THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN URBANIZATION AND POSITIVE SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR: A STUDY OF HELPFULNESS BETWEEN STRANGERS IN VARIOUS TYPE OF URBAN ENVIRONMENTS AS AN INDICATION OF QUALITY OF SOCIAL LIFE

POSİTİF SOSYAL DAVRANIŞ VE ŞEHİRLEŞME ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ: ŞEHİRDE SOSYAL HAYAT KALİTESİNİN ANLAŞILMASI BAKIMINDAN BİRBİRİNİ TANIMAYAN İKİ FERT ARASINDAKİ YARDIMLAŞMANIN İNCELENMFSİ

NAMIK AYVALIOĞLU

Department of Psychology, University of Istanbul

A field study was carried out in Turkey in order to compare the level of helpfulness in town, cities, and urban squatter settlements. Four different naturalistic measures of helpfulness were developted and used: willingness to give change, willingness to cooperate with an interview, response to a small accident, and response to a lost postcard. The results generally showed significantly less helpfulness in Turkish cities than in towns and urban squatter settlements, which showed equivalent levels of helpfulness. This supports the view that the squatters may in a pschological and social sense be «urban villagers». Consistent and considerable differences in helpful ness were also found between other typs of city districts. Some of these districts came close to the towns and squatter settlements in their levels of helpfulness, suggesting that drawing distinctions between environments in terms of their behavioral characteristics is best done with the concept of a social-enviromental continuum rather than an urban-nonurban dichotomy. Also environmental input level as an explanation of urban social behaviour was tested in naturalistic environments, found to influence the level of helpfulness for female subjects but not male subjects. Finally, a survey

study was carried out in order to examine differences in attitudes of helpfulness between environements in the question. Dispositional hypothesis of urban social behavior was partly substantiated.

Şehir, kasaba ve gecekondu yerleşim çevrelerindeki yardımseverlik davranışının seviyesini mukayese etmek için bir saha çalışması yürütülmüştür. Dört değişik yardım severlik ölçüsü geliştirilmiş ve kullanılmıştır. Bu ölçüler bozuk para isteğine tepki, bir survey araştırmasıda rol alma isteğine tepki, küçük bir kazaya tepki, ve kaybolmuş posta kartına tepkidir. Neticeler genel olarak şehir çevresinde, kasaba ve gecekondu çevresinden anlamlı seviyede daha az, kasaba ve gecekondu çevrelerinde de eşit seviyede yardımseverlik davranışını göstermiştir. Bu netice gecekonduda yaşayanların psikolojik ve sosyal anlamda şehir köylüleri olduğu görüşünü doğrulamaktadır. Ayrıca şehir içinde incelenen çeşitli yerleşim sahalarında tutarlı ve hatırısayılır seviyede yardımseverlik davranışında farklılıklar gözlenmiştir. Bazı şehir yerleşim sahalarında yardım severlik davranışının seviyesi kasaba ve gecekondu çevrelerinde gözlenen seviyeye yaklaşmıştır. Bu da çevreler arasında davranış bakımından farklılığın şehir/kasaba dikotomisi yerine sosyal-çevresel devamlılık kavramı ile daha iyi açıklanabileceğini göstermiştir. Şehiç sosyal davranışını açıklayan input seviyesi hipotezi, tabiî çevrede test edilmiş ve input seviyesinin sadece kadın denekler için anlamlı bir seviyede doğru olduğu gözlenmiştir.

bir seviyede doğru olduğu gözlenmiştir. Son olarak, bu araştırmada söz konusu olan çevrelerde yardımseverlik davranışı ile ilgili attitudlerdeki farklılıklar araştırılmıştır ve şehir davranışının disposionel hipotezi kısmen doğrulanmıştır.

Numerous social psychological analyses of city life have suggested influences which the city exerts on both the social behavior and underlying dispositions, attitudes of urban dwellers. Wirth (1938) the most influential urban analyst has seen the three features: population size, density, heterogenity in unban environment as leading to an urban way of life in which an urban develler become utiliterian, superficil impersonal and unhelpful towards others. Furthermore, the urban living also influences more important types of social behaviours: The relationships between neighbours, friends

and kin that became weakened by the city life. While the other analyses blame the pace of life (Simmel,1950), and intense stimulations in the urban environment (Milgram,1970) for the urban social behavior.

Evidence evaluating the urban impact and social behavior hypothesis is scare. A recent review (See Ayvahoğlu, 1982) of the existing studies has suggested that urban-nonurban differences in social behavior are only evident in the social contact between strangers and there is little differences between urban-nonurban dwelles in their related attitudes.

Compared to their less urban counterparts, urbanites are less helpful, trusting and considerate toward strangers (Gelfand, Nartman, Walden and Page, 1973 : House and Wolf, 1978 : Korte and Kerr, 1975 : Krupat and Coury, 1975 : Lowin, Holtes, Sandler, and Bornstein, 1971: Merrens, 1973 : Milgram, 1970 : for an exception, see Forbes and Gromoll, 1971). These studies have used a variety of naturalistic measures of trust and helpfulness, e.g., mailing a «lost» letter, villigness to cooperate in an interview, assisting people who appear lost, and the results confirm those aspects of urban theories which stipulate particular urban forms of social interaction between strangers. Given the absence of clear urban-nonurban differences on types of social behavior occurring between friends, neighbors, and relatives in the city (See Ayvahoğlu, 1982), at the present this findings on urban forms of social contact between strangers represent a partial confirmation on the very broad characterization of urban social behavior.

Yet the significant contact with strangers is a compelling characteristic of urban everyday life as it is strangers that we are often coping with a wide variety of everyday affairs and the nature of this contact, or more acuretly, the impression of this contact would apear to be central to our stereotypes of places and impressions of quality of life (Lofland, 1973).

The finding that urbanites are different from non-urbanites in their responsiveness to strangers (and not different in other types of social relationships) is very important in guilding research that seeks to identify the particular aspects of an urban environment

which influence social behavior. This finding leads us to focus attention on those features of an urban environment which seem to relate especially to the nature of social contact which occurs between strangers. Yet this evidence demonstrating social contacts benween strangers as more explotative, impersonal, less trusting and less helpful, however, is entirely based on studies carried out in the United States, and confidence in the consistency of urban/non-urban differences in helpfulness toward strangers is considerably weakened when one turns to data from cultures other than the United States. To date only four studies on this topic have been reported, carried out in Holland (Korte, Ypma and Toppen, 1975), in Canada (Schneider and Mocus, 1974; Ruschton, 1978) and Australia (Amato, 1980). Only two of these four studies, from Canada (Rushton, 1978) and Australia (Amato, 1980), found urbanites to be less helpful and less considerate than non-urbanites. As argued by Korte et.al. (1975), this suggest that the occurance of urban/non-urban differences in social behavior may depend upon particular cultural fatures that modify the influences of a city environment; if so, this might lead to a different account of urban/non-urban social behavior than suggested by current urban theories. Hence it seems the generality of urban/-nonurban differences in helpfulness in other cultural settings is open to question.

Futhermore ,all these studies have been carried out in similar types .of societics, in developed and westernized countries. What is completely lacking is an indication of whether there are urban/non-urban differences in social behavior in cultures that are markedly different from those that have been studied to date, i.e. in developing nations. According to several analyses, cities in developing nations exhibit certain characteristics that do not exist in those of developed western nations. For example, one striking aspect is that among city dwellers of Djarkarta, Rangoon and Calcutta, a low level of heterogeneity on major social characteristics, i.e. social differentiation specialization, sophistication and cosmopolitanism has been reported (Hauser, 1965). Almost half of city population lives in self-contained, rural types of settlements which have been called urban villages within the city, eg. Cairo - Egypt (Abu-Loughood, 1961), Ankara and Istanbul - Turkey (Karpat, 1976 ; Türkdoğan, 1977; Yavuz,

Kaleş and Geray, 1978), Latin America (Lewis, 1959; Turner, 1962) and in Africa (Wilson and Mafeje, 1963). These analyses of cities in the developing world (Abu-Lughood, 1961; Hauser, 1965) have argued that the western model of urban behaviour and urban social characteristics does not apply to cities of the developing world where impersonality, distrust, alienation and unhelpfulness are not predominant to the degree depicted in the cities of Western developed countries. This characterization of cities in developing countries seems to challenge the view of urban theories which presume a universality of social behavioural effects associated with the urban environment involving variables such as size, density and heterogeity of population.

However, there are no data which directly test this characterization of cities in the developing world and this prompted the present study. The main focus of this experiment, then, was to evaluate the generality of the helpfulness-urbanization relationship in a culture quite different from those previously used in this line of research. To provide a proper empirical evaluation, we need to investigate cities in the developing world that seem to challenge the formulations of current urban theories which treat urbanization as a universal phenomenon independent of any specific form of urbanization. For this reason Turkey was selected as the focus of our research, since it is a Middle Eastern, developing nation with significant urban centres (Istanbul and Ankara) which would provide a good setting to test the generality of urban/non-urban differences in helpfulness towards strangers. Hence, the first part of this study was concerned with examining the response to a variety of helpfulness measures in a sample of Turkish towns and major cities.

Urban village phenomena : helpfulness in squatter settlements

The city appears to contain a variety of environments in terms of both physical characteristic and social characteristic. Despite this, the previous research (See Ayvalıoğlu, 1982) concerning the presumed linear relationship between urbanization, as indicated by population size, and the pattern of helpfulness does not take account of intra-city differences. Generally the data have been col-

lected from a section of a city and then compared with data collected from a section of a town. This conceptualization of urban environments, which defines 'urban' in terms of size of population, treats urban environments as homogeneous entities, when, in fact, there may be significant intra-urban differences which may retale to patterns of social behaviour. It is thus an overly simplistic approach, and does not allow us to identify specific, crucial factors which may be responsible for urban social behaviour.

Wirth (1938), Simmel (1950) and Milgram (1970) have clearly distinguished the environmental factors in an urban environment such as population size, density and heterogeneity of population (Wirth, 1938) and stimulation from these factors (Simmel, 1950; Milgram, 1970) that may have particular impact on social behaviour, yet there is no assurance that such effects would not be over shadowed by other forces in the city, ie cultural, economic and certain other factors which may also influence the pattern of social behaviour.

Several community studies have described urban neighbourhoods where mutual aid and cooperation flourish in a fashion that reminded observers of a small town or village life, and these communities provide indicators of the possible mediating role of cultural factors between social behaviour and the various phenomena of urbanization. One of the most interesting accounts of these urban neighbourhoods (Jacobs, 1961) concerned the residents of Greenwich village (a district of New York) and Boston West End (a working-class Italian neighbourhood). It describes their sense of belongingness and identification with the neighbourhood and the high level of neighbourly relationships and mutual aid between them. Jacobs also notes the high level of safety and help experienced by both residents and outside visitors alike, due to the virtual absence of street crime, and the feeling that in a troublesome situation they would always find support from local residents. The existence of a similar quality of social life has been reported in other urban communities by different analysists (Gans, 1962; Fried and Gleicher, 1970) and is perhaps best described as an 'urban village' style of life. Indeed, in a community such as Boston West End studied by Gans the patterns of social behaviour are commensurate with a village way of life. The

high level of familiarity between the residents, residential stability and strong identification with the local neighbourhood resulted in the establishment of extensive interpersonal networks which provide the intensive support and aid to individuals in time of hardship lacking in many other neighbourhoods of Boston reported by West End residents. Gans (1962) has added that the pattern of inter-personal behaviour observed within the neighbourhood results from the rural origins of the residents and is bound up with the social tradition of a particular ethnic sub-culture. This social milieu has partly insulated them from some of the stressful disturbances or disintegrating forces of urban life (ie high residential mobility and population heterogeneity), thus enabling them to maintain an environment that supports helpfulness and intimacy. In a later period, the systematic quantitative data gathered by Fried and Gleicher (1970) from West End demonstrates that the important features of urban villages are the localization of inter-personal ties; the overlap in these ties to the extent that many neighbours are also kin; the many interrelated friendship netwoorks; frequent mutual aid, the long and continuous history of these relationships and the fact that the various ties often became interwoven through many activities within a common community. The streets themselves were favourite recreation areas, bars and the settlement houses in the area all served as points of contact for overlapping social networks. In short, as most of the residents of West End stated, West End was home for them and because of its familiarity and security they felt a commitment to it. What is of course immediately striking about this picture of urban districts with their greater level of helpfulness is that it clearly runs counter to the urban social behaviour hypothesis (especially Wirth's 1938) that various forms of helpfulness, eg helpfulness towards strangers who need assistance, suffer a decline in urban environments. As earlier reviewed (also, see Ayvalıoğlu, 1982), researches at this point clearly suggest that urban dwellers are less helpful and considrate towards strangers than their non-urban counterparts. Yet while this basic city-town difference in helpfulness is informative, it tells us hardly anyhing about the within city variations. However, examination of helpfulness in environments within the city besides offering settings to evaluate the urban impact

hypothesis can be very important to illuminate possible determinants of naturally occurring urban helpfulness.

Data to evaluate the idea that there are particular parts of cities which show higher levels of helpfulness are extremely scarce. Only one study by Korte el al (1975) carried out in several city districts in Amsterdam (Hollanda) has examined this question. A preliminary stereotype study was conducted among Amsterdam residents first in order to select city neighbourhoods presenting an image of a high level of friendliness and helpfulness. Two neighbourhoods which satisfied this criterion were identified and were old, stable, working-class districts. The actual helpfulness shown to strangers in these neighbourhoods was then compared with the two neighbourhoods which were ranked the lowest in helpfulness by Amsterdam residents. The result of this study did not support the expectation that level of helpfulness would be influenced by the enhanced quality of life associated with urban village social patterns.

Korte et al's failure to find any differences in helpfulness between the two types of city districts in Amsterdam can be attributed to several factors. First, it may be that helpfulness is expressed in ways not detected by the measures employed by this study or, second, perhaps helpfulness is limited to relatives, friends and neighbours in the neighbourhood. However, if urban villages are more helpful in this way, that is between friends, relatives and neighbours, then one may imagine how the impression of this trait could be easily generalized, perhaps without much justification to include helpfulness toward strangers. A final point that might account for the failure of Korte et al's study is that they may not have located real instances of the urban village phenomenon in Amsterdam. Perhaps, as Wirth (1938) has suggested, because of the melting pot effect of the urban environment the urban village phenomenon had a rather limited, short-lived history of rural to urban migration and stable, homogeneous, ethnic enclaves or ghettos. The present day versions of urban villages may in fact be best illustrated within the cities of developing nations which are at present undergoing extraordinary population growth, swelled by significant rural-to-urban migration. The new urban residents frequently settle into 'squatter' neigbourhoods which remain quiet and are composed of lower and working-

class persons with rural origin. Several accounts have noted a high level of interpersonal relationships and helpfulness among the squatter residents (for analyses of Turkish squatter settlements, see Suzuki, 1964; Levine, 1973; Karpat, 1976; Tekkeli, 1971; Yasa, 1966; for analyses of the squatter settlements of other developing countries, see Abu-Loughood, 1961; Wilson and Mafje, 1963; Turner, 1962; Lewis, 1959). The behavioural characteristics of these urban settlements have been viewed (Abu-Loughood, 1961; Karpat, 1976) as challenging the urban impact hypothesis offered by Wirth (1938) that the behaviour of urbanites adapts toward inevitable forms in response to the influence of the urban environment.

