interests, objectives and priorities. GUILDFORD CONSERVATIVES accept this challenge. We aim to:

1. create a sense of identity with the whole Borough of Guildford without making the new 45 member Council remote and impersonal
2. foster community spirit in the parishes and wards
3. encourage self-reliance, and in particular the extension of opportunities for home ownership by the most effective means available, while providing for those in need or who cannot help themselves
4. protect the rural and urban environment, especially in the Green Belt and our 21 conservation areas, without detracting from the liveliness of our town and village communities
5. consult people affected by planning applications and really take their views into account, without unduly prolonging the planning process or abdicating the Council’s duty to make the final decision
6. maintain and improve the quality of life, including the provision of opportunities for sport and other leisure activities

provide services for ALL the people of the Borough and, within the resources available, tailor the services to what the people want and not to what officials think they ought to have

balance the quality of the services provided against the need to keep to the minimum the burden on the rate payer

The policies of the present government and the rampant inflation of the last few years have created a crisis in local government. This is no time for instant policies, quick remedies or slogans as a substitute for thought. As CONSERVATIVES we permit ourselves only one slogan:

We stand for ALL the people
vote CONSERVATIVE on 6th MAY

CONSERVATIVES CARE ABOUT LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Rates are unfair . . . they are unrelated to the ability to pay. A CONSERVATIVE Government would reform the way local services are financed.

Services in Surrey are being cut and rates are having to rise because Surrey’s rate support grant was severely reduced at short notice. A CONSERVATIVE Government would be fair and would enable local authorities to plan ahead.

Too many new laws are imposing extra work and extra costs on local councils. A CONSERVATIVE Government would halt this flood of ill-considered legislation.

The worst of these new laws is the Community Land Act, which is putting enormous new powers over property into the hands of local councils. There are bound to be temptations to abuse these powers and further erode individual freedom. A CONSERVATIVE Government would repeal the Community Land Act.

Until we have a CONSERVATIVE Government again we must depend on local councils to defend freedom and choice. This means CONSERVATIVE councillors and a CONSERVATIVE Guildford Borough Council.

vote CONSERVATIVE on 6th MAY

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL ELECTIONS 1976

STANLEY COBBETT
ASHLEY SPANNER
JEAN HARRIS

STANLEY COBBETT
Sponge, Flower Walk, Guildford.
Telephone Guildford 72520.
Married with two children. Born at Sutton, Surrey, and has lived in the County all his life and the last seven years in St. Nicolas Ward. A barrister’s clerk, Involved with the City of London, served with the R.A.F. as a navigator 1939—1945. Has been closely associated professionally with local government and environmental problems. A keen preservationist, member of the Guildford Society and the National Trust.

JEAN HARRIS
MRS. JEAN HARRIS, Wen or Cottage Sandy Lane, Guildford. Telephone Guildford 30880.
A housewife, married to an official of the National Farmers Union. Has lived in the Ward for seventeen years. Secretary of the St. Catherines Village Association (local amenity association) for the past ten years. In President of the St. Catherine’s Women’s Institute, serves on the management Sub-Committee of the St. Catherine’s Primary School Foundation, is a member of the Guildford Crime Prevention Panel, a member of the Guildford Society and the National Trust.

ASHLEY SPANNER
32 Denzil Road, Guildford.
Telephone Guildford 33688.
Age twenty seven years. Married with one daughter attending St. Nicolas School. Has lived in the Ward all his life. Member of the St. Nicolas Ward Branch of the Guildford Conservative Association. Works for a small civil engineering company as contract manager.

YOUR CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATES

STANLEY COBBETT
JEAN HARRIS
ASHLEY SPANNER

An official poll card will be delivered to you before polling day.

VOTE FOR ALL THREE ON THURSDAY 6th MAY
8 a.m. to 9 p.m.

GUILDFORD CONSERVATIVE CANDIDATES

Printed and endorsed by D.J. Brown, 9 High Street, Guildford

Printed and endorsed by D.J. Brown, 9 High Street, Guildford
Dear Elector,

Among many points of grave concern in the affairs of your Council, we should like to draw your attention to the following.

RESIDENTIAL PARKING The present system ignores the rights and needs of the householders. Where a property can accommodate neither a garage nor even a hard standing for a car it is galling that adjacent street space should be sacrificed to the shopper or commuter. Additionally, when servicing is necessary, e.g. plumbing, repairs, fuel delivery, etc., the householders, together with the supplier, is doubly handicapped. Parking space should be returned to the householders.

