

**HAS THE RECENT URBANIZATION IN TURKEY CHANGED  
THE NATURE OF TRADITIONAL PRIMARY GROUP  
RELATIONSHIP; A STUDY OF SOCIAL SUPPORTIVENESS  
BETWEEN KIN, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBOURS IN  
VARIOUS TYPE OF TURKISH ENVIRONMENTS**

NAMIK AYVALIOĞLU

*Istanbul University, Turkey.*

*Abstract*

The social psychological analysis of the city suggest that the urban environment and urban living produce alterations even in important social behaviour between primary groups : kin, friends and neighbours. A field study was carried out to evaluate this hypothesis in Turkey, a different setting than most studies done to date. Data collected from various types of Turkish urban environments; city, towns, city squatter settlements did not show any significant differences on various measures of social contacts and social supportiveness occurring between kin and friends (controlling for spatial distance) across these three environments. But one influence exerted by the urban environment was that it increased spatial distance between kin, friends which in turn effected social contact patterns and supportiveness between kin and friends. Neighbourly social relationships and supportiveness were significantly less in Turkish city environments than in the towns and squatter settlements, which showed equivalent level of neighbourly social behaviours. This supports the view that the city squatters in a psychological and social sense are «urban villagers». The implications of the present data oppose the deterministic

view of urban theories which argue unequivocal impact of the urban environment on social behaviour.

### *Introduction*

It has been suggested that the shift to an urban habitat is a significant, if not most significant, development in human history. But the most commonly shared popular view is that of the city as an unnatural human habitat (Ittleson et al, 1974). The quality of human interaction, and of certain essential ingredients of social behaviour, are thought to be eroded by features of city life. Urban dwellers are seen as unhelpful, aloof, indifferent in their social relationships with others, and deficient in their kin