The cities (Ankara and Istanbul) examined in the present study contain numerous squatter settlements which offer an excellent opportunity to test the urban impact hypothesis empirically, as well as the urban village thesis that overall social quality within neighbourhoods that relates to the urban village stereotype enhances various types of helpfulness. The present study also evaluated this expectation by examining helpfulness shown toward strangers in the city squatter settlements.

Some background on the characteristics of Turkish urban squatter settlements will illustrate their relevance as a testing ground for the validity of some aspects of urban impact theories especially that of Wirth's (1938) as well as the urban village thesis.

The population of Turkey grew from 16 million in 1935 to 43 million in 1980. Within the same period, owing to 'push' factors, the high birth rate and economic hardship in rural areas, there has been a population flow from rural areas to cities (Tumertekin, 1968; Hart, 1969). As a result, the pouplation of the cities has increased dramatically: for example, from 1940 to 1980 Istanbul grew 793, 949 to about 5.000.000, while Ankara grew from 152, 242 to about 3.500.000 (1980 Turkish census). One result of this rural-urban migration has been the formation of numerous squatter settlements (Gece Kondu) located often but not always on the fringe of the city. The squatter settlements at the present time form a significant part of he urban population: for instance, 59 % of Ankara's and 55 % of Istanbul's population reside in the squatter settlements (Yavuz, Keles and Geray, 1978).

The settlements can be best described as disricts of low-quality housing erected illegally on unused land by migrants to the city who find with their limited economic means, no other viable alternative for housing. Once erected, these settlements are quite stable with several in Turkey having persisted now into the third generation of inhabitants. Residence within the settlement is often organized according to the particular village in the rural district from which settlers originate. New migrants a particular village in rural Turkey will commonly seek out fellow villagers who preceded them in their migration to Istanbul or Ankara and join them in that part of the settlement.

Accounts of the social patterns within the squatter settlements (see, for example, Abu-Loughood, 1961; Suzuki, 1964; Levine, 1973; Tekkeli, 1971; Asma, 1970; Karpat, 1976; Tiirkdoğan, 1977) suggest that the forms of social behaviour usually associated with urban villages prevail also in this setting. The residents have been depicted as helpful, supportive of one another, and engaged in extensive mutual aid networks involving friends, kin and neighbours, as well as having retained the mannerisms, attitudes and values that prevail in the village of origin. Hence the city-squatter residents resemble the present day inhabitants of villages and towns in Turkey more than they resemble their non-squatter fellow urbanites.

The present study was designed with two aims: (1) to evaluate the urban impact hypothesis, and (2) to contribute to the debate about the character of these urban villages. With this end in view, the nature of helpfulness shown by the squatters towards in several contexts was examined to see in particular if their behaviour does in fact resemble that found in towns and villages in Turkey while differing from the behaviour of those of the non-squatter areas of Turkish cities.

Higher levels of helpfulness shown toward strangers by the squatters, compared to the 'regular' urban sample, could be predicted for a number reasons. Traditional Turkish values stress the importance of social responsibility and the giving of assistance to others (Erdentug, 1977; Turkdoğan, 1977; Kurtkan, 1977) and the squatter population close to their village origins and immersed in

social networks and ways of life that are based on the village model may exemplify these traditional values in their behaviour more than the regular urbanites. Also, their 'urban villages' may partially insualete them from some of the stressful disturbances of urban life, eg bureaucratic life, role conflict, input 'overload', whose symtoms may include a decline in considerateness towards strangers who need assistance (Wirth, 1938; Miigram, 1970). The present study will not directly test these different explanations, but will examine the preliminary question of whether the squatters do differ from regular urbanites in their social behaviour in order to test (1) the urban impact hypothesis (Wirth, 1938), (2) the urban village thesis.

Helpfulness in non-squatter urban environments within the city

The cities (Ankara and Istanbul) examined in this present study, in addition to differentiation along squatter/non-squatter lines, can also be viewed as internally differentiated according to the level of urbanization of their various districts and social characteristics of the residents. Urban environments have often been regarded as homogeneous etities, when in fact there are significant differences and intra urban variations which may be related to patterns of social behaviour. Districts of the city differ in environmental characteristics that are seen as prototypically urban, eg density, noise level, activity level, commercial versus residential character.

Specifically, if the behavioural characteristics are determined to some degree by the actual conditions of the immediate environment as suggested by studies on density, noise, urban architecture and design (see Ayvahoğlu, 1982) as well as by Milgram's (1970) explanations in tems of input overloads, then urban environments within the city varying in several environmental characteristics may be expected to influence the occurrence of helpfuness. The study reported in this paper was also designed to assess this possiblity by comparing helpfulness between various sections of the non-squatter city environments.

The are, very few studies which have compared the patterns of social behaviour in city districts that differed in their level of urbani-

zation Previously reviwed studies by Rushton (1978) and Newman and McCauley (1977) used suburban settings an an intermediary level of urbanization between the inner section of a city and a town, and found, as expected, an intermediary level of helpfulness and friendliness towards strangers in the suburhan settings. However, between the inner section and the suburban section of a city, other levels of urbanization also exist. Environments within the city may be ordered along a continuum according to their environmental characteristics, ie density, crowding, noise, activity level, commercial and residential characteristics, and these environmental characteristics may coincide with the social behaviour found there.

The present study involved, first, carrying out a preliminary study to select various environments within the city which differed in their level of urbanization, and compared patterns of helpfulness found there.

Helpfulness and environmental input level

One limitation in the research which attemts to establish a link between urbanization and social behaviour is the failure to discriminate between various factors which might account for urban/non-urban differences (Fisher, 1978; Korte, 1976, 1978, 1980). The urban environment differs from the non-urban in various ways and any of these may influence the occurrence of social behaviour such as helpfulness. Thus, what seems to be needed is to identify those features of the urban environment which may influence the occurrence of social behaviour and evaluate the explanatory value of each of these variables.

Some of these aspects of the urban environment includecrowding, density, noise, sights and events whose collective impact might be sufficiently stressful to produce certain behavioural changer eradaptotions. Effects of the urban environment may be predicted by the findings of psychological research (in both the laboratory and the field) which have long concerned with the effects of noise, density, crowding, and architectural design which although the findings are at present rather controvertial suggest the potential adverse psychological and behavioural effects of

these factors. For example, a high density and crowding are likely to create problems of interference, and disturbing resources necessary for an individual. Then this in turn may have several psychological and behavioural effects such as stress reactions of psychological arousal, feelings of anxiety, withdrawal from inter-personal social relationships and interference with task performance. Like density and crowding, noise has negative effects upon behaviour at several levels such as deteriorating effects on task performance and inter-personal relationships, while urban architecture and design features have also been found to influence the pattern of social behaviour and may elicit negative psychological reactions (see Ayvahoğlu, 1982 for detailed discussion for these conclusions).

Milgram (1970), by emphasizing these aspects of the urban environment, has proposed the input overload explanation for the lower level of helpfulness shown towards strangers in the city. The present research report also tested this explanation in field settings in Turkish city and town environments.

According to Milgram (1970), the urban environment generates a higher number of inputs such as sights, sounds, demands and novel events which impinge on the urban residents. This increasing environmental input level will produce a situation of input overload in which a person cannot effectively process the inputs and demands of the environment. Consequently, as Milgram suggests, a person will be forced to develop a series of adaptive, economizing responses in order to cope with the excessive demands of the environment. Hence, the urbanite's adaptation is reflected in his inattentiveness to environmental events, his unresponsiveness to various requests and demands, and internalization of urban norms of behaviour. The picture then, suggests that an individual undergoing high environmental input will be less attentive or less responsive to others or to the needs of another person who has not a personal claim on his time or obligation (ie a stranger).

Milgram's explanation can be expressed in terms of short term adaptation and long-term adaptation (Korte, 1978): urbanites may vary in responsiveness as a function of adaptation to the immediate level of environmental bombardment (a short-term adaptation),

alternatively as a function of adaptation to the basic general level of inputs that for the most part characterizes the environment (a long-term adaptation). A long-term adaptation to input levels in the environment occurs in the form of a gradual development of mode of responding and norms of behaviours. The behavioural norms (ie norms of non-involvement, withdrawal) are evolved in response to frequent discrete experiences of the general level of input; typical of that given environment (ie district or city). These norms, then, became general modes of responding with inter-personal relationships. Long-term adaptation therefore is indicated by an invariant level of helpfulness which refletcs the general level of inputs in the individual's locality. Alternatively, the urbanite may show adaptation to the input level of the immediate situation, becoming more or less responsive to environmental events as the input level decreases or increases. This variation in responsiveness, as resarch on input overload suggests (Cohen, 1978), could be mediated by several phenomenon such as lowered attentiveness, or awareness, or mental fatigue on decisional processes. Hence, an individual undergoing a high input level may be less attentive to environmental events or cues indicating the need of help, or the high input level may create mental fatigue in individuals thereby reducing their responsiveness to others, ie reduce helpfulness towards a stranger in need.

The second stage of development, Milgram's long-term adaptation, is the major argument for urban/non-urban differences in helpfulness. However, the short-term adaptation explanation is clearly testable as opposed to the long-term one due to the fact that the variables of interest, a city's or district's characteristic input level would be correlated with other potentially influential factors such as SES, heterogeneity, types of community and so on (Korte, 1978). Hence, the present research decided to test the short-term version of this explanation which predicts a lower level of helpfulness with an increase in environmental input level and this eliminates the complexity just mentioned. However, confirmation of the short-term adaptation will give some support for the long-term adaptation explanation (Korte et al, 1975). Thus it would partly provide an explanation for the lower level of helpfulness found in the city.

Milgram's short-term adaptation explanation has recently been tested by Korte, Ypma and Toppen (1975) in naturalistic settings by the use of environmental inputs in Holland. The results quite clearly supported Milgram's hypothesis and showed that in sites where were lower input levels, pedestrians were significantly more likely (a) to grant a street interview, (b) to stop and help a person needing direction, and (c) pick up and retrieve an accidently dropped key.

Further support for the effect of input levels on helpfulness has been found in several other studies: for instance, Matthews and Canon (1975); Sherrod and Downs (1974); Weiner (1976); Boles and Hayward (1978), found decreased helpfulness with an increased level of environmental noise in both laboratory and natural field settings.

Recently, Korte and Grant (1980) have taken the input overload explanation of helpfulness one step further and have demonstrated that it may be a restriction of environmental awareness as a function high input overload which decreases the level of helpfulness. Investigating in the field, they found that subjects exposed to a high input level from the environment were less aware of peripheral objects and happenings in their immediate surroundings, and also walked faster keeping their gaze fixed straight ahead. This finding is in line with earlier findings in both the laboratory and the field (Saegert, Mackintosh and West, 1975; Matthews and Canon, 1975; Cohen and Lezak, 1977).

In sum, then, another of the purposes of the present study was to test more stringently the relationship between the environmental input level and helpfulness using naturalistic environmental inputs in cities and towns in Turkey. It was hypothesized that the level of helpfulness shown towards strangers would be higher under the condition of low environmental input level as compared with high environmental input level. That is, within a given geographical area differing input levels would lead to different degrees of helpfulness. Discovery of a relationship between input level and helpfulness over a short-term would support Milgram's argument and, in turn, it would partly provide support for the long-term adaptation explanation of the input overload hypothesis for general urban unhelpfulness.

The present study also afforded an opportunity to examine sex differences in helpfulness in a developing nation. Theoretical anlysis and empirical results have not resolved the question of whether there are reliable male-female differences in helpfulness and there is good reasons to think that the occurrence of sex differences will depend on the type of situation and type of helpfulness involved (Gergen, Gergen and Meter, 1977; Krebs; 1970). In a culture such as Turkey, there are traditional concepts of sex roles that stress the importance of a woman avoiding involvement in public settings and particularly contact with strangers (Abadan, 1963; Meeker, 1976). This sex role concept would suggest a prediction of a greater response from males who confronted with a stranger needing assistance. In addition, if traditional values and conceptions wane as a function of urbanization, then we could expect the superior helpfulness of males relative to females to be greater in Turkish towns than in Turkish cities. These expectations were evaluated in the present study with the hopes of throwing light on the situational specificity of sex differences in social behavior.

Differences in attitudes and dispositions of urban and non-urban residents as a function of living in city and town

Major urban theories postulate that urban living and urban environment have negative effects not only on an individual's social behaviour but have effect on an individual's dispositions and attitudes, and the observed behavioural differences are in fact the expression of underlying urban/non-urban differences in dispositions and attitudes. Th present study, in addition to examining behavioural differences in helpfulness shown to strangers in various types of Turkish environments, also studied differences in the residents of these environments in attitudes of helpfulness within the context of stranger relationships to evaluate this hypothesis.

According to Wirth (1938), the aggregation of a great number of diverse individuals in city creates a social structure in which social ties between individuals inevitably loosen. This situation, in turn, has consequences on an individual's personality and attitudes which are reflected in form of estrangement, superficiality, anonymity and distrustfulness in the course of interac-

tion with other fellow urbanites as well as within primary group relationships (ie kin, friends and neighbours). Similar consequences of city living have also been suggested by Simmel (1950) who maintains that the high level of stimulation of the urban market economy pace, and tempo of urban life compel the urbanite to make adaptations to the environments, which reflect in his character. These personality characteristics, like those of Wirth, may generally be summed up as blase attitude, calculability and reserve, and distrustfulness.

However, unlike Wirth or Simmel, Milgram (1970) suggests a limited effect on related dispositions: urbanites may adapt behaviourally in a number of ways to an overload or urban environment, in terms of both behaviour and attitudes, yet these adaptations occur only within the context of a stranger relationship without great adjustments in attitudes and values hence this does not extend to influence the character of more essential types of social behavior. The experience of input overload envirnments in the city by urbanites and adaptation to it lead totne development of norms of behaviour. The behavioural norms, eg norm of non-involvement and withrawal, are evolved in response to frequent discrete experiences of inputs in the city becoming general modes of responding in the curse of inter-personal relationships with other fellow urbanites, ie strangers.

Emprical evidence on this issue in fact very few and there were found some but rather limited differences between urban residents and non-urban residents in attitudes towards strangers which relate to the urban hypothesis, ie trustfulness, helpfulness and suspiciousness. Urban residents hold significantly more suspicious and less trusting attitudes towards strangers than their non-urban counterparts (Fisher, 1973; Franck, 1981). Yet these findings have not thoroughly been substantiated by some of the later studies (see Holanhan, 1978; House and Wolf, 1978; Glenn and Hill, 1977). But most of these evidence are based on aggregate data, thus the area of research needs further investigation (Holahan, 1978).

The present study, in addition to studying helpfulness across various environments such as cities, towns and squatter areas in Turkey, also evaluated the dispositional explanation or urban hypothesis by examining more systematically differences in views

of helpfulness across these environments of city, town and city squatter areas.