STOKE PARK AND THE PRIORY SITE The Council has already shown bad judgement in its handling of the County Hall issue. The legal costs arising from this will cost the rate payers £8435! Now it is ignoring public opinion again on the question of the Priory site development. As a recent public meeting, the Chief Executive Officer stated that M.E.P.C. had paid £1 million per acre for this land. Presumably construction will double this figure. There is already considerable alarm felt by shopkeepers who wished to rent premises on this site at the suggested rents they will have to pay. Under these circumstances the Guildford ratepayer should not indemnify M.E.P.C. nor be responsible for any part of their debts. Dare we quote in this connection Mr. Edward Heath, who himself coined the immortal phrase "the unacceptable face of capitalism"?

RATING REFORM The existing form of rating, based upon size of dwelling and situation, is considered inadequate and unfair. The principle of increasing rateable value when a property is improved, e.g. by the addition of a bathroom, is not in the best interests of the community. A new system of rating should be devised, which is more closely related to the ability of the household to pay.

HOUSES AS OFFICES? Not likely! A large number of houses now serve as offices and, at the same time, there is much empty office accommodation. In the County of Surrey there is a surplus of office space of more than a quarter of a million square feet. All "office houses" should be returned to residential use forthwith, as per the Town Plan, with beneficial effect on our swollen Housing List.

WARDENS FOR OLD PEOPLE'S HOMES There is a need for a resident warden in every area where there are old people's dwellings. The need has been met in some areas administered by the Borough Council but more wardens are still needed. Many old people living alone feel isolated and fear being ill with no one to help. A resident warden with a telephone would provide a basis for security and a feeling of being in touch with the outside world.

LOCAL BUS SERVICES AND PENSIONERS Over half the people who need to travel depend on public transport. Cross town services must be encouraged, if only to avoid irritating delays at the central bus station. The large subsidies given by the local authority to the bus companies should ensure free travel for Old Age Pensioners, especially at off peak hours. Empty buses, or near-empty buses, are an irony from the rate payer's point of view.

VOTE LABOUR AND GET YOUR VIEWS REPRESENTED. IF YOU AGREE WITH US, VOTE WITH US

Yours sincerely,

Judy Hemman, Greta Lines and Maurice Munnell

THE CANDIDATES

Judy Hemman a resident of Guildford, for 10 years, recently moved into St. Nicholas Ward. Aged 36. Married with three cats. A Social Science graduate, currently employed by the EBC, Trade Union: ABS. Active in the Residents' Association at her former address and a member of the Save Guildford Association. Address 48 Woodland Avenue. Telephone 70331

Greta Lines a resident of Guildford District for 27 years, living in Holy Trinity Ward. Married, with one grown up daughter who was educated in Guildford. A Committee Member of the United Nations Association and of the Save Guildford Association. Address Fieldings, One Tree Hill Road. Telephone 66400

Maurice Munnell a resident of Guildford for 45 years, living in Holy Trinity Ward. Married with two grown up children, both educated in Guildford. Formerly employed as a Reader for a Printing and Publishing firm. Educated at the University of London. Address 6 Warwick's Bench. Telephone 68750

PLEASE CUT OFF THIS SECTION AND DISPLAY IT IN YOUR WINDOW.
## Appendix 2.1

Mean Difference between the Evaluation Scores of Councillors and (i) Non-members; (ii) FWRA members; (iii) All residents; using the Student’s t-test (one-tailed test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(i) Non-residents</th>
<th>(ii) FWRA members</th>
<th>(iii) All residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and recreation</td>
<td>( t = 6.37 )</td>
<td>( t = 4.69 )</td>
<td>( t = 6.62 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing provision</td>
<td>( t = 7.76 )</td>
<td>( t = 5.99 )</td>
<td>( t = 7.38 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>( t = 0.56 )</td>
<td>( t = 0.51 )</td>
<td>( t = 0.61 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .28 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .30 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .27 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish disposal</td>
<td>( t = 6.37 )</td>
<td>( t = 4.08 )</td>
<td>( t = 6.37 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and transport</td>
<td>( t = 1.93 )</td>
<td>( t = 1.31 )</td>
<td>( t = 1.79 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .10 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>( t = 1.65 )</td>
<td>( t = 1.01 )</td>
<td>( t = 1.5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .16 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .065 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>( t = 6.73 )</td>
<td>( t = 4.60 )</td>
<td>( t = 5.73 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the environment</td>
<td>( t = 4.2 )</td>
<td>( t = 4.09 )</td>
<td>( t = 4.41 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-members \( \bar{n} = 69 \)
FWRA members \( \bar{n} = 56 \)
All residents \( \bar{n} = 125 \)
Councillors \( \bar{n} = 30 \)
Appendix 9.2

Mean Difference between the Evaluation Scores of Officers and (i) Non-members; (ii) FWRA members; (iii) All residents, using the Student's t-test (one-tailed test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>(i) Non-members</th>
<th>(ii) FWRA members</th>
<th>(iii) All residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and recreation</td>
<td>$t = 6.16$</td>
<td>$t = 3.62$</td>
<td>$t = 3.93$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing provision</td>
<td>$t = 8.94$</td>
<td>$t = 7.33$</td>
<td>$t = 8.98$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$t = 1.29$</td>
<td>$t = 1.20$</td>
<td>$t = 1.32$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .10$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .12$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish disposal</td>
<td>$t = 3.18$</td>
<td>$t = 2.24$</td>
<td>$t = 2.78$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .003$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and transport</td>
<td>$t = 1.77$</td>
<td>$t = 1.39$</td>
<td>$t = 1.64$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .05$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .08$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>$t = 2.83$</td>
<td>$t = 2.07$</td>
<td>$t = 2.76$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .005$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .02$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .006$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$t = 3.97$</td>
<td>$t = 2.4$</td>
<td>$t = 3.28$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .0005$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the environment</td>
<td>$t = 3.10$</td>
<td>$t = 3.01$</td>
<td>$t = 3.17$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .002$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-members $n = 69$
FWRA members $n = 56$
All residents $n = 125$
Officers $n = 11$
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A PARISH COUNCIL FOR FRIARY WARD?

A SURVEY OF RESIDENTS' ATTITUDES

D.L. Uzzell.
M.E. Uzzell.
W.G. Jackson.

FRIARY WARD RESIDENTS’ ASSOCIATION

NOVEMBER 1978.
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1.0 Introduction and Summary

1.1 In June 1978, Friary Ward Residents' Association in common with other amenity and residents' groups in Guildford, received notification from Guildford Borough Council that it was intending to carry out a review of both the parishes and unparished areas in the Borough in accordance with two recent government circulars (121/77 and 33/78) and the report no. 286 of the Boundary Commission. The Residents' Association was invited to submit proposals or comments on this matter by early September.

1.2 The topic of 'eparishment' for Friary Ward was raised first through the Association's newsletter of July 1978, which also gave notice that it would be the main focus for discussion at the General Meeting on 8th August. At this meeting, the Chairman of the Surrey County Association for Parish and Town Councils was guest speaker and explained what the setting up of a Parish Council could mean for an area such as Friary Ward. Following questions and discussion the majority of those present voted in favour of making a preliminary application to the Council for consideration for Parish status, and this was consequently done.

1.3 However, the Residents' Association felt it was important to take a wider sample of opinion than was possible through the machinery of the General Meeting, and this is in line with the recommendations of the Boundary Commission's report no 286 that inhabitants of areas under review be given adequate opportunity to express their views. (p.3 - paras. 2 and 3). It was therefore decided to initiate a survey of households in the area covered by FWRA by means of a questionnaire (Appendix I) and interview to determine whether there was widespread support for the introduction of Parish status. The results of this survey form the basis for this report.

Summary

1.4 Just under one-third of the households of Friary Ward were interviewed as to their opinion on the establishment of a Parish Council for Friary Ward.

1.5 The very large sample ensured that all sections of the population were interviewed. Despite the fact that the survey was instituted and organized by the Friary Ward Residents' Association, no attempt was made to canvass solely members of the Association. In fact members of FWRA accounted for less than one-third of those interviewed. (Section 3).

1.6 Two in every three residents said that there was a need for a Parish Council to represent the interests of residents. This reply was made regardless of age, sex, form of house tenure, length of residence in the ward, or membership of the Residents' Association. (Section 7).

1.7 Three out of every four residents said that they would like to see a Parish Council established. Again this reply was given regardless of age, sex, form of house tenure, length of residence, or membership of the Residents' Association. (Section 8).

1.8 When it was suggested to residents that the establishment of a Parish Council would mean an increase in the rates, 70% of those interviewed said that it would be worth the cost. (Section 9).
1.9 Opinion was equally divided as to whether the residents' interests were satisfactorily represented at present. But two-thirds of those who said their interests were represented still wanted a Parish Council. Therefore, the desire for a Parish Council comes not just from those who feel the interests of the community are not satisfactorily represented. (Section 5).

1.10 Half the population interviewed thought that the Ward was a recognisable community suitable for having a Parish Council. There was a tendency for those who said that Friary Ward was a community to say that they would like to see a Parish Council established. The recognition of a community appears, as one might expect, to be a function of length of residence and involvement in the community. (Section 10).

2.0 Background to the Survey

2.1 The survey took place over three weeks in November 1978, using 22 volunteer interviewers. The original intention was to interview as many households in the Ward as possible. According to the last Population Census in 1971, there were 1541 households in the Ward. This necessitated knocking on every door on the Ward. This was done, but because interviews were primarily carried out in daylight hours, there was not always a reply. Interviewers were instructed to call back to the household on at least one more occasion if there was no reply on the first visit. The only criterion for taking part in the survey was the entitlement by the respondent to vote at local government elections, i.e. their name was on the electoral roll.