The measures of views on helpfulness were obtained by means of a short, open-ended questionnaire study conducted in the field in the cities, towns and in the citysquatter areas. These measures involved subjects' judgements of various types of helping acts in a number of situations, their perception of helpful people, recognition of social respensibility, and perception of societal norms and expectancy of helping others. The questionnaire items, comprising four different areas of investigation, seemed to be comprehensive enough to test the urban hypothesis of differences in attitudes of helpfulness across environments varying in size.

In summary, the major aim of the present study was to examine the generality of the relationship between urbanization and helpfulness in the light of the urban social behaviour theory. This involved first of all a comparison of the level of helpfulness in urban and non-urban environments in Turkey. In addition, the urban environment was differentiated along a number of dimensions, each of which investigated the precise nature of the city's impact on social behaviour in a developing nation : the dimensions were (1) squatter versus nonspquatter urban environments, (2) level of urbanization of the different districts of a city, and (3) the level of environmental inputs which characterize any particular locale. The these conditions as well as investigating differences between male study compared the helpfulness show to strangers across each of and female respondents. In the second part, a survey was carried out with respondents along each dimension of urbanization to examine differences in views of helpfulness, testing the hypothesis that urban environments have an impact on individuals' attitudes, dispositions of helpfulness and trust.

Method

Overview

Four measures of helpfulness were administered to a total of 1383 subjects, while a questionnaire assessing views concerning helpfulness was administered to a total of 372 subjects in four towns and

two cities in Turkey. The four helpfulness measures were : (a) the response to a reques for an interview, (b) the response to a request for change, (c) the response to a person having difficulties retrieving a dropped box, and (d) the response to a lost postcard. The field and questionnaire data were collected by two Turkish nationals, one a male in his early 30s and the other a female in her late 20s, who played the roles of the persons needing assistance. Each measure and questionnaire was administered in the four towns and, for both Istanbul and Ankara, in two squatter settlements and four city districts differing in level of urbanization. In each of these sixteen different locations, two settings of high versus low levels of environmental input were located and served as the actual research sites for that location.

Selection of town and city locations

Four Turkish towns were selected, one each from northern, mideastern, central and western Turkey and met the criteria of being large enough to provide settings of both high and low levels of environmental input, and not being appendages of large urban centres or commuter towns. The towns chosen were Bartm (18,409), Kaman (16,516), Yerköy (19,927) and Karacabey (21,648) (their 1975 populations are given in brackets).

The two principal cities of Turkey, Istanbul and Ankara, were chosen for the urban sample and within each city two squatter settlements and four districts were selected as the research locations.

squatter settlements. Both Istanbul and Ankara have a number of squatter settlements located in various parts of the city which differ in size, age and other characteristics. In each city, municipal officials were contacted and asked to name the two settlements that they regarded as most representative of the squatter settlements in their city and, on the basis of this, two settlements were selected for Istanbul-Zeytinburnu and Gaziosmanpaşa-and two for Ankara-Kaleiçi-Yenidoğan and Şentepe.

City districts. In order to select four districts in each city that represented different levels of urbanization, a preliminary study was carried out among a sample of 173 respondents contacted on

the streets of Istanbul and Ankara. First, a four-part typology of city districts was drawn up, with the four types of districts defined as representing different points on a continuum from highly urbanized sections of the city to those very low in urban characteristics. Urban characteristics were considered to include a high activity and noise level, high traffic and pedestrian density, and a commercial rather than residential character. The resulting typology of four district types is listed below :

(a) district 1— the most urbanized section of the city, containing the business district, entertainment centres, luxury housing and having high levels of density, noise and population;

(b) district 2— highly urban section but less urban than district 1 with slightly lower levels of density, noise and population, containing commercial districts, shopping centres, hotels and apartment houses;

(3) district 3— area of mixed commercial and residential character with a level of urbanization similar to a small city; housing is largely lower middle and working class;

(d) district 4— suburban areas that are mostly residential with very low levels of urbanization; housing is largely middle and upper middle class.

Then, in each city, sidewalk interviews were conducted with respondents who were given a list of the principal districts of their city (20 in Istanbul and 17 in Ankara) along with the definitions of the four types of districts described above. Respondents were asked to pick for each district type the one district that best illustared that type. The selection of districts for this study was then made by taking, for each district type, the district most frequently nominated resulting in four Istanbul districts (Karaköy, Beyazit, Kadiköy, Eyüp and Yeşilköy and four Ankara districts (Kizilay, Maltepe, Yenimahalle and Gaziosmanpasa).

Selection of setting of high versus low environmental input level

Using the procedurs described thus far, sixteen research locations were selected. Within any particular location, the actual site of

data collection consisted of two adjacent settings (ie streets or intersections they were judged as differing in their level of environmental inputs, ie sights, sounds, noise level, traffic and pedestrian density. In each location, settings of high input level were identified by an informal observation of local conditions and this selection was then compared with that made by local judges. There was a high degree of concurrence in these judgements and the high input level setting was invariably the main thoroughfare of the district. A quieter side street adjacent to the high input setting would then be selected as the low input setting in each case.

In addition to this subjective judgement for the selection of high versus low input level conditions for this quasi-experiment, later on objective measures of input level were administered to check the subjective judgements in each condition of high and low input level in a given experimental locale. To measure input level, the measurement procedure of Korte et al (1975) was used. Korte et al (1975), in their Holland study to measure the input level of environment, developed measuring instruments which consisted of recording four environmental features : sound level, traffic density, pedestrian density and the number of visible establishments catering for the public (mostly stores).

The input level measures were administered as follows: (a) for a minute, recordings were made of the sound level at 5 second intervals, using a decibel recorder, located approximately 2.5 metres away from the kerb, (b) for a minute, a count by means of a brand counter was made of vehicles passing a pre-selected line, (c) for a minute, a count was made of pedestrian passing a pre-selected line, (d) a count was made of all shops, supermarkets, banks, entertainment places.

The recordings of the input level measures were taken twice at different hours of the day and at non-consecutive days. From these procedures it was possible to determine the mean sound level, the level of pedestrian and traffic flow, and the number of public buildings in each setting (high versus low) in a given locality. This was done in the sixteen different research locations (squatters, cities, towns).

The results of input measures involving sound level, pedestrian and traffic volumes and counts of public buildings also supported the

subjective judgements of subjects of the high and low input conditions in a given locale. In each of the sixteen different locations, two adjacent settings (the high and low input settings), the input data were collected on four different occasions on two non-adjent days. In analysis, each input measure (sound level, traffic, pedestrian volume, count of public buildings) from the two adjacent settings in the 16 different locations were combined and contrasted, except for the building count ($t\ (30) = 0.50$, ns), on all three input measures: sound level ($t\ (30) = 1.76$, $p < 0.05$), pedestrian volume ($t\ (30) = 1.90$, $p < 0.05$) and traffic volume ($t\ (30) = 1.52$, $p < 0.08$) — marginally significant - were significantly higher in the input condition than low input condition. Thus high and low input conditions were successfully established. (See, Appendix for the data on input levels)

The data collection was arranged so that the locational differences were not contaminated by order or time effects. Likewise, in order to make the data collected from any particular location more representative of that location. The data were collected during the daylight hours, between june and October 1978.

Helpfulness measures

For the four measures described below, a small validity study was carried out to determine whether the response defined as helpfulness was regarded as such within Turkish culture. A sample of 30 subjects were interviewed in public settings and asked whether four particular acts, corresponding to the helpful response on the four measures, could be regarded as helpful or not. The results of this study confirmed the appropriateness of these measures as indicators of helpfulness in Turkish society.

In each of the research locations selected, four measures of helpfulness were administered. Subjects were male and female pedestrians, selected at random by the field researchers. Fir the interview and change measures, subject selection was done by taking fifth pedestrian to pass by once a trial had begun, as long as they met the following criteria: (a) they must be unaccompanied, (b) not carrying anything, and (c) between the ages of 18 and 75. Additional details of these measures are provided below.

Interview measure. Four hundred and fifty-six subjects were approached jointly by the male and female field researchers and asked the following by the male researcher, «Excuse me, may I ask you few questions for a survey study we are carrying out?» The request was made in a friendly manner, all questions were politely answered and no further persuasion was applied to induce cooperation. The field researchers were well equipped to conduct interviews, with a clipboard, pencils, and interview forms, and if the respondent agreed to the request, a short, five item interview about norms of helpfulness was administered. Following the interaction, the subject's response was coded by the two field researchers into one of the following four categories (after Korte, et al., 1975): (a) subject ingored the researchers, (b) subject listened to the request but declined the interview, (c) subject declined interview but offered a valid excuse, and (d) subject agreed to interview. The first response category proved unnecessary, as there was no occurrence of this behavior among the Turkish subjects.

Change measure. A total of 463 subjects were approached by the research team and asked (by the male) if they had change for a five lira piece (approximately S. 20). Cooperative subjects were thanked for their help and again the response of all subjects was coded according to a four-category scheme : (a) subject ignored the researchers, (b) subject replied superficially, without stopping, that he/she had no change, (c) subject stopped to search for change, appeared basically unwilling to help, and reported having no change, (d) subject appeared quite willing to help, stopped to search for change and then either gave change or reported having none. Again, the first response category proved unnecessary, as no Turkish subjects acted in this manner.

Dropped box measure. This measure was administered to 464 subjects who were selected on the basis of their being the first person encountered in a 25 meter stretch of sidewalk and who met the criteria for inclusion described above. The male researcher, walking toward the subject, was encumbered with a load of three large boxes, stacked on top of each other. Just as he neared the subject (4-5 meters away), he stumbled, losing the top box. His efforts at retrieving the fallen box were futile, as he could not pick up the fallen box

without losing the remaining two. The response of the target subject, who in each case was the nearest and usually the only person available to help, was noted and coded according to the following three categories : (a) subject ignored the situation, (b) subject attended to the situation without assisting the researcher, and (c) subject assisted the researcher. The coding was a joint product of the two researchers' judgments, one acting the part of the box dropped, the other observing discretely from a short distance.

Lost postcard measure. A total of 96 stamped, addressed postcards were dispersed at various spots, e.g., bus stops and supermarkets, always in close proximity to a mail box or post office. The postcard gave the appearance of having been lost by the sender and contained the following important message :

Dear Aunt,

Thank for your letter and invitation. I am really excited about it. My bus will arrive in (Istanbul or Ankara) at 2 or 2 : 30 p. m. on Friday (date given). Could you please pick me up the central bus station?

Yours,
(female name)

The data given in the message was always set ten days after the date when the postcards were distributed. The particular female name given served as a code for the location of where the postcard had been dropped. Twenty-four postcards were dropped in each of the following localities : Istanbul, Ankara, the squatter settlements and the towns.

The questionnaire on views of helpfulness

An open-ended questionnaire on views of helpfulness was developed to investigate possible normative differences between residents of environments differing in the level of urbanization. The questionnaire was administered in street interviews to a total of 349 randomly-chosen male and female city, town and squatter residents where helpfulness data were collected. The questionnaire was admi-

nistered to those 349 out of 456 subjects asked who agreed to be interviewed by two male and female field experimenters (see interview measure section for subject selection, administration procedure).

The first item in the questionnaire is concerned with how a helpful person is perceived by respondents. The second item in the questionnair sought to find out respondents' feelings about giving assistance to others in need. And in the third item subjects were presented with three types of helping situations and asked whether they would help. The final item in the questionnaire was concerned with societal expectancy or norms about helping others in need. These four items were aimed at exploring respondents' attitudes and dispositions of helping behaviour at personal and societal level.

The questionnaire development and pre-testing were done through several informal interviews with Istanbul respondents. The final form of the questionnaire was as follows :

Survey on Public Views of Helpfulness

1. How would you define a helpful person?
2. Do you feel any responsibility to help someone who is apparently in need of assistance?
3. If someone were to approach you with types of request as shown below, would you feel like giving assistance?
   (a) asking you the location of an address you happen to know;
   (b) asking you for change;
   (c) asking four your assistance in carrying awkward load for a short distance.
4. Do you feel that giving assistance to strangers is generally accepted in our society? Why is this so, and can you think of any sayings or principles that state how we should treat strangers in need of assistance?

Results

The overall rate of helpfulness toward strangers obtained in Turkey was quite favourable, with the exception of the results using

the lost postcard measure. For each of the interviews, dropped box and change measures, at least 70 % of the respondents fell into the most helpful category.

It is interesting to note that on the interview measure, which had been administered in an identical fashion in Holland (Korte et al, 1975), the Turkish respondents were significantly more helpful than the Dutch respondents had been (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

Comparison of Turkish and Dutch respondents on their willingness to agree to a request for an interriew

Response Category[a]	Turkey	Holland[b]
Ignore	0%	3.5%
No	4.8%	9.5%
No with excuse	16.7%	19.3%
Yes	78.5%	67.7%
	(n = 456)	(n = 400)

Note : Chi-square analysis comparing the frequency distribution of Turkish and Dutch respondents showed a significant difference $X_2(3) = 27.02$, $p < .01$.

[a] See text for an explanation of these categories.
[b] These data are taken from Korte et al (1975).

The overall return of the lost postcards (13.5%) was considerably lower than what usually been found with this measure (see, eg, Milgram, 1970; Shotland, 1979). Secondly, as will be seen later, the pattern of helpfulness which was obtained with this measure was quite mixed and showed no parallel with other helpfulness measures utilized in this study. Results of the lost postcard study will be reported at the end of this section.

Helpfulness in city, town and squatter settlement

Before comparing the helpfulness rates between the differen subgroups, the comparability of these sub-groups in terms of their

male/female composition was examined. This was necessary as the subject's sex showed a relationship with two of the helping measures (see Table 2) : male were significantly more helpful on interview measure ($X_2(2) = 42.48$, $p < .01$), somewhat more helpful on the dropped box measure ($X_2(2) = 5.12$, $p < .10$), and no different from females on the change measure ($X_2(2) = 1.77$, ns).

TABLE 2

Comparison of male and female respondents on their response to the three helpfulness measures

	Frequency of Response Category (in %)	
Change measure[a]	Male	Female
No stopping	14.2	19.1
Effort to help	72.0	67.2
Reluctant stopping	13.9	13.7
	(n = 332)	(n = 131)
Interview measure[b]		
Decline	2.4	12.1
Decline with excuse	12.1	30.2
Agree	85.6	57.8
	(n = 340)	(n = 116)
Dropped box measure[c]		
Ignore	2.4	6.3
Notice	24.2	28.3
Help	72.4	65.4

[a] $X^2(2) = 1.77$, ns
[b] $X^2(2) = 42.48$, $p < .01$
[c] $X^2(2) = 5.12$, $p < .10$

Given this outcome, comparisons of various sub-groups on the interview and dropped box measure were carried out separately for male and female subjects when those sub-groups differed in their male/female composition. In many cases, this meant, in effect, carrying out the comparison with only the male subjects, as the number of female subjects was often too low to draw any meaningful comparisons with the female subjects alone. The low number of female subjects, 37 % of the total sample, is probably a reflection of Moslem norms which restrict the public activity of women, particularly their contact with strangers.

A comparison of the city, city squatter and town samples on the helpfulness measures showed less helpfulness in the city than the town where the level of helpfulness obtained in the squatter settlements resembled that found in the towns rather than in the cities, This pattern proved consistent across the three different measures of helpfulness, and for the separate comparisosn within the male and female samples, with the one exception of the results for the female subjects, using the interview measure.

On the change measure (see Table 3), helpfulness wass highest among the squatter residents, followed by the town residents, with city residents at a distant third.

The city residents were significantly less helpful than both the town ($X^2(2) = 27.58$, $p < .01$) and squatter residents ($X^2(2) = 37.84$, $p < .01$) while these latter two groups did not differ significantly from each other. This same pattern was obtained for both the male and female samples analyzed separately.

Results comparing city, town and squatter settlements, using the interview measure, differed between the male and female samples, due to the large drop off in helpfulness among city squatter femals. For the male respondents, the results paralelled those found with the change measure : city respondents were significantly less helpful than both the town ($X^2(2) = 11.73$, $p < .01$) and city

TABLE 3

Comparison of City, Town, and City Squatter Residents on the Four Measures of Helpfulness

No stopping	24.2	7.7	5.5	15.6
Reluctant stopping	20.3	8.5	5.5	13.8
Effort to help	55.5	83.8	89.1	70.6
	(n=236)	(n=117)	(n=110)	(n=463)
Interview measure : males[b]				
Decline	4.3	0	1.2	2.4
Decline with excuse	18.6	7.1	4.9	12.1
Agree	77.0	92.9	93.8	85.6
	(=161)	(n=98)	(n=81	(n=340
Interview measure : females[c]				
Decline	11.9	0	21.4	12.1
Decline with excuse	20.0	23.8	35.7	30.2
Agree	58.2	76.2	42.9	57.8
	(n=67)	(n=21)	(n=28)	(n=116
Dropped box measure : males[a]				
Ignore	3.7	1.1	1.2	2.4
Notice	41.4	12.9	7.3	25.2
Help	54.9	86.0	91.5	72.4
	(n=162)	(n=93)	(n=82)	(n=337)
Dropped box measure : females[e]				
Ignore	6.9	3.7	7.1	6.3
Notice	36.1	25.9	10.7	28.3
Help	56.9	70.4	82.1	65.4
	(=72)	(n=27)	(n=28)	(n=127)

[a] Chi - square analysis showed a significant association between locale and helpfulness, $X^2(4) = 54.07$, $p < .01$. The city respondents were significantly less helpful than the town respondents ($X^2(2) = 27.58$, $p < .01$) and the city squatter respondents ($X^2(2) = 37.84$, $p < .01$). while the town and city squatter respondents were not significantly different from each other ($X^2(2) = 1.39$, ns).

[b] Chi-square analysis showed a significant association between locale and helpfulness, $X^2(4) = 19.22$, $p <. 01$. The city respondents were significantly less helpful than the town respondents ($X^2(2) = 11.73$, $p < .01$) and the city squatter respondents ($X^2(2) = 10.62$, $p < .01$), while the town and city squatter respondents did not differ from each other in helpfulness ($X^2(2) = 1.57$, ns).

c Chi-square analysis showed no significant association between locale and helfulness, $X^2(4) = 7.45$, ns. The city squatter respondents were significantly less helpful than the town respondents ($X^2(2) = 7.39$, $p < .05$), while the city respondents did not differ significantly from either the town respondents ($X^2(2) = 3.54$, ns) or the city squatter respondents ($X^2(2) = 2.28$, ns).

[d] Chi-square analysis showed a significant association between locale and helpfulness, $X^2(4) = 48.39$, $p < .01$. The city respondents were significantly less helpful than the town respondents ($X^2(2) = 25.54$,$p < 01$). and the city squatter respondents ($X^2(2) = 33.06$, $p < .01$), while the town and city squatter respondents were not significantly different from each other ($X^2(2) = 1.48$, ns).

[e] Chi-square analysis showed no significant association between locale and helpfulness, $X^2(4) = 7.12$, ns. The city respondents were significantly less helpful than the city squatter respondents ($X^2(2) = 6.49$, $p < .05$), while the town respondents did not differ significantly from either the city respondents ($X^2(2) = 1.54$, ns) or the city squatter respondents ($X^2(2)$ 2.30, ns.).

squatter respondents ($X^2(2) = 1062$, $p < .01$), while those two groups did not differ from each other in helpfulness. Female city respondents were less helpful than their town counterparts, though this difference did not reach significance ($X^2(2) = 3.3.54$). As already noted, the female city squatter respondents were the least helpful on this measure, significantly less so than the town respondents ($X^2(2) = 7.39$, $p < .05$). These comparisons using only the female subjects are based on quite a small sample size and hence the results using the data from male subjects must be regarded as far more reliable.

On the third helpfulness measure, the response to the dropped box, consistent results were again found. For the male respondents, the city squatter residents were slightly more helpful than the town rsidents and both groups were significantly more helpful than the city residents ($X^2(2) = 33.06$, $p < .01$ and $X^2(2) = 25.54$, $p < .01$, respectively). The same ordering of helpfulness was obtained for the female respondents, though the only significant difference was between the city and city squatter residents ($X^2(2) = 6.49$, $p < .05$). In sum, then, with the exception of the female respondents on the interview measure, it can be said that the city squatter residents were equivalent in helpfulness to the town residents and that both these groups were considerably more helpful (usually significantly so) than the city residents.

Further analysis was carried out to compare the different locations within each category (ie towns, cities, squatter settlements) in terms of their level of helpfulness. For this analysis, male and female respondents were combined when the various groups being compared did not differ significantly ($p > .10$, to be conservative) in their male/female composition. When the composition did differ, this is indicated by the separate reporting of male and female results. Comparison of the four towns showed no significant differences on any of the three helpfulness measures : change ($X2(6) = 1.75$, ns), interview ($X^2(3) = 2.15$, ns) and dropped box ($X^2(6) = 10.22$, ns). Comparison of the two cities is perhaps more meaningful, as the two cities used, Ankara and Istanbul, are both prominent and enjoy high-standing in Turkey. The results showed more helpfulness in Ankara than Istanbul (exclusive of the squatter settlements), though this

difference approached significance only on the dropped box measure ($X^2(2) = 5.11$, $p < .08$). Comparison of the four squatter settlements included in this study (two in Istanbul and two in Ankara) showed marginally significant differences between tthem on the change measure ($X^2(6) = 10.93$, $p < .10$) and the interview measure ($X^2(6) = 10.69$, $p < .10$) and no difference on the dropped box measure ($=^2(6) = 9.55$, ns). This outcome reflects the fact thac there was a generally consistent ranking of the four settlements in terms of their helpfulness on the three measures; Sentepe (in Ankara) was the most helpful of the four settlements on each of the three measures, while Zeytinburnu (in Istanbul) showed the least helpfulness on two of the measures and the next least helpful on the third measure.

The level of helpfulness in city districts which differ in their level of urbanization

A consistent pattern of differences in helpfulness between the four city districts occurred with each of the three helpfulness measures. Across the first (ie highly urbanized section), the second (ie second degree of urbanized section) and the third (ie a section of city akin to a small city, housing lower middle class and working class), there was a consistent increase in the level of helpfulness, while the fourth district (ie suburban areas, very low urbanization; housing largely middle class and upper middle class) showed the least helpfulness of all four (see Table 4).

A significant difference in helpfulness between districts was obtained only with the change measure ($X^2(6) = 22.37$, $p < .01$); the interview and dropped box measures showed an identical pattern of differences between districts but with neither of these measures was a significant level of association reached ($X^2(6) = 5.36$, ns and $X^2(6) = 10.27$, ns, respectively). This same rank order of districts by helpfulness level prevailed for the Istanbul and Ankara samples analyzed separately, with one exception: on the change measure in Ankara, district I was the least helpful district, with district 4 the next least helpful. It is interesting to compare the most helpful area of Istanbul and Ankara, district 3, with the city squatter settlements and the towns where generally high levels of helpfulness

were obtained. For each of the three measures, the squatter sample was more helpful than the district 3 sample, though this reached significance (using male subjects only; the female sample was too small for separate analysis) only on the dropped box measure ($X^2(2) = 11.76$, $p < .01$). The town residents were also more helpful than district 3 subjects on each of the three helpfulness measures, significantly so on the dropped box measure ($X^2(2) = 6.19$, $p < .05$) and interview measure ($X^2(2) = 6.67$, $p < .05$); again, only the male subjects were used in making these comparisons.

TABLE 4

Comparison of the Four City Districts on the Three Measures of Helpfulness (Male and Female Combined)

Frequency of Response Category (in %)

	DISTRICT				
Change measure[a]	1	2	3	4	Total
No stopping	28.4	21.7	10.4	32.8	24.2
Reluctant stopping	26.9	16.7	8.3	26.2	20.3
Effort to help	44.8	61.7	81.3	41.0	55.5
	(n=67)	(n=60)	(n=48)	(n=61)	(n=236)
Decline	3.3	8.3	4.2	10.0	6.6
Decline with excuse	26.7	18.3	16.7	25.0	21.9
Agree	70.0	73.3	79.2	65.0	71.5
	(n=60)	(n=60)	(n=48)	(n=60)	(n=228)
Dropped box measure[c]					
Ignore	4.8	6.7	0	6.5	4.7
Help	52.4	60.0	69.4	43.5	55.6
Notice	42.9	33.3	30.6	50.5	39.7
	(n=63)	(n=60)	(n=49)	(n=62)	(n=234)

Note : Istanbul and Ankara data are combined, with the squatter settlements excluded.

[a] Chi-square analysis showed a significant association between districts and helpfulness, $X^2(6) = 22.37$, $p < .01$. The helpfulness obtained in district 3 was significantly or marginally significantly higher than that obtained in the other districts : versus district 1 ($X^2(2) = 15.53$, $p < .01$), district 2 ($X^2(2) = 4.91$, $p < .10$), and districts 4 ($X^2(2) = 17.98$, $p < .01$). In addition, district 2 was marginally significantly more helpful than district 4 ($X^2(2) = 5.18$, $p < .08$). No other significant differences occurred between districts.

[b] Chi - square analysis showed no significant association between districts and helpfulness ($X^2(6) = 5.36$, ns), nor any significant differences in helpfulness between any particular pair of districts.

[c] Chi-square analysis showed no significant association between districts and helpfulness ($X^2(6) = 10.26$, ns). District 3 was significantly more helpful than district 4 ($X^2(2) = 8.97$, $p < .02$) and marginally significantly more helpful than district 1 ($X^2(2) = 4.77$, $p < .10$). Ne other differences were significant.

Input level

The helpfulness measures were also analyzed for their relation to the input level variable, to see whether less helpfulness occurred under conditions of high versus low environmental input as predicted by the input overload hypothesis of Milgram (1970). In an overall comparison between the high and low input locales, environmental input level had a general impact on the occurrence of helpfulness. There was uniformly greater helpfulness in the low input settings in the three helpfulness measures, though the difference was only statistically significant for female respondents on the change measure ($X^2(2) = 11.17$, $p < .01$), and the dropped box measure ($X^2(2) = 11.85$, $p < .01$) (see Table 5). For males the differences in helpfulness the low versus high input settings did not reach statistical significance.

A log-linear analysis (Fox, 1979) was undertaken to evaluate interaction between variables : locale (city, town, city squatters), input level and sex, on each of the three helpfulness measures. Since the analyses so far presented repetitive single X^2 analysis they do

not allow us to see clearly interactions between variables. First, the effect of locale-city, town, squatter-and environmental input level on the three helpfulness measures were evaluated by dichotomizing each helpfulness measure into the categories of help and no help and applying a log-lincar analysis (see Fox, 1979, and Kenny, 1976, for further information on log-linear/logit models). For each of the three measures, using separately data from male and female subjects, no interaction between locale and input level variables was found (see Table 6).

Further analysis was undertaken to see whether the overall level of environmental input across urban environments studied varies so that this, in line with Milgram's explanation, might accunt for the observed level of helpfulness in these environments Analysis of the input measures suggested that the high levels of environmental input were characteristics of Turkish urban environments that distinguishes them from towns. Combining the high and low input settings the city locales were found significantly higher than the town in sound level ($t(264) = 14.05$, $p < .01$), in pedestrian density ($t(46) = 3.29$, $p < .01$), and in traffic level ($t(264) = 4.26$, $p < .01$), and than the squatter settlements in sound ($t(264) = 4.10$, $p < .01$), in pedestrian density ($t(46) = 2.38$, $p < .01$), in traffic level ($t(46) = 3.48$, $p < .01$). Also, the squatter settlements in the city were significantly higher than the town in sound level ($t(264) = 21.75$, $p < .01$), in pedestrian density ($t(46) = 2.48$, $p < .01$), and in traffic level ($t(46) = 3.18$, $p < .01$) (see Appendix).

Differences between urban and non-urban environments in the input level parallels the observed city-town differences in helpfulness, By contrast, the input findings did not correspond to the differences in helpfulness between the town and the city squatter settlements. The city squatter settlements had significantly higher environmental input level, but in the level of helpfulness the city squatter residents were slightly higher than their town counterparts in all measures of helpfulness, though not significantly. Hence this analysis suggests that the helpfulness in the city-squatter settlements should be explained by non environmental factors, for example, socio-cultural characteristics of the squatter settlements.

Also, an analysis of the environmental input level for the city districts was carried out by comparing only district 1 to district 4, due to their being extreme point in the level of urbanization within the city environments. District 1 was significantly than district 4 in all measures of the input level (see Appendix, in sound level ($t(174) = 55.4$, $p < .01$), in pedestrian density ($t(14) = 10.44$, $p < .01$), and in traffic level ($t(14) = 32.16$, $p < .01$).

Again, as observed between the city squatter settlements and the town, comparison of city district 1 (the most urbanized section of the city) and city district 4 suggested that the environmental input level cannot be an explanation for the observed differences in helpfulness between these two city districts. Althoug district 4 was significantly lower than district 1 in its level of various environmental input level, against the expectation of the input overload hypothesis, it exhibited a lower level of helpfulness than district 1 and was the least helpful district of all four city districts studied (see Table 4). It is interesting to note that the level of environmental input in district 4 was even lower than that observed in the town (see Appendix). Hence this suggest looking beyond the input level as an explanation of helpfulness in district 4.