2.2 A total of 454 usable questionnaires were completed. This constitutes 29.5% of the households in Friary Ward. Therefore just under one in every three households were interviewed.

2.3 All the interviewers carried the following in addition to the questionnaire:

i) identification - as working on behalf of FWRA;
ii) the FWRA newsletter for October, which had carried both a report of the August General Meeting and advance notice of the survey, and had already been circulated to every household in the Ward, regardless of membership/non-membership of FWRA;
iii) a map of Friary Ward - the area covered by the Association - in case any of those interviewed were uncertain about the boundaries. (Appendix II);
iv) a copy of the latest electoral list for the part of the Ward the interviewer was covering;
v) an information sheet summarising the main features of Parish status (which had also been carried in expanded form in the October newsletter. (Appendix III).

2.4 All those interviewed were assured that the information they gave would be strictly confidential and anonymous. A high proportion of the interviewers were female, and because many were operating alone, most of the interviews took place during daylight hours which explains why many of the respondents in the survey were also female. (See Table I).
2.5 Except where indicated otherwise the no-response (N/R) figures mean that the respondent failed to give an answer to a question.

3.0 The Population Interviewed

3.1 In this section we provide a simple descriptive summary of the population we interviewed. We also compare the sample we interviewed with the population as a whole for Friary Ward, extracted from the 1971 Census.

3.2 Several points should be made. In some cases there is a disparity between our sample and the total population. In some cases this is due to the simple sampling method we used. In other cases (e.g. House tenure), there has been a considerable increase in Council-owned property in the Ward since 1971 (Falcon Road, Bedford House). It should be remembered that the 1971 Census is now seven years old. Friary Ward has seen important population changes in their time, especially concerning an influx of young couples, and a decline in the elderly section of the population. However, for all these points, we believe that the sample population we interviewed reflects in proportion the population characteristics of the Ward.

3.3 The results of the questionnaire were processed using a statistical package (SPSS) at the University of Manchester Computing Centre, accessed by means of the ICL Computer at the University of Surrey.

Sample details

Table I Respondents by sex:
(n = 454)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Ward Census</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* both male and female interviewed together.
** unrecorded.

Table 2 Respondents by age:
(n = 454)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18 - 24 years</th>
<th>25 - 34 years</th>
<th>35 - 44 years</th>
<th>45 - 59 years</th>
<th>60+ years</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Respondents by tenure of property
(n = 454)

Sample - FW. Census:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Occupiers</th>
<th>Rented from local Auth.</th>
<th>Private Rented (furnished)</th>
<th>Private Rented (unfurnished)</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Respondents by length of residence in Friary Ward
(n = 454)

Sample - FW. Census:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>3-10 yrs.</th>
<th>10 yrs.+</th>
<th>Born here &amp; Continuous Residence</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Respondents by membership of FWRA.
(n = 454)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 Knowledge of the Proposals

Q.1. Did you receive the last FWRA Newsletter?

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Details of what a Parish Council is were provided in the two FWRA Newsletters prior to the survey. Two out of three residents saw the FWRA newsletter immediately preceding the survey. We did not expect everyone to recall receiving it, for a variety of reasons, and thus we ensured later in the interview that further details were provided about the purpose of a Parish Council and what it would mean for Friary Ward.

5.0 Level of Satisfaction with the Representation of Community Interests

Q.2. Do you think the interests of the local community are adequately represented?

Table 7. (n = 454)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Opinion here was divided equally. However, when the answers to this question were examined in relation to whether or not the residents wanted a Parish Council in Friary Ward, it was found that over two-thirds (71.7%) of those interviewed who thought that the interests of Friary Ward were represented still wanted to see a Parish Council representing the residents' interests. Just under 4 in every 5 residents (77.8%) who felt the interests of the Ward were not represented said they would like a Parish Council in Friary Ward. Therefore, the desire for a Parish Council comes not solely from those who feel that the residents' interests are not represented.

5.2 There was no significance between the sexes, each age group, housing tenure groups and length of residence in the answers to this question. That is, those who said that the interests of the community were represented were as likely to be found in a young age group as an older one, or those who had lived in the Ward for only a few years, as those who had lived in Friary Ward all their life.

5.3 There was however an important difference (statistically significant) between members and non-members of the FWRA in their answer to this question. Over half the non-members of FWRA, (55.3%) said that the interests of the community were represented, as compared with just under half of the FWRA members (44.7%). But more important, just under two-thirds (64.1%) of those who said the interests of the community were not represented were non-FWRA members as compared with only a third (35.9%) of FWRA members. Therefore, it is primarily the non-members of FWRA who feel that the interests of the Ward are not represented.