Sex differences in helpfulness

Finally, considering the sex differences in helpfulness, Turkish males were significantly more helpful than females on interview measures, somewhat more helpful on the dropped box measure (marginal significance) and no different on the money chare measure (see Table 2). An analysis to see whether these differences became weaker in the city versus town (or city squatter) sample showed generally no change in sex differences between town, city and city squatter. Separate log-linear analysis of the interaction between sex and locale showed a significant interaction effect for only one of the three helpfulness measures, the interview measure ($X^2(2) = 11.16$, $p < .01$). This interacion reflects the unusually strong sex

TABLE 5

Helpfulness in High and low Environmental Input Settings with Male and Female Subjects Compared

	Frequency of Response Category (in %)	
	High Input Setting	Low Input Setting
Change measure : males[a]		
No stopping	16.1	12.7
Reluctant stopping	14.9	12.7
Effort to help	69.0	75.3
	(n=174)	(n=158)
Change measure : females[b]		
No stopping	30.4	10.7
Reluctant stopping	17.9	10.7
Effort to help	51.8	78.7
	(n=56)	(n=75)
Interview measure : males[c]		
Decline	3.4	1.2
Decline with excuse	13.1	10.9
Agree	83.4	87.9
	(n=175)	(n=165)
Interview measure : females[d]		
Decline	13.0	11.3
Decline with excuse	35.2	25.8
Agree	51.9	62.9
	(n=54)	(n=62)

Frequency of Response Category (in %)
High Input Setting Low Input Setting

Dropped box measure : males[e]		
Ignore	3.4	1.3
Notice	27.9	22.2
Help	68.7	76.6
	(n=179)	(n=158)
Dropped box measure : females[f]		
Ignore	10.9	2.8
Notice	40.0	19.4
Help	49.1	77.8
	(n=55)	(n=72)

[a] $X^2(2) = 1.74$, ns
[b] $X^2(2) = 11.17$, $p < .01$
[c] $X^2(2) = 2.32$, ns
[d] $X^2(2) = 1.52$, ns
[e] $X^2(2) = 3.37$, ns
[f] $X^2(2) = 11.85$, $p < .01$

TABLE 6

Helpfulness of male and female Turkish subjects by locale and input level

		Male subjects								
		Interview Help[a]			Change Help[b]			Box Help[c]		
Locale	Input	Yes	No	Logit[1]	Yes	No	Logit	Yes	No	Logit
City	High	58	23	0.92	40	42	0.06	44	40	0.09
	Low	66	14	1.54	52	31	0.54	46	32	0.35
Town	High	46	4	2.43	42	8	1.86	42	7	1.78
	Low	45	3	2.70	39	5	2.06	38	6	1.87
Squatler	High	42	2	3.04	38	4	2.24	38	6	1.83
	Low	36	1	3.58	27	4	1.91	36	1	3.58
	N	293	47		238	94		244	92	

		Female subjects								
City	High	19	15	0.23[d]	16	20	0.23[e]	18	17	0.06[f]
	Low	21	12	0.55	22	13	0.52	23	14	0.49
Town	High	7	2	0.84	3	4	0.51	4	7	0.56
	Low	9	3	1.09	14	2	1.93	15	1	2.70
squatter	High	4	7	0.56	10	3	1.21	7	4	0.55
	Low	9	8	0.11	23	1	3.13	16	1	2.77
	N	69	47		88	43		83	44	

[1] Logit = ln (frequency yes/frequency no). Logit is log-dependent variable odds for each combination of independent variable categories.

[a] The model which contains only locality effect fits the observed data ($X^2(2) = 44.41$, $p < .01$).

[b] The model which contains only locality effect fits the observed data ($X^2(2) = 24.08$, $p < .01$).

[c] The model which contains only locality effect fits the observed data ($X^2(2) = 49.5$, $p < .01$).

[d] The model which contains both locality effect and input level effect

$$X^2(1) = 8.0,\ p < .01.$$

fits the observed data : (locality) $X^2(2) = 13.48$, $p < .01$

$$X^2(1) = 8.0,\ p < .01.$$

[e] No interaction occurred.

[f] The model which contains only input, effect fits the observed data ($X^2(1) = 8.83$, $p < .01$).

TABLE 7

Helpfulness of Turkish subjects by sex and locale

Sex of subjects	Locale	Interview Help[a]			Change Help[b]			Box Help[c]		
		Yes	No	Logit[1]	Yes	No	Logit	Yes	No	Logit
Male	City	124	37	1.20	92	73	0.23	89	73	0.18
	Town	91	7	2.56	81	13	1.82	80	13	1.81
	Squatter	76	5	2.72	66	7	2.23	75	7	2.36

	City	39	28	0.32	39	32	0.20	41	31	0.27
Female	Town	16	5	1.16	17	6	1.03	13	8	0.86
	Squatter	12	16	0.29	32	5	1.85	23	5	1.52

[1] Logit = In (frequency yes/frequency no). Logit is log-dependent variable ods each combination of independent variable categories.

[a] The model which includes sex X locale interaction fits the observed data ($X^2(2) = 11.16$, $p < .01$).

[b] The model which includes locale effect fits the observed data ($X^2(2) = 11.16$, $p < .01$).

[c] The model which includes locale effect fits the observed data ($X^2(2) = 53.35$, $p < .01$).

TABLE 8

Helpfulness of Turkish subjects by sex and input level

Sex of subjects	Input level	Interview Help[a] Yes	No	Logit[1]	Change Help[b] Yes	No	Logit	Box Help[c] Yes	No	Logit
Male	High	146	29	1.61	120	54	0.79	123	56	0.78
	Low	145	20	1.97	119	39	1.10	121	37	1.18
Female	High	28	26	0.07	29	27	0.06	27	28	0.05
	Low	39	23	0.52	59	16	1.29	56	16	1.24

[1] Logit = In (requency yes/frequency no). Logit is log-dependent variable odds for each combination of independent variable categories.

[a] The model which includes sex effect fits the observed data $X^2(1) = 36.93$, $p < .01$).

[b] The model which includes sex x input interaction fits the observed data ($X^2(1) = 4.03$, $p < .05$).

[c] The model which includes sex x input interaction marginally fits the observed data ($X^2(1) = 3.77$, $p < .06$).

effect obtained in the squatter sample in comparison with the town and city samples, though in all three groups males were significantly more helpful than females (see Table 7). Separate log-linear analysis of the interaction between sex and input level revealed a significant

interaction effect for the money change measure ($X^2(1) = 4.03$, $p < .05$) and a marginally significant interaction effect for the dropped box measure ($X^2(1) = 3.77$, $p < .06$); no interaction occurred on the interview measure. These interaction effects reflect the previously reported results for the input level effect which was non-existent for males, yet significant for females for the money change and dropped box measures (see Table 8).

Finarly, results from the lost postcard measure of helpfulness have not been reported for the various comparisons drawn, due to the very low return rate obtained with this measure (see Table 9). This made the reliability of this measure very uncertain. The actual return rates for the three types of localities were as follows : cities, 18.8%; squatter settlements, 0%; towns, 16. 7%.

TABLE 9

Number of lost postcards returned

Number of postcards	Cities	Towns	Squatters	%
Non - returned	39	20	24	86.5
Returned	9	4	0	13.5
Total (N)	48	24	24	(n=96)

There are two lines explanation which may throw some light on why the lost postcard measure in Turkey had such a low return rate. This result may well be attributable to a high illiteracy rate in Turkey especially amonge the residents of city squatters (Turkish Population Statistics, 1975). This result can also be explained in terms of Turkish culture. In Turkish and Middle Eastern culture, a greoter emphasis on face to face inter-personal communication is placed as opposed to other types of communications (Meeker, 1976; Dubetsky, 1976) especially this behavioural pattern among the rural and town population is more common. Possibly one of these two or both expiations may account for the low return rate obtained in the lost postcard measure in Turkey. Yet this present result has an implication on the cross-cultural validity of the letter technique as

a behavioural measure. First, this measure should not be administered on a population with high illiteracy; second, the related cultural characteristics of the population must be taken into account for this measure.

Differences between urban and non-urban residents in attitudes and dispositions of helpfulness

The questionnaire on views of helpfulness was open ended and consisted of items such as: perception of a helpful person; feeling of responsibility to giving assistance to other persons; willingness to help others in there different helping situations, and finally perception of social expectances as to one's giving assistance to others in need. On responses for each item of the questionnaire a content-analysis was carried out to develop response categories for each item. In order to do this responses, on each of the questionnaire items were combined and reduced to four or five.

Responses for each item on the questionnaire were grouped according to their contents (except for the third item for which there was a predeveloped three-point response category) and chi-square analyses were carried out on the data.

Item 1 : *Perception of a helpful person*

Responses in this item initially fell into nine categories and 'I do not know' responses which constitute 4.06% with a distribution of 14.9% females and 0.3% males were discarded from the analysis. However, later on, by combining somewhat similar responses, the number of categories within this item were reduced to four distinct categories. These categories were as follows :

(a) someone who puts someone else's needs before his in any situation;
(b) someone who donates money to poor people;
(c) someone who is generally cooprative and willing to go out of his way to assist another person;
(d) someone who lends things to help other persons.

Before comparing the response rates within each item between city, town, city squatter respondents, the comparability of these groups in terms of their male and female composition for each item was examined. This was necessary as the respondent's sex often showed a relationship with responses to items, as will be seen later. Looking at the female and male response to item 1 (see Table 10), male respondents did not significantly differ from female counter-

TABLE 10

Comparison of Turkish male and female respondents on their response to the definition of a helpful person[a]

1.	Someone who puts someone else's needs before his own, in any situation.	22.7	27.7	23.5
2.	Someone who donates money to the poor people.	70.0	61.1	68.6
3.	Someone who is generally cooperative and willing to go out of his way to assist another person.	7.24	11.2	7.8
4.	Someone who lends things to help others.	0	0	0
		(n=290)	(n=54)	(n=344)

Note : Only a few respondents fell into the category 4 that were omitted in the analysis.

[a] $X^2(2) = 2.11$, ns.

parts in their perception of a helpful person ($X^2(2) = 2.11$, ns). The male and female data were therefore combined and comparisons of various sub-groups were carried out on this response. In responses to other items, ie items 2, 3 and 4, a separate analysis with only the male and the female group was made for comparison of various sub-groups. However, as there were too few female respondents (18. %) - as observed earlier in the analysis of helpfulness data - it was difficult to draw a conclusion out of various sub-groups comparisons

with only female data alone: in a number of cases, this meant relying on the data of male subjects only.

A comparison of the city, city squatter and town samples (male and female combined) on the response to their perception of a helpful person differed significantly from each other ($X^2(4) = 19.22$, $p < .01$) (see Table 11).

The city respondents differed significantly from both the town respondents ($X^2(2) = 7.72$, $p < .01$) and the squatter respondents ($X^2(2) = 16.55$, $p < .01$), while the town and the squatter respondents only differ marginally from each other ($X^2(2) = 5.81$, $p < .09$). By looking at response categories it may be possible to discern a different pattern of helping behaviour that a helpful person possesses in the definitions. In the first category (ie a person who puts someone else's needs before his own in any situation), the defnition seems to lay stress on helping dimensions in a helpful person that includes helping by a person in various situations and moreover without expectation of any type of reward as a result of his helping behaviour. Compared with the latter three categories of definitions that include only certain helping dimensions (ie donating money, being generally a cooperative person and lending things to others), the first categorya person who puts someone else's needs before his own in any situation-constitutes a higher level of definition. This reasoning is also consistent with the definition of altruism and helping behaviour given by Berkowitz and his co-workers (1970) and Aronfreed (1970). According to Berkowitz and Aronfreed, altruism is a mode of behaviour carried out to benefit another without anticipation of rewards from external and internal (Aronfreed) resources; it is only carried out for purposes that have consequences for another person.

TABLE 11

Comparison of city, town and city squatters on their responses to the definition of a helpful person[a]

	Frequency of response catogory (in %)			
	City	Town	City Squatter	Total
1. Someone who puts someone else's needs before his own, in any situation.	20.6	28.1	21.9	23.25
2. Someone who donates money to the poor people.	64.6	66.9	78.02	68.8
3. Someone who is generally cooperative and willing to go out of his way to assist another person.	14.6	4.8	0	7.8
	(n=158)	(n=103)	(n=91)	(n=344)

[a] $X^2(4) = 19.22$, $p < .01$

[1] The city vs town ($X^2(2) = 7.72$, $p < .01$).

[2] The city vs the city squatter ($X^2(2) = 16.55$, $p < .01$).

[3] The town vs the city squatter ($X^2(2) = 5.81$, $p < .09$) (marginally significant).

According to this criteria, the four categories of a helpful person definitions may be ordered higher to lower definitions : (1) person who puts someone else's needs before his own; (2) donating money; (3)being generally a cooperative person; (4) lending things to others. The preceding analysis suggested that, compared with the town and city squatter respondents, the city respondents perceived a helpful person with limited helping dimensions (ie more a generally cooperative person) and the male an female respondents did not differ in this respect.

Item 2 : *Feeling of responsibility about helping others in need*

On the second item, the response to the personal feeling of responsibility about helping others in need, the respondents' response, falls into four different categories :

(a) Yes, it is one's duty no ease one's fellows' distress;
(b) Yes, it should be reciprocal; I may, in turn, need help some time from others;
(c) generally no responsibility, depends on situation, ie kind of request or person who makes the request;
(d) no responsibility to help.

Before comparing responses of sub-groups, male and female composition was examined on response help, since there was a significant difference between sex and responses ($X^2(3) = 9.65$, $p < .02$) (see Table 12). The male respondents felt more responsibility to help others than their female counterparts, especially the female respondents more than the male respondents (31. % vs 17. %) felt that giving help depends on the situation and person seeking help.

TABLE 12

Comparison of Turkish male and female respondents on their feelings of responsibility to help someone who needs assistance[1]

Response categories	Frequency of responses (in %)		
	Male	Female	Total
1. Non - conditional duty to help	64.9	46.0	61.4
2. Reciprocal	10.8	17.5	12.0
3. Conditional (depends on situation or person)	17.5	30.1	19.8
4. No responsibility	6.66	6.4	6.6
	(n=285)	(n=63)	(n=348)

[1] $X^2(3) = 9.65$, $p < .02$

Given this out come, comparison of city, town and city squatters on responses to this item was carried out separately for each male and female respondent. A chi-square analysis on the male respondents' responses showed a significant association between locale and respondents' prsonal responsibility to help others in need ($X^2(6) = 85.18$, $p < .01$) (see Table 13).

The city male respondents felt significantly less non-conditional feeling of responsibility to help others in need than the town respondents ($X^2(3) = 35.31$, $p < .01$) and than the squatter male respondents ($X^2(3) = 60.98$, $p < .01$), while the town and the squatter male respondents felt a similar degree of responsibility to help others in need ($X^2(3) = 5.67$, ns). Comparison within the female respondents for differences in three sub-groups (city, town, city squatter) revealed no significant differences in responses ($X^2(6) = 6.2$, ns). Also there were no significant differences between the city and the town female respondents' response ($X^2(3) = 3.25$, ns) and as well as the city and the city squatter female respondents ($X^2(3) = 5.27$, ns), while comparison of the town and the city squatter respondents did not significantly differ in this respect ($X^2(3) = 1.00$, ns). In sum, then, the male respondents generally felt more non-conditional responsibility that one should help others in need as compared to the female respondents. within the male group, the town and the city squatter respondents felt significantly more personal responsibility for helping than the city respondents. However, the Turkish females, regardless of where they lived, did not significantly differ from each other. But, on the other hand, the female group was too small in number to draw much of a conclusion. Therefore the results using the data from male respondents must be regarded as far more reliable.