6.0 Level of Satisfaction with the Friary Ward Residents' Association

Q.3. Are you satisfied with the way Friary Ward Residents' Association represents your interests to the local Borough and County Councils.
6.1 Well over half of those interviewed were satisfied with the efforts of the FWRA to represent the interests of residents. When this is broken down one finds, as one might expect, that three-quarters of FWRA members (76.7%) were satisfied with FWRA efforts to represent the community, as compared with a half of non-members (51.9%). Less than 14% in both groups were dissatisfied with FWRA, although a high proportion of non-members (34.4%) felt that they did not know how well FWRA represented the community.

6.2 A high proportion of those who said that they were satisfied with the efforts of the FWRA to represent the community said that they would still like to see a Parish Council representing the residents' interests (74.1%). As with the last question, despite the existence of a Residents' Association, residents still felt that a Parish Council would more adequately represent their interests. One cannot attribute this to the quality of the FWRA's performance, as a large percentage of the residents' expressed satisfaction with their efforts, but still felt a statutory Parish Council is needed.

6.3 Unlike the previous question there were differences in the response to this question when the answers were broken down by the age, tenure and length of residence of respondents. One might trace these differences to the membership pattern of FWRA. Those under 24 years of age were less satisfied with FWRA's efforts as were those who lived in furnished rented accommodation, and those who had lived only for a short time in the Ward (less than 1 year). This section of the population might be characterized as more mobile, if not rootless composed partly of students living in flats and bedsits, whose interest in the local community is minimal as they do not see themselves as residents for any prolonged period of time. Generally, satisfaction with FWRA's efforts increased both with length of residence and age of respondents. Satisfaction with FWRA was high also amongst owner occupiers (66.7%), council tenants (64.8%) and tenants of private unfurnished property (53.1%).

7.0 Attitudes to the Need for a Parish Council for Friary Ward

Q.5. Do you think there is a need for a Parish Council in Friary Ward?

Table 9 (n = 454)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1 Just over two residents in every three interviewed said that they thought there was a need for a Parish Council in Friary Ward. Generally there was little variation in response according to sex, age, housing tenure or length of residence. Furthermore, there was no statistically significant difference between members and non-members reply to this question. Exactly 75% of the FWRA members said that there was a need for a Parish Council in Friary Ward, as compared with 68.8% of non-members.

7.2 However the replies to this question are broken down, the need for a Parish Council in Friary Ward is unequivocally expressed.

8.0 Attitudes to the Establishment of a Parish Council in Friary Ward

Q.6. Would you like to see a Parish Council representing the interests of residents in Friary Ward?

Table 10. (n = 454)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1 Although this question is similar to the previous one, we considered that it was possible to express a need for a Parish Council in Friary Ward, while at the same time not personally wanting to see a Parish Council representing the residents. Therefore, the question asks directly and personally "Would you like to see a Parish Council representing the interests of residents in Friary Ward?" Again an overwhelming majority (72.5%) answered 'yes'.

8.2 The high percentage wishing to see a Parish Council representing the residents was reflected in each group (between 70.7% (45-59 year olds) to 83.7% (18-24 year olds) answering yes), housing tenure group (between 70.2% (owner-occupiers) to 87.2% (private, furnished accommodation)) and length of residence group (between 72.1% (1-3 years; over 10 years) to 80.0% (born in Friary Ward and continuous residence). There was little difference too between males & females replying that they would like to see a Parish Council representing the interests of the residents of Friary Ward (68.8%; 76.6%).

8.3 Finally, there was no significant difference between members and non-members of the FWRA in their answers to this question. Four out of every five FWRA members (80.3%) said they would like a Parish Council to represent the community's interests, as compared with just under three in every four non-FWRA members (71.5%). Therefore, the support for the idea of a Parish Council in Friary Ward does not come solely from the members of the Residents' Association. Rather it has general support by all sections of the community.
9.0 Attitudes to the Cost of a Parish Council

Q.7. Would the benefits of a Parish Council be worth the extra penny in the pound you would have to pay in rates?

Table 11 \( n = 454 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1 We went to some lengths to ensure that the residents were aware that the institution of a Parish Council would entail a certain cost for themselves (by an increase in the rates). Taking into account current rating in rural areas, and the proportion of highly rated commercial property in the Ward, we suggested to residents that a Parish Council would cost them about an additional one penny in the pound rate. In this question we asked them to consider whether the advantages of a Parish Council were worth the extra penny rate. As can be seen from the table, over two-thirds of the population interviewed (70.5%) still thought it was worthwhile. Just under 20% said that a Parish Council was not worth an additional penny in the pound rate.

9.2 When the answers to this question were broken down by membership of FWRA, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference in the answers given by members and non-members. A significantly higher percentage of FWRA members (78.1%) than non-members (67.8%) thought that the benefits of a Parish Council would be worth the extra penny in the pound rate. However, the proportion of non-members who thought it worthwhile was still considerable, with two in every three replying 'yes' to the question.