TABLE 13

Comparison of city, town and squatter respondents on their feeling of responsibility about helping someone who needs assistance

	Frequency of responses (in %)			
	City	Town	City squatter	Total
A. Response catigories for males only				
1. Non-conditional duty to help	36.1	81.1	90.7	64.9
2. Reciprocal	14.7	8.8	7.8	10.87
3. Conditional (depends on situation or person)	35.2	7.7	1.3	17.5
4. No responsibility	14.2	2.2	0	6.66
	(n=11)	(n=90)	(n=76)	(n=285)
B. Response categories for females only				
1. Non-conditional duty to help	35.1	53.3	72.7	46.0
2. Reciprocal	21.6	13.3	9.09	17.5
3. Conditional (depends on situation or person)	32.4	33.3	18.1	30.1
4. No responsibility	10.8	0	0	6.34
	(n=37)	(n=15)	(n=11)	(n=63)

A. $X^2(6) = 85.18$, $p < .01$

Male : [1] city vs town ($X^2(3) = 35.31$, $p < .01$)
[2] city vs squatter ($X^2(3) = 60.98$, $p < .01$)
[3] town vs squattr ($X^2(3) = 5.67$, ns)

B. $X^2(6) = 6.2$, ns

Female : [1] city vs town ($X^2(3) = 3.25$, ns)
[2] city vs squatter ($X2(3) = 5.27$, ns)
[3] town vs squatter ($X^2(3) = 1.00$, ns)

Item 3 : *Willingness to help others in three helping situations*

Item 3 in the questionnaire sought respondents' responses to whether they would help someone who needs assistance in the three helping situations utilized as behavioural measures of helpfulness in the field. Responses of the respondents were recorded in one of the three pre-arranged point response categories for each helping situation and they were: (1) Yes, I would help; (2) Probably, I would but it depends on the situation and person; and (3) No, I would not help. As it was carried out in the analysis of previous items, first male and female responses were compared for each of three helping situations. In response rates to assisting for address and helping for change money, the male and the female respondents did not significantly differ from one another ($X^2(2) = 2.23$, ns) and ($X^2(2) = 2.23$, ns), respectively (see Table 14). In response to willingness to helping someone to carry a heavy parcel, the male respondents were more significantly willing to help than the female respondents ($X^2(2) = 31.5$, $p < .01$). A chi-squareanalysis was carried out on combined male and female scores of assisting for address and change money, while a separate analysis on willingness to help carrying a heavy parcel scores of each male and female. There was a significant difference in city, town and city squatter respondents' responses to willingness to help for address and change money ($X^2(4) = 73.17$, $p < .01$; $X^2(4) = 73.17$, $p < .01$) (see Table 15).

Comparison of the city respondents with the town respondents in both measures showed a significant difference in favour of town ($X^2(2) = 37.7$, $p < .01$; $X^2(2) = 37.7$, $p < .01$). The city squatter respondents also were significantly more willling to help as compared with the city respondents on these two measures ($X^2(2) = 34.85$, $p < .01$; $X^2(2) = 34.85$, $p < .01$, respectively), while the town and the city squatter respondents did not significantly differ from each other on the two measures ($X^2(2) = 0.21$, ns; $X^2(2) = 0.21$, ns).

TABLE 14

Comparison of Turkish male and female respondents on the response to their willingness to help in three helping situations

	Frequency of responses (in %)		
Assisting someone for address[a]			
	Male	Female	Total
1. Yes, I would help.	82.1	74.6	80.6
2. I would probably help but it depends on the situation or person.	13.3	17.4	14.0
3. No.	4.6	8.0	5.15
	(n=285)	(n=63)	(n=349)
Helping with change[b]			
1. Yes, I would help.	82.1	74.6	80.5
2. I would probably help but it depends on the situation or person.	13.3	17.4	14.0
3. No.	4.6	8.0	5.15
	(n=285)	(n=63)	(n=349)
Helping to carry a heavy load[c]			
1. Yes, I would help.	73.3	36.5	66.6
2. I would probably help but it depends on the situation or person.	18.5	38.1	22.12
3. No.	8.0	25.4	11.2
	(n=285)	(n=63)	(n=349)

[a] $X^2(2) = 2.23$, ns.
[b] $X^2(2) = 2.23$, ns.
[c] $X^2(2) = 31.5$, $p < .01$.

TABLE 15

Comparison of city town and city squatter respondents on their willingness to help in three helping situations

	Frequency of responses (in %)			
	City	Town	City squatter	Total
Assisting someone for address[a] (male and female combined)				
1. Yes, I would help.	62.1	95.2	96.5	80.5
2. I would probably help but it depends on the situation or person.	26.2	4.7	3.4	14.2
3. No.	11.5	0	0	5.3
	(n=156)	(n=105)	(n=87)	(n=349)
Helping with change[b] (male and female combined)				
1. Yes, I would help.	62.1	95.2	96.5	80.5
2. I would probably help but it depends on the situation or person.	26.2	4.7	3.4	14.2
3. No.	11.5	0	0	5.3
	(n=156)	(n=105)	(n=87)	(n=349)
Helping to carry heavy load[c] (male sample only)				
1. Yes, I would help.	47.9	84.44	100.0	73.73
2. I would probably help but it depends on the situation or person.	34.45	13.35	0	18.5
3. No.	17.65	2.2	0	8.1
	(n=119)	(n=90)	(n=76)	(n=285)

Helping to carry heavy load[a] (female sample only)				
1. Yes, I would help.	24.3	40.0	72.7	36.5
2. I would probably help but it depends on the situation or person.	43.2	33.3	27.2	38.1
3. No.	32.4	26.6	0	25.3
	(n=37)	(n=15)	(n=11)	(n=63)

[a] $X^2(4) = 73.17$, $p < .01$.
1. city vs town ($X^2(2) = 37.7$, $p < .01$).
2. city vs squatter ($X^2(3) = 34.84$, $p < .01$).
3. town vs squatter ($X^2(2) = 0.21$, ns).

[b] $X^2(4) = 73.17$, $p < .01$.
1. city vs town ($X^2(3) = 37.7$, $p < .01$).
2. city vs squatter ($X^2(2) = 34.84$, $p < .01$).
3. town vs squatter ($X^2(2) = 0.21$, ns).

[c] $X(^24) = 74.2$, $p < .01$.
1. city vs town ($X^2(2) = 28.9$, $p < .01$).
2. city ve squatter ($X^2(2) = 54.4$, $p < .01$).
3. town vs squatter ($X^2(2) = 12.89$, $p < .01$).

[d] $X^2(4) = 9.75$, $p < .05$.
1. city vs town ($X^2(2) = 1.1$, ns).
2. city vs squatter ($X^2(2) = 9.6$, $p < .01$).
3. town vs squatter ($X^2(2) = 4.3$, ns)

Comparison of scores of city, town and city squatters' responses to willingness to help with a heavy parcel within the male group showed a significant association between locale and willingness to help ($X^2(4) = 74.2$, $p < .01$). The city respondents were significantly less willing to help then both the town ($X^2(2) = 28.9$, $p < .01$) and the squatter respondents ($X^2(2) = 55.4$, $p < .01$), while the squatter respondents were significantly more willing to help than the town respondents ($X^2(2) = 12.89$, $p < .01$). Female group responses in comparison of various sub-groups also showed an association between locale and willingness to help ($X^2(4) = 9.75$, $p < .05$). The city respondents did not differ significantly from the town respondents ($X^2(2) = 1.1$, ns), but did differ from the squatters who were willing

to help ($X^2(2) = 9.6$, $p < .01$), while the town and the squatter respondents did not significantly differ from each other ($X^2(2) = 4.3$, ns). In sum, then the city respondents in three different types of helping situation (in the third measure the female sample was too low, hence male, data was more reliable for the results) were significantly less willing to assist a person in need than both town and squatter respondents.

Item 4 : *Perception of societal expectancy about one's giving assistance to others in need*

Responses to the fourth item in the questionnaire involving societal expectancies about helping others in need fell into five categories, ranking from 'treating others like brothers' to 'not expected'. The five response categories were as follows :

(a) Yes, treat others like brothers do unto others, or treat others as you like to be treated ;
(b) Yes, but some people, I expect, would help ;
(c) Not any more, people are afraid to get involved and do not trust one another ;
(d) Things are not what they used to be; now everyone looks out for himself;
(e) Not expected.

Examination of male and female distribution on responses to societal expectancies on giving help showed a significant difference ($X^2(4) = 20.77$, $p < .01$) (see Table 16).

Given this outcome, male and female respondents separately were examined. Comparison of city, town and city squatters' responses within the male group showed a significant association between locale and respondents' responses to perception of societal norm or expectancy of helping others ($X^2(8) = 51.36$, $p < .01$) (see Table 17).

The city respondents perceived a significantly lower societal expectrancy about helping others than the town respondents ($X^2(4) = 35.92$, $p < .01$) and the city squatter respondents ($X^2(4) = 5.2$, ns).

A separate analysis using only the female sample was examined as a result of comparison of city, town and squatters within the female sample did not show any significant association between locale and respondents' response to societal expectancy about helping others ($X^2(8) = 8.95$, ns), nor did other comparison between subgroups (see Table 17). Yet, again, a too small sample size of females' results seems to be misleading.

In sum, then, the outcome of the present item indicated that the city respondents showed considerably less societel expectancy about helping others (strangers) in need as compared with the town and the city squatter respondents who equally felt that there was a higher level of societal expectancy. Looking at Table 17, almost half of the city respondents (48%) stated that either 'people are afraid to get involved' or 'evoryone looks out for himself these days' or 'not expected', while only 10% of the town respondents and 15.7% of the squatter respondents fell into these response categories. This response pattern was also very similar to what was observed in Item 2 (see Table 13).

TABLE 16

Comparison of Turkish male and female respondents on the response to their perception of societal expectancy about helping others[1]

Response categories	Frequency of category (in %)		
	Male	Female	Total
1. Yes, treat others like brothers.	68.7	41.2	63.8
2. Yes, but some people, I expect, would help.	4.2	7.9	4.9
3. Not any more; people are afraid to get involved and don't trust each other.	13.3	30.15	16.4
4. Things are not what they used to be; now everyone looks out for himself.	8.7	17.5	10.4
5. Not expected.	5.3	3.2	4.9
	(n=285)	(n=63)	(n=348)

[1] $X^2(4) = 20.77$, $p < .01$.

TABLE 17

Comparison city, town and city squatter respondents on the response to their perception of societal expectancy about helping others

	Frequency of responses (in %)			
	City	Town	City squatter	Total
Male respondents[a]				
1. Yes, treat others like brothers or treat others as you like to be treated.	46.6	84.4	84.2	68.77
2. Yes, but some people, I expect, would help.	5.8	5.5	0	4.2
3. Not any more; people are afraid to get involved and do not trust each other.	23.3	3.3	9.2	13.3
4. Things are not as they used to be; now everyone looks out for himself.	11.66	6.6	6.5	8.7
5. Not expected.	12.5	0	0	5.2
	(n=120)	(=90)	(n=76)	(n=285)
Female respondents[b]				
1. Yes, treat others like brothers or treat others as you like to be treated.	29.7	66.6	45.4	41.2
2. Yes, but some people, I expect, would help.	8.10	13.3	0	7.9
3. Not any more; people are afraid to get involved and do not trust each other.	37.8	6.6	36.3	30.1
4. Things are not as they used to be; now everyone looks out for himself.	18.9	13.3	18.1	17.4
5. Not expected.	5.4	0	0	3.1
	(n=37)	(n=15)	(n=11)	(n=63)

[a] $X^2(8) = 51.35$, $p < .01$.
1. city vs town ($X^2(4) = 35.92$, $p < .01$).
2. city vs squatter ($X^2(4) = 34.37$, $p < .01$).
3. town vs squatter ($X^2(4) = 5.2$, ns).

[b] $X^2(8) = 8.95$, ns.
1. city vs town ($X^2(4) = 7.46$, ns).
2. city vs squatter ($X^2(4) = 2.17$, ns).
3. town vs squatter ($X^2(4) = 4.86$, ns).

Taken together, a consistent pattern of differences occurred between the city, town and city squatter respondents' responses to each of the four items in the questionnaire. Compared on the town and the squatter respondents, the city respondents on the whole scored a significantly lower response rate to each of the four items: defined a helpful person relatively more with generally cooperative characteristics, feeling of lesser degree of responsibility about giving assistance, less willingness to help others in various helping situati ons and lower perception of societal expectancy about helping others, with the exception of the female respondents who did not significantly differ on response scores to feeling of responsibility about helping, and perception of societal expectancies about helping others. It can be said that the city squatter respondents were equivalent in normative helpfulness to the town residents and that both scored significantly higher in normative helpfulness than the city respondents. Altogether, these subjective accounts of helpfulness of residents across various environments studied parallelled their behavioural responses of helpfulness. Hence, one could argue that the behavioural differences in helpfulness shown towards strangers across environments may be a function of the observed differences in attitudes of helpfulness.

Discussion

City-town difference in helpfulness

The major findings of this study clarify both the differences and similarities in the social behaviour of urbanites and non-urbanites in a developing nation. One type of social behavior, the helpfulness

shown towards a stranger, clearly differed between town residents and non-squatter city residents, with the urbanites showing significantly less helpfulness on three different naturalistic measures. This in itself is a key finding, as it is the first confirmation of city/town differences in helpfulness in a developing nation. It support the view that behavioural differences between urban and non-urban environments may indeed be a somewhat general phenomenon, extending to cultures such as those of the developing nations where some have argued (Hauser, 1965) that this is less likely to occur. Hauser (1965) suggested that behavioural characteristics presumed to apply to urbanites might not occur in the cities of developing nations and the present study offers the first empirical evaluation of this view, at least in regard to the helpfulness of urbanites.

'Urban villages'

Residents of Turkish cities appear to have different behavioural characteristics from the residents of Turkish towns, yet the results of this study also point to the existence of local environments within the city which differ considerably in their level of helpfulness. Indeed, some of the city environments studied showed that the level of hlpfulness came quite close to town environments. Most interesting in this respect were the squatter settlements of Istanbul and Ankara, whose residents showed a level of helpfulness that was equal to that found in Turkish towns and significantly greater than that found in the rest of Istanbul and Ankara. This demonstrates the extent to which social behaviour can vary within an urban environment. It is worth noting that, in the present case, though the city-town differences in helpfulness were strong, the city-city squatter differences were even greater. Initially, we can say that whatever is responsible for a lower helpfulness rate in cities within Turkey has no affect upon the squatter areas. The behavioural equivalency between town and squatter residents disconfirmig Wirth's hypothesis (1938) supports the analysis of Abu-Loughood (1961) and others who argue for the persistence of 'urban villages' in large metropolitan areas and who maintain that the residents of these villages have not adopted the behaviour patterns which characterize the urban stereotype, eg distrust, impersonality, unhelpfulness.

Of most interest in the result obtained is the question of what factors might explain the high level of helpfulness which occurred in the squatter settlements. As noted earlier, the urban village thesis suggests that all types of helpfulness are enhanced within neighbourhoods where the occupants are long-time residents, are quite familiar with each other and share a common cultural background. The urban squatter settlements of Turkey do in these respects resemble urban villages, that is they are composed of migrants from rural villages who have established a way of life and social networks (ie extensive neighbour, friend and kin relationships) which derive from their original home rural village pattern. The high level of helpfulness observed in city squatter settlements is likely to be an outcome of or fostered by the social pattern of the settlement culture, traditional, Islamic and rural, which stresses the importance of generosity and responsibility towards other people (Erdentug, 1977; Karpat, 1976). This formulation is also supported by the squatters' subjective self-report on helpfulness. The squatter respondents more frequently stated the norm of social responsibility, and to a greater extent perceived the social expectation that one should give help to another person who needs assistance, as compared with their non-squatter, city, counterparts. The results of this survey study will be discussed in more detail later.

Another argument for the squatters' greater degree of helpfulness could be made in terms of the strong identification with place associated with urban villagers (Gans, 1962). The squatters' greater identification and familiarity with place (Karpat, 1976) perhaps produces a sense of responsibility for events happening in one's own territory. This line of reasoning is also consistent with Newman's (1973) concept of defensible space and overall suggests a greater likelihood of a positive response (from squatter residents) to strangers requiring help.

It is also possible to interpret the result in a somewhat simpler manner by reference to social class. It may be that helpfulness increases in a neighbourhood as a function of low economic status. When economic status is low, as is the case in the squatter settlements, it might be that the residents rely to a greater extent on each other for help. This explanation for the observed helpfulness in the squat-

ter settlement was certainly borne out by the results from the non-squatter districts, where it was working-class neighbourhoods that showed the greatest helpfulness, as we shall see in the next section. Thus, we can speculate that the economic conditions within squatter settlements may lead to the establishment of a behaviour pattern involving a high level of giving and receiving help. This helping pattern might then extend to a stranger needing help. This line of argument may partly be supported by other findings from the helping research, for example, the presence of a helpful, generous and altruistic model in the environment may facilitate and enhance the future altruistic behaviour of observers Bryan and Test, 1967; Wagner and Wheeler, 1969). On the other hand, however, the low income status may provide some explanation for the degeree of helpfulness among settlement residents in face of the fact that strangers were clearly outsiders. Yet, admittedly, strangers received a greater level of helpfulness from squatters than in other more affluent areas of the city (ie suburban). What follows from this is that a social class explanation, although it goes some way towards explaining this result, still seems to have difficulty explaining the squatters helpfulness towards strangers.

Finally, as we have already sean, there are a number of possible explanations for the results obtained in this research, none of which can be directly evaluated within the context of the present study. Our experiment has, however, supported the urban village thesis by demonstrating that the social behaviour of the squatter residents does resemble that of their small town counterparts rather than the behaviour of their fellow urbanites. Second, contrary to urban theories, it has demonstrated that urban environments are not homogeneous in terms of social behaviour, since the squatters are non-urban in their social behaviour. This also points our the possibility of the mediating role played by culture in the link between helpfulness and urbanization .

Helfulness in non-squatter city environments

The results discussed thus far might suggest a revision of the conceptualization of environments in terms of the urban/non-urban dichotomy into a new one, eg one which views the city squatter

settlements as *behaviourally* non-urban. Yet, this solution is not consistent with the results pertaining to the variations in helpfulness that occurred between the different types of urban districts. Different types of city districts showed consistent differences in level of helpfulness with one exception - suburbs, where the the lowest level of helpfulness was obtained. One of the districts, district 3, was clearly more helpful than the other districts, for the most part significantly so, on the change and dropped box measures. This supports the viw that the urban environment contains a variety of local environments which when defined in terms of their behavioural characteristics forms a continuum. Equally important is the fact that in its most helpful area (the third district) the helpfulness of the city came close to matching the level of helpfulness found in the squatter settlements and the towns. District 3 was an area with a mixed residential and commercial character, having a level of urbanization akin to a small city; it was typically a lower middle or working class district. It would seem to be different from other parts of the city in ways that are perhaps similar to those which distinguish the squatter settlements from the rest of the city, eg lower economic status of residents and a less intense commercial character. Any of these factors, and probably other ones as well, are possible explanations four why levels of helpfulness varied systematically across these different types of environment. What seems clear from the present results is that the best conception of urban non-urban environments in terms of the characteristic social behaviour of their residents is that of continuum rather than a dichotomy, and that such a continuum is probably in part a reflection of the social characteristics of the environment. For example, it seems likely that the helpfulness of squatters is not predictable simply from knowing the characteristics of the physical environment they inhabit but that it also refelcts their attitudes, norms and social organization.

Input level effect

It has already been suggested that there are a number of explanations which could account for the variation in helpfulness between different sections of the urban environment and between Turkish cities and towns. This study was primarily concerned with

clarifying the particular behavioural differences that could be identified across different environments. However, one explanation for differences in helpfulness was also examined - Milgram's (1970) input overload explanation. According to this explanation, the level of helpfulness towards a stranger is partly influenced by the amount of environmental bombardment the potential helper is having to cope with; the greater the bombardment, the less the priority (or awarenss) given to a stranger's need or request for assistance. In this study, although overall comparisons between the high and the low input locales uniformly indicated somewhat greater helpfulness in the low input settings, this effect was significant only for the female subjects and only for two out of three measures. This was an unexpected outcome and intriguing in light of other recent research suggesting sex differences in response to environmental conditions Epistein and Karlin, 1975) and also in light of possible cultural interpretations of these differences. The finding of input level effects for female but not for males could be interpreted as indicating a greater responsivenss on the part of females to the level of environmental bombardment and a corresponding greater adjustment in their level of helpfulness. On the other hand, we need to recognise the Turkish and Islamic norm which stresses the importance of a woman's non-involvement with strangers in public settings. For example, values or norms of honour related to women ('Namus' dictate the seclusion of women from public life. In this study, the high input locales may have been regarded as more public than the low input locales and hence in the former the norm was more salient and more adhered to, resulting in a reduced level of helpfulness among Turkish women. However, neither explanation in terms of culture or women's greater responsiveness to environmental input can be evaluated with the data from the present study and this unexpected sex difference in the effects of input level requires further empirical examination. In sum, then, it may be said that the present study provided general support for the Milgram hypothesis of input overload by finding an overall lower level of helpfulness in the high input level environments, as compared to the lower input level envirnments. However, the present research asked the question, how much may the environmental input level account for the observed helpfulness across environments studied in Turkey? Overall

differences between city and town environments paraleis city/town differences in helpfulness. However, it was clear that the level of environmental input cannot be an explanation of helpfulness found in the city squatters, district 4 and that other influencial factors (such as, perhaps, socia-cultural factors) of these environments mediated this effect.

Sex differences in helpfulness

The present study found clear sex differences between the Turkish male and female populations in helping behaviour, yet no weakening of this difference in the city versus town or squatter settlement. The direction of the overall sex overall sex difference were more helpful than women.

These Turkish findings stand in opposition to the results of previous studies in the westren hemisphere which found equal levels of helping for both men and women if the behaviours required were free form high cost, threat and no masculine orientation was involved (Latane and Darley, 1970; Gergen and Meter, 1972, 1977).

The present result seems partly attributable to the Moslem norms mentioned earlier which could have deterred Turkish women from involvement with strangers in public. However, it is not altogether clear why these norms did not affect the change money measure. It may be that this measure did not require the same degree of involvement as the interview measure, nor the intiation of contact as did the dropped box measure. Yet, whatever factors were responsible for the sex differences, they were as strong in the urban environments as in the town and squatter environments, thus disconfirıuing the expectation that these factors would lessen in the city. It may be that Islamic based social norms are equally strong thoughout different environments in Turkey.

Differences in dispositions and attitudes of helpfulness between urban and-urban environments in Turkey

The survey study tested the hypothesis that there would be differences in urban and non-urban attitudes and dispositions for

helpfulness by examining the views concerning helpfulness of the city, town and squatter residents, and indeed found consistent differences between the residents in their perspective on helping which parallel the behavioural data. Compared with the town and squatter respondents, the city respondents scores on each of the four aspects of views on helping and helpfulness were significantly lower. The city respondents viewed a helpful person as having more generally cooperative characteristics as opposed to a person who puts someone else'e needs before his own in any situation; they felt a lesser degree of personal responsibility about giving assistance to others as well as showing less willingness to help others in various situations, and finally the felt a lower level of societal expectancy about giving help, while the town and squatter respondents were equivalent in their judgements of these four aspects of helpfulness. These results support the urban impact theory (Wirth, 1938; Simmel, 1950; Milgram, 1970) and suggest that there are differences in the general attitudes and dispositions of helpfulness involving strangers between urban and non-urban residents. According to these social psychological analyses of urban life, the size, density and heterogeneity of cities produce levels of stimulus input which are stressful and overloading. Urbanites adapt to this overload by sharply limiting the number of people with whom they interact and their degree of commitment towards most of these people. Thus the theory suggests that urbanites become brusque, aloof, unfriendly, non-trusting and unhelp ful both in their behaviour and attitudes towards strangers.

Our results contradict earlier evindce by Holahan (1978) and Hause and Wolf (1978) which suggests that there is virtually no difference between urban and non-urban residents in attitudes and dispositional views of helpfulness from the town residents. In line with urban hypothesis, an explanation for the differences between the urban and non-urban respondents attitudes can be found in the the prenset data.These data suggest that the environmental characteristics of the city had some effect upon the attitudes of the urban respondents. Half of the city respondents (49% male and 43% female) in response to the question about whether they would feel personal responsibility for giving assistance to others needing help replied either it depends on the situation and person who seeks help

or I feel no responsibility. Their response to the question about whether they feel social pressure to give help to others is also consistent with responses to the previous questions; a high percentage of the city respondets (48% male and 62% female) replied either that people are afraid to get involved or everyone looks out for himself these days. As Tables 13 and 17 indicate, the percentage of town and squatter respondents who fell into these response categories was considerably lower or there were none at all.These responses described above reveal that the city respondents have specific attitudes of withdrawal and non-involvement with strangers which Milgram suggested (1970) would develop as a result of their experiences of stressful and overloading urban environments. The suspiciousness and lack of trust towards other persons can also be discerned in these responses. These attitudes can possibly be attributed to urban respondents' fear for their personal safety and feelings of vulnerability which might be due to the apparent rise of urban violence and crime throughout the world (Fisher, 1976). As one would expect, the female city respondents, as compared with the male, seemed to be more influenced by this situation in the city, probably as a result of feeling more vulnerable as a sex.

An alternative exlanation might be that the socio-economic status of respondents accounts for these differences in city/town attitudes towards helpfulness. The one limitation of the present study is that it did not examine the influence of this factor. Nevertheles, this study did draw upon a large sample of randomly chosen respondents from each of the environments studied, and furthermore it seems that the explanatory power of SES is conceptually and empirically rather limited as compared with the urban/non-urban dimension. Future studies should collect data relating to this point.

The city squatter respondents were quite distinct in their attitudes and dispositions concerning helpfulness towards other people as compared with their non-squatter city counterparts; indeed, their attitudes were similar to those of the town respondents. The factors responsible for the city respondents diminished attitudes of helpfulness towards others did not seem to influence the city squatter respondents. This is most likely due to the social characteristics of the squatter environments described earlier - rural and Muslim cul-

tural background. Examining their responses, it is possible to discern attitudes and values of helpfulness which derive from the traditional Islamic rural norms that emphasize the importance of generosity and responsibility towards other people (Erdentug, 1977; Karpat, 1976). For example, more than three quarters of the squatter respondents (90. 7% male and 72.7% female) replied that 'to help others is one's duty to ease one's brother/sister fellow's distress, and his is a commandment of God'; their response (84.2%) to another item was 'treat others like your own brothers/sisters or do unto others: that is what Islam and God say'. It may be that this adherence to traditional Islamic norms explains why level of helpfulness shown towards a stranger was found to be higher there.

In sum, then, the Turkish urban and non-urban residents as well as the city squatters differed in views of helpfulness paralelling the observed differences in helping behaviour between the environments reported earlier. In the light of the present data from Turkey, a speculative argument on the observed helpfulness differences between urban and non-urban environments can be made, especially with regard to the conclusion of Holahan (1978) and House and Wolf (1978). These authors, on the basis of finding a limited difference in attitudes of helpfulness and trust between urban and non-urban, concluded that the differences in helpfulness and trust between city and town are more a function of adaptations to temporary situational pressures in different environments, rather than attitudes and values. By looking at the findings in Turkey - both helpfulness and normative helpfulness - one might argue that the observed differences within the context of stranger in helpfulness between a Turkish urban/non-urban environment may have been a function of differences in attitudes and dispositions of helpfulness. However, again this argument should be considered speculative because such a claim could hardly be tested with the design of the present study. It should be the task of a future study to test the hypothesis with an appropriate research design for this conclusion, ie taking hypothesis-related behavioural and attitudinal measures from the same subjects in the naturalistic field, (city vs town). Yet, the present study only evaluated the hypothesis of urban/non-urban differences in views of helpfulness concerning strangers and demons-

trated that these differences between the two Turkish environments exist which supported the urban hypothesis.

In conclusion, the major finding of the present study is that it has demonstrated the reality of overall difference in level of helpfulness towards a stranger between city and town residents in Turkey, a culture quite dissimilar in many ways from those cultures previously used in this line of research and where differences were found. Yet, the size of city-town differences were matched by the differences occurring between different sections of Turkish cities, particularly when one includes the squatter settlements. The distinctiveness of the squatter residents, indicated by patterns of social behaviour, resembled those found in Turkish towns, rather than those of the nonssquatter urban environments within the city. This supports the view that squatters may in a psychological and social sense be 'urban villagers'. Consistent differences in helpfulness were also found between other types of city districts. More importantly, the observed behavioural pattern across environments in the present study suggest that urban/non-urban environments can be better conceptualized in terms of urban/non-urban continuum instead of urban/non-urban dichotory. The present author is planing to carry out a reseach to test this now conceptualization in urban and non-urban settings in the U.S.A. Taken together, these findings were confirmed and support a view that stresses the heterogeneity rather than the homagenity of the behavioural phenomena which occur in an urban environment. Environmental input level was found to influence the level of helpfulness, yet only significantly for female subjects. Also, males were significantly more helpful than females and this difference showed a consistent pattern across environments. Finally, the survey study found differences in views of helpfuness between environments in Turkey which paralelled helpfulness data. This supports the hypothesis that the urban environments has an impact on individuals' attitudes and dispositions of helpfulness; it may be that the observed level of helpfulness was a function of this underlying difference between urban/non-urban environments.

REFERENCES

ABADAN, N (1963) *Social Change and Turkish Women,* Ankara University Press, Ankara.

ABU - LOOGHOOD (1961) Migrants' adjustment to city life : the Egyptian case. *American Journal of Sociology, 67,* 22-32.

AMATO, P (1980) City size, sidewalk density, and friendliness toward strangers. *Journal of Social Psychology, 3,* 151-152.

ASMA, T (1970) *Rural-Urban Migration; Night Squatter Communities of Istanbul and Ankara.* Unpublished MSc thesis, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

AYVALIOĞLU, N. (1982) «Helpfulness in Cities and Towns : The relationship between urbanization and social behaviour in Turkey. Unsuplished Ph. D. Thesis, The University of St. Andrews, Scotland/U.K.

BERKOWITZ, L (1970) The self, selfishness and altruism. In J R Macaulay and L Berkowitz (Eds), *Altruism and Helping Behavior,* Academic Press.

BRAYN, J H and TEST M A (1967) Models and helping; naturalistic studies in aiding behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6,* 400-407.

COHEN, S (1978) Environmental load and the allocation of attention. In A Baum, J A Baum, J E Singer and S Valins (Eds), *Advances in Environmental Psychology,* Vol I, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey.