9.3 Again, regardless of how long the respondent had lived in the Ward, their type of housing tenure, or their sex, all thought it was worthwhile. The age of the respondent did however have some effect on whether or not they thought dispensation worthwhile financially. There was a tendency, perhaps naturally, for those over 60 years old to consider it not worth the extra cost. Sixty-one per cent of those over sixty years old considered it worthwhile as compared with an average of 76% in the other age groups.

10.0 Attitudes to the Existence of a Community in Friary Ward

Q.8. Do you think that Friary Ward is a "distinctive and recognisable community with its own sense of identity" suitable for having a Parish Council?

Table 12 \( n = 454 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerable emphasis was placed in the DOE Circular 121/77 on ensuring that if Parish Councils are to be formed in previously unparished urban areas, their boundaries should enclose "a small, distinctive and recognisable community with its own sense of identity". (para. 7). Community, like beauty, exists in the eye of the beholder and similarly more often than not draws an emotive rather than rational response. The difficulties in defining the exact nature of a community are legion, and researchers have not yet agreed on universal criteria for measuring so subjective a phenomenon. For this reason we did not attempt to circumscribe respondents' ideas as to what a community is when we asked this question.

Our lack of faith in its usefulness is not the result of our question, but rather a general belief that each person's interpretation of community and its size will be different. For this reason we phrased the question using the same wording as Circular 121/77 and allowed respondents to make what they would of it. We also felt that it was a difficult question to understand 'on the doorstep'. With this in mind we asked the question reluctantly because we had reservations as to both the validity and usefulness of the answers.

Half the households we interviewed considered that Friary Ward was a suitable community with its own identity to have a Parish Council. Just under a third of the households disagreed. As one might expect, those residents who believed that Friary Ward formed "a distinctive and recognisable community" also thought there was a need for a Parish Council and personally wanted to see one representing their interests. Three in every five residents (59.6%) who said they wanted a Parish Council also said that they thought Friary Ward was a recognisable community, as compared with 24.7% who thought it was not. On the other hand, 64.7% of those who do not want a Parish Council said that Friary Ward was not a community. However, this latter group only forms 10.2% of the total households interviewed. One might argue that this is a chicken-egg problem. Community consciousness may well be enhanced by an organisation like a Parish Council.

The female population interviewed were more likely than males to say that a "recognisable community" existed as were those who lived in their own or council property. As might be expected those who have lived in the Ward for many years said that Friary Ward had a sense of identity, as compared with those who have lived in the Ward for only a short period of time. The table below shows what percentage in each group answered yes to question 8.

Table 13. Length of Residence (n = 441)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>under 1 yr.</th>
<th>1-3 yrs.</th>
<th>3-10 yrs.</th>
<th>over 10 yrs.</th>
<th>Born here &amp; continuous residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friary Ward</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Friary Ward | a sense of identity | 75% |
10.5 Finally, FWRA members were more likely than non-members to say that Friary Ward is a distinctive community suitable for having a Parish Council. Two-thirds of FWRA members (66.0%) answered 'yes' to question 8, as compared with 42.4% of non-members.

11.0 Conclusion

11.1 It would be very easy for the FWRA to conclude this report by arguing, as a Residents' Association, for the setting up of a Parish Council in Friary Ward. However, the Association does not intend to do this for two reasons. Firstly, the results presented in this report speak for themselves. The Association is quite content to allow the elected members to draw their own conclusions based on the findings of the survey presented here.

11.2 Secondly, the Friary Ward Residents' Association did not carry out the survey with the intention of 'using' it to further the Association's case. The survey was carried out as an honest attempt to find out whether the residents of Friary Ward would like to see a Parish Council established in order to act as a unit of "community feeling and community representation" (Circular 121/77, para 7). Although the Friary Ward Residents' Association at its August General Meeting decided to provisionally make an application to Guildford Borough Council seeking Parish Council status for the Ward, it was felt necessary to find out what everyone in the Ward thought about the proposal. As was noted in Table 5, two-thirds of those who answered the questions were not members of the Friary Ward Residents' Association. By interviewing a third of the households in the Ward, the Friary Ward Residents' Association believes it has canvassed widely and impartially the views of all sections of the population in Friary Ward.
1. Did you receive the last FWRA Newsletter? (show copy)
   1. yes 2. no 3. don't know 4. no response

2. Are you entitled to vote in the local elections, that is are you on the electoral list?
   1. yes 2. no 3. don't know 4. no response

3. Do you think the interests of the local community are adequately represented?
   1. yes 2. no 3. don't know 4. no response

4. Are you satisfied with the way the Friary Ward Residents Association represents your interests to the local Borough and County Council.
   1. Yes 2. no 3. don't know 4. no response

5. Here is a brief reminder of the main functions and features of a Parish Council. Could you please read it (show card): Is there anything further you would like to know?