COHEN, S and LEZAK, A (1977) Noise and inattentiveness to social cues. *Environment and Behavior, 9,* 559 - 572.

DUBETSKY, A (1976) Kinship, primordial ties and factory organization in Turkey; an antropological view. *International Journal of Middle East Studies, 7,* 433 - 451.

ERDENTUG, N (1977) Sosyal adet ve gelenekler, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 254, Halk kitapları, 4, Ankara.

EPSTEIN, Y., And KARLIN, R. Effects of acute experimental crowding *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 1975, *5,* 34-53.

FISHER, C. S (1976) *The Uoban Experience,* Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc, New York.

FISHER, C S (1978) Sociological commets on psychological approaches to urban life. In A Baum, J E Singer and S Valins *(Eds), Advances in Environmental Psychology, Vol I : The Urban Environment,* Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey.

FORBES, G B and GROMOLL, H F (1971) The lost - letter technique as a measure of social variables; some exploratory findings. *Social Forces, 50,* 113-115.

FOX, J (1979) Comment on Harris, Luginbuhl and Fishbein : Log-linear and logit models for tabular experimental data. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 42,* 431-433.

FRIED, M and GLEICHER, P (1970) Some sources of residential satisfaction in an urban slum. In H M Proshansky, H W Ittelson and L G Rivlin (Eds), *Environmental Psychology : People and Their Physical Settings,* Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

GANS, H (1962) *The Urban Villages,* Free Press, New York.

GELFANG, D M, HARTMANN, D P, WALDER, P and PAGE, B (1973) Who reports shoplifters; a field experimental study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25* (2), 276-285.

GERGEN, K J, GERGEN, M M and METER, K (1972) Individual orientations to prosocial behavior. *Journal of Social Issues, 28* (3), 105-130.

GERGEN, K J, GERGEN, M M and Meter, K (1977) Individual orientation to prosocial behavior. In L Wispe (Ed), *The Psychology of Sympathy and Altruism,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

HART, C W M (1969) *Zeytinburnu Gecekondu Bölgesi,* Istanbul.

HAUSER, *P* (1965) Application of the ideal-type constructs to the metropolis in the economically less advanced area. In Hauser and Schnore (Eds), *The Study of Urbanization,* Wiley, New York.

HOLAHAN, C J (1978) *Environment and Behavior; A Dynamic Perspective,* Plenum Press, New York.

HOUSE, J and WOLF, S (1978) Effects of urban residence on interpersonal trust and helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36,* 1029-1043.

JACOBS, J (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities,* Vintage Books, New York.

KARPAT, K (1976) *The Gecekondu, Rural Migration and Urbanization,* Cambridge University Press, London.

KENNY, D A (1976) Data analysis in the social psychological experiment. *Representative Research in Social Psychology, 7,* 120-132.

KORTE, C (1976) *Helpfulness in the Urban Environment.* Unpublished manuscript, University of St Andrews.

KORTE, C., Ypma, I., and TOPPEN, A. Helpfulness in Dutch society as a function of urbanization and environmental input level. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1975, *32,* 996-1003.

KORTE, C (1978) Helpfulness in the urban environment. In A Baum, J E Singer and Valins (Eds), *Advances in Environmental Psychology,* Vol I, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey.

KORTE, C (1980) Urban-non-urban differences in social behavior and social psychological models of urban impact. *Journal of Social Issues, 36,* 29-51.

KORTE, C and GRANT, R (1980) Traffic noise, environmental awareness and pedestrian behavior. *Environment and Behavior, 12,* 408-420.

KORTE, C and KERR, N (1975) Response to altruistic opportunities under urban and rural conditions. *Journal of Social Psychology, 95,* 183-184.

KRUPAT, E and COURY, M (1975) *The Lost Letter Technique and Helping ; An Urban/Non-urban Comparison.* Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, Chicago.

KURTKAN, A (1977) Türk Milletinin Manevi Değerleri, Eğitimde Temel Kavramlar Serisi 2. Devlet Kitapları.

LEVINE, N (1973) Old culture, new culture; a study of migrants in Ankara, Turkey. *Social Forces, 51,* 355-368.

LEWIS, O (1959) *Five Families,* Basic Books, New York.

LOFLAND, L (1973) *A World of Strangers,* Basic, New York.

LOWIN, A, HOLTES, J, SANDLER, B and BRONSTEIN, M (1971) The pace of life and sensitivity to time in urban and rural settings; a preliminary study. *Journal of Social Psychology, 83,* 247-253.

MATHEWS, K E, Jr and CANON, L K (1975) Environmental noise level as a determinant of helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32* (4), 571-577.

MEEKER, M (1976) Meaning and society in the Near East; examples from the Black Sea Turks and the Levantine Arabs. *International Journal of Middle East Studies,* 7, 243-270.

MEEKER, M (1976) Meaning and society in the Near East; examples from the Black Sea Turks and the Levantine Arabs. *International Journal of Middle East Etudies,* 7, 243-270.

MERRENS, M (1973) Non-emergenency helping behavior in various sized communities. *Journal of Social Psychology, 90,* 327-328.

MILGRAM, S (1970) The experience of living in cities. *Science, 167,* 1461-1468.

NEWMAN, J and McCAULEY, C (1977) Eye contact with strangers in city, suburb and small town. *Environment and Behavior, 9,* 547-557,

NEWMAN, O (1973) *Defensible Space,* Collier Books, New York.

RUSHTON, P (1978) Urban density and altruism : helping strangers in a Canadian city, suburb and small town. *Psychological Reports, 43,* 987- .

SCNEIDER, F and MOCUS, Z (1974) Failure to find a rural-urban difference in incidence of altruistic behavior. *Psychological Reports, 3 4,*294.

SEAGERT, S, MACKINTOSH, E ans WEST, E (1975) Two studies of crowding in urban public places. *Environment and Behavior, 7,* 133-158.

SHOTLAND, L R (1979) The lost-letter technique; some methodological considerations. Unsuplished manuscript, Pennsylvania State University.

SIMMEL, G (1950) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel* (Kurt Wolff, ed), Free Press, New York.

SUZUKI, *P* (1964) Encounters with Istanbul; urban peasants and village peasents. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 5,* 208-216.

TEKKELİ, I (1971) Gecekondu Planlama Sorunları ve Yolları. METU. *Studies in Development.*

TÜMERTEKİN, E (1968) Türkiye'de İç göçler (Internal Migration in Turkey), Istanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, No 54.

TÜRKDOĞAN, O (1970) Türkiyede köy sosyolojisinin Temel sorunları. Atatürk Üniversitesi Yayınları, No 76, İşletme fakültesi Ders kitapları serisi 3, Erzurum.

TURNER, R (1969) *India's Urban Future,* University of California Press, Berkeley.

WAGNER, C., and WHEELER, L. (1969) Model, need and cost effects in helping behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 12, pp. 111-116.

WILSON, M and MAFJE, A (1963) *Langa: A Study of Social Groupings in an African Township,* London University Press, London.

WIRTH, L (1938) Urbanism as a way of life. *American Journal of Sociolog y,44,* 1-24.

YASA, I (1966) *Ankara'da Gecekondu Aileleri,* Ankara.

YAVUZ, F, KELES, R and Geray, C (19) *Urbanism: Problems, Applications and Policy,* Ankara University Press, Ankara.

APPENDİX

Names of the sites of data collection in cities City-squatters and towns in Turkey

	High input setting	Low input setting
ANKARA		
Kızılay (District 1)	Atatürk Bulvarı	Mithat paşa caddesi
Maltepe (District)2	Tandoğan meydanı including the avenue leading to Kızılay	Onur caddesi
Yeni mahalle (District 3)	Çarşı caddesi and Hükümet konağı meydanı	Akın caddesi
Gaziosmanpaşa (District 4)	Kavaklıdere caddesi	Nene Hatun caddesi
ISTANBUL		
Karaköy (District1)	Karaköy meydanı and Rıhtım caddesi	Bankalar caddesi
Beyazıt	Ordu caddesi and Hürriyet meydanı	Şehzade başı
Kadıköy (District 2)	Dörtyol caddesi	Rıhtım caddesi leading to Haydarpaşa
Eyüp (District 3)	Eyüp Sultan türbesi Meydanı, and Çarşı Cadd.	Hacı Osman caddesi
Yeşilköy District 4)	Ataköy Bulvarı, and istasyon caddesi	Exitension of Ataköy Bulvarı
SQUATTER SETTLEMENTS		
ANKARA		
Kaleiçi	Pazaryeri, kale içi sokak, and Işık caddesi	Bayır sokak
Yenidoğan		
Şentepe	Çarşı caddesi, Okul Meydanı	27 Mayıs caddesi

ISTANBUL		
Zeyzinburnu	İstasyon, and Ondokuz Mayıs caddesi	Extension of Ondokuz Mayıs caddesi
Gaziosmanpaşa	Belediye meydanı, and Kurtuluş caddesi	Extension of Kurtuluş caddesi
	High input setting	Low input setting
TOWNS		
Bartın	Aşağı çarşı caddesi, and Karakaş caddesi	Orta okul caddesi, and Asma köprü caddesi
Kaman	Ömer hacılı caddesi, İstiklal caddesi, and 27 Mayıs caddesi	Keskinci caddesi Müdderis sok
Yerköy	Kirşehir caddesi, Vatan caddesi, Cumhuriyet caddesi, and Beşliaydm caddesi	Hükümet caddesi, and Yozgat caddesi
Karacabey	Hükümet Meydani, Bursa caddesi, Panayır caddesi	Karaca Ahmet caddesi, Tahıl Meydanı

Measurements of the level of sound, pedestrian, traffic and public buildings density in high and low input settings in sixteen city city squatter and town locations

ISTANBUL

		Sound level		Pedestrian		Traffic		Visible public buildings
	Input	S	M	S	M	S	M	M
Beyazıt and Karaköy	High	2.37	75.41	10.35	74.5	10.14	84.5	20
	Low	2.49	69.36	10.80	35.0	6.02	42.5	17
Kadıköy	High	1.65	70.87	13.63	63.0	9.84	58.5	18
	Low	2.28	67.20	4.73	31.75	5.25	27.5	11
Eyüp	High	2.63	67.5	6.02	33.5	6.39	26.25	12
	Low	2.98	64.36	3.94	21.75	6.02	23.5	14
Yeşilköy and Göztepe	High	4.04	60.4	4.08	14.0	5.5	8.5	6
	Low	2.85	57.35	1.5	4.25	2.75	3.25	0

ANKARA

		Sound level		Pedestrian		Traffic		Visible public buildings
	Input	S	M	S	M	S	M	M
Kızılay	High	3.27	74.25	9.73	71.25	12.15	71.5	21
	Low	2.43	70.04	13.66	56.5	8.60	68.5	20
Maltepe	High	2.02	73.92	4.20		7.70	52.6	14
	Low	4.66	70.03	10.60	35.5	8.61	30.5	17
Yenimahalle	High	3.06	68.23	6.50	30.0	7.02	22.5	17
	Low	1.97	66.17	8.31	23.5	4.75	17.5	12
Gaziosmanpaşa	High	2.07	60.36	3.09	8.35	2.50	10.5	4
	Low	1.02	58.28	1.7	6.25	2.70	8.0	2

TOWNS

	Input	Sound level S	Sound level M	Pedestrian S	Pedestrian M	Traffic S	Traffic M	Visible public buildings M
Bartın	High	3.54	60.5	2.87	19.25	1.52	7.33	11
	Low	3.40	57.20	2.0	8.0	0.5	5.3	6
Yerköy	High	2.56	59.7	2.98	21.25	2.62	7.75	12
	Low	2.04	56.25	0.95	10.75	3.09	5.25	8
Kaman	High	1.61	61.23	1.28	14.75	2.21	9.25	8
	Low	3.26	56.58	1.29	15.5	0.5	1.25	7
Karacabey	High	3.64	62.3	3.55	20.0	3.10	14.5	13
	Low	3.68	59.15	2.75	14.75	1.70	7.25	7

CITY SQNATTER SETTLEMENTS

	Input	Sound level S	Sound level M	Pedestrian S	Pedestrian M	Traffic S	Traffic M	Visible public buildigns M
Gaziosmanpaşa	High	3.51	65.2	4.6	30	2.36	10	12
	Low	2.10	62.5	2.2	12	3.20	9	5
Zeytinburnu	High	1.66	67.3	3.1	29	1.5	20	13
	Low	2.09	65.2	2.3	19	2.6	6	7
Şentepe	High	2.7	67.5	1.6	18	0.5	18	10
	Low	3.07	61.4	2.2	12	1.52	9	9
Kaleici	High	1.25	65.4	3.25	27	1.8	19	16
	Low	4.25	63.6	4.6	15	3.10	6	6

	Input	M	S
Sound level[a]	High	65.38	4.05
	Low	62.06	4.32
Pedestrian volume[b]	High	28.89	11.8
	Lo w	17.85	7.83
Traffic volume[c]	High	22.58	16.77
	Low	13.3	12.49
Building volume[d]	High	12.58	1.5
	Low	8.45	2.73

[a] $t(30) = 1.76$, $p < .05$
[b] $t(30) = 1.90$, $p < .05$
[c] $t(30) = 1.52$, $p < .08$
[d] $t(30) = 050$, ns

Comparison of environments in their environmental input levels (low and high input levels combined)

Locales A

	Sound level		Padestrian density		Traffic level		Visible public buildings	
	S	M	S	M	S	M	S	M
City	5.60	67.10	22.2	34.35	25.4	34.92	6.64	12.81
town	2.24	59.11	4.6	15.50	3.8	7.25	2.60	9.00
City squatter settlements	2.51	64.76	7.4	20.25	5.9	12.12	3.77	5.79

City districts B

	Sound level		Padestrian density		Traffic level		Visible public buildings	
	S	M	S	M	S	M	S	M
District 1	2.68	72.01	18.0	59.50	17.6	66.75	1.70	19.5
District 4	1.52	59.09	4.2	8.21	3.07	7.56	2.50	3.0
District 2	2.76	70.50	14.0	42.68	16.2	42.90	3.16	15.0
District 3	1.69	66.56	5.5	27.18	3.65	22.40	2.60	13.75
District 3	1.69	66.56	5.5	27.18	3.65	22.40	2.60	13.75

A City versus town (sound level) = $t(264) = 14.05$, $p < .01$
City versus town (pedestrian density) = $t(46) = 3.29$, $p < .01$
City versus town (traffic level) = $t(46) = 4.26$, $p < .01$
City versus squatter (sound level) = $t(264) = 4.10$, $p < .01$
City versus squatter (pedestrian density) = $t(46) = 2.39$, $p < .01$
City versus squatter (pedestrian density) = $t(46) = 3.48$, $p < .01$
Town versus squatter (sound level) = $t(264) = 21.73$, $p < .01$
Town versus squatter (pedestrian density) = $t(46) = 2.68$, $p < .01$
Town versus squatter (traffic level) = $t(46) = 3.18$, $p < .01$

B District 1 versus District 4 (sound level) = $t(174) = 55.4$, $p < .01$
District 1 versus District 4 (pedestrian density) = $t(14) = 10.4$, $p < .01$
District 1 versus District 4 (traffic level) = $t(14) = 32.16$, $p < .01$