6. Do you think there is a need for a Parish Council in Friary Ward?
   1. Yes 2. No 3. don't know 4. no response

7. Would you like to see a Parish Council representing the interests of residents in Friary Ward?
   1. Yes 2. no 3. don't know 4. no response

8. Would the benefits of a Parish Council be worth the extra penny in the pound you would have to pay in rates?
   1. yes 2. no 3. don't know 4. no response

9. Do you think that Friary Ward is a "distinctive and recognizable community with its own sense of identity" suitable for having a Parish Council?
   1. Yes 2. no 3. don't know 4. no response
10. **Gender**

   - 1 Male
   - 2 Female
   - 3 Both
   - 4 No response

11. **Age**

   1. 18 - 24 years
   2. 25 - 34 years
   3. 35 - 44 years
   4. 45 - 59 years
   5. Over 60 years
   6. No response

12. **Tenure**

   1. Owner occupier
   2. Rented from local authority
   3. Privately rented - furnished
   4. Privately rented unfurnished
   5. No response

13. **How long have you lived in Friary Ward?**

   1. Less than 1 year
   2. 1 year - 3 years
   3. 3 years - 10 years
   4. Over 10 years
   5. Born here and continuous residence
   6. No response

14. **Are you a member of the Friary Ward Residents' Association?**

   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Don't know
   4. No response
APPENDIX 3

A PARISH COUNCIL FOR FRIARY WARD?

The Boundaries Commission is looking into Local Government at its lowest level to identify the need to establish new parish or town councils in areas which are, at present, not part of a parish. Friary Ward is, of course, one of these.

At present the Association represents residents and makes their views known on any relevant matters. The County and Borough Councils consult us on most matters affecting the Ward. However, they do not have a statutory duty to do so.

Parish Councils have duties and responsibilities for the following:

1. Provision of recreational facilities.
2. Provision and upkeep of bus shelters and seats.
3. Provision of footway lighting.
4. A right to be consulted on all planning applications.

It is significant that these authorities come direct to Parish Councils as part of the consultation process on local issues.

Parish Councils raise income by levying an annual rate, per pound rateable value, on property in the parish. Well over three-quarters of the twenty-three parishes in Guildford levy a rate of only one penny in the pound. So from a property with a rateable value of £120 the parish income would be £1.20 per year.

This money is collected with the Borough Council rates and passed on to the parish.

The parish council would thus have its own money for direct use on the parish itself. This could be spent on improvement to amenities according to the wishes of the local electorate.
Appendix 9.4

FWRA Objection to the Proposed Drummond Road/
Artillery Terrace Link

With reference to the above proposal, we recognise the need for all streets in the area to have access from at least two points in order to comply with fire regulations. We appreciate that such a regulation is applicable to the houses in George Road and Artillery Terrace with the proposed blocking off of a number of roads bounded by York Road, Stoke Road and Woodbridge Road.

At present emergency vehicles attending houses in George Road have access from Woodbridge Road through Artillery Road, and from York Road into Artillery Terrace. As we understand the road plans for the area, it is proposed that access be continued from Woodbridge Road via Artillery Road; and Stoke Road through Park Road, Drummond Road and into Artillery Terrace, as a consequence of blocking off the Artillery Terrace/York Road exit.

We object to the proposed Drummond Road link for the following reasons:

1. Evidence from various road improvement schemes suggests that traffic is encouraged by new routes, which may often divert traffic away from routes better equipped to cope with it. We consider that a new link road as proposed between Artillery Terrace and Drummond Road must increase traffic flow. Traffic flow in the Artillery Terrace/Drummond Road area must increase by virtue of the increased number of traffic sources. In addition to the increase in internal traffic sources, we believe that traffic external to the area will be encouraged to use the roads in this residential part of the Ward as a short-cut between Stoke and Woodbridge Roads.

2. The emergence of cars from a two-lane (7.3 metre wide) road into a road the width of Drummond Road would be dangerous and contrary to most principles of traffic management. Drummond Road is only two-thirds the width of the proposed link road. In addition, the close proximity of terraced
houses to the roadway would present a danger to the inhabitants of those houses from turning traffic, as Drummond Road cannot cope with two-way traffic. It would only take a slight misjudgment by a lorry turning into Drummond Road, and the fronts of several houses opposite to the proposed link road would be demolished.

3. A new road would mean the loss of a number of parking bays in Drummond Road as Drummond Road would have to have double yellow lines on both sides in order to allow the free flow of traffic. As there are no alternative sites for residents' car parking in this area, this would cause a great deal of inconvenience to residents who would be forced to park at some distance from their houses, and of course thereby causing a nuisance and reducing the parking spaces available to those residents in nearby streets.

4. The new road would involve the demolition of three residential units in a General Improvement Area, at a time when the housing shortage (especially smaller housing for which there is the greatest demand) is critical. The link road would not enhance the environment in such a way that the demolition of any residential units could be justified. The declaration of this area as a General Improvement Area in the early 1970's implies that the houses in the Stoke GIA are of a suitably high structural standard with a life expectancy of at least 30 years. The demolition of houses for reasons other than housing safety and standards is thus to be condemned and contradicts a statement issued by the Guildford Borough Council Planning Department in 1970 which states:

"Above all, the designation of the area will be an affirmation of the Council's faith in its future life as an area capable of providing a good standard of low-cost housing and improved environs."

(Housing Act 1969; Proposed Stoke General Improvement Area, para. 4.3)

5. The houses at the eastern end of Drummond Road contain a large number of children and old people. Apart from pedestrian movement being dangerously
impaired, pedestrian access and egress to and from properties at this end of the street would also be affected owing to the short distance from the house frontages to the roadside, especially on the north side of Drummond Road.

6. The right-angle bend at the eastern end of Drummond Road is dangerous enough at present. An increase in traffic flow could create a very bad accident spot. Oncoming traffic around that corner can only be seen once it has begun to turn. Again a higher traffic flow than at present would increase this danger. Traffic would have to negotiate six right-angle (in some cases, blind) corners in order to travel from Artillery Terrace to Stoke Road by way of the proposed Drummond Road link.

7. While we have argued that the traffic capacity of Drummond Road would not allow the construction of a two-way road into Drummond Road, it can also be argued that the 'environmental capacity' of the area would also be exceeded. It was the intention of the Buchanan Report to create relatively quiet and traffic-free environmental areas in high density inner town areas such as Friary Ward. The traffic management objectives of Buchanan in 1963 were very much reiterated in the rationale behind the environmental objectives in the creation of General Improvement Areas under the 1969 Housing Act. With this in mind it would seem a regressive step to introduce more traffic, noise, visual intrusion and pollution into an area which central government has repeatedly stressed should be freed from such afflictions.

The nature of the street pattern around the proposed link road could create a number of environmental problems other than those already cited, the chief of which would be noise (the sharp corners and short distances between corners would necessitate frequent vehicle gear changes and continual acceleration with its attendant noise and pollution on top of the noise of more traffic in an hitherto relatively quiet cul-de-sac): vibration (with the frontages so close to the roadside, vibration affecting the houses would be all the greater): encroachment of traffic physically on to pavements, because of the lack of space to turn into or out of Drummond Road.
One criterion of need which has been mentioned in discussion of this proposal is the benefit which will accrue to the residents and the wishes of the residents themselves. Discussions by members of the Friary Ward Residents' Association with residents in the Ward have not elicited support for the notion that the scheme would be of particular benefit to the residents in the Ward, i.e. by increasing the internal circulation of traffic, as suggested by Guildford Borough Council.

8. Cost of the scheme. The Drummond Road link would involve at the minimum the demolition of three residential units; the construction of a 7.3 metre wide tarmac road on completely new foundations with associated drainage facilities and the construction of two 2-metre wide pavements which are not needed, as pedestrian access from Drummond Road to Artillery Terrace is already available by way of a footpath at the side of Shaftesbury Hall. In the light of local authority spending cuts, this scheme must be considered a waste of public money as the economic costs far outweigh any benefits which may or may not accrue to the area.

9. By way of a conclusion we would like to say that no measure of need or demand has been put forward for the proposed road. The building of the proposed road can have two alternative consequences. On the one hand it may increase the amount of traffic passing through this part of the Ward. If this does occur, as we believe it will for the reasons cited in paragraph 1 above, then a considerable amount of social and environmental damage and danger will result. At the meeting held at the Municipal offices on 22nd February 1977, the officers of the Surrey Area Highways (S.W.Division) agreed that this would in fact be the case. If, on the other hand, the new road would not generate traffic, as the Highways Officers maintain, we can see very little purpose in building such a road. This is especially true in the light of the reduction in County Council spending and recent Government policy currently being realised in the moratorium on road building.
We recognise the need to comply with Fire Regulations, but in the light of objections given above, we are opposed to the proposal as it stands, but would like to put forward an alternative proposal as follows:

The link between Artillery Terrace and Drummond Road be reduced to the status of a raised pavement, of one vehicle width (wide enough to accommodate a Fire Engine). This would allow emergency vehicles easy and quick access into both parts of the Ward, but would not create the type of traffic flow problems and associated environmental hazards we have cited above. Such a link would be similar to the one already in existence at the western end of Drummond Road. It is suggested that the Drummond Road link be constructed of a maximum width of 5-6 metres, including the corners. Such a pavement would double as a pedestrian access and would clear and tidy up a section of Drummond Road which at present serves no purpose and is unsightly. The Friary Ward Residents' Association would wholeheartedly support a scheme for a pedestrian link which also allowed emergency vehicle access.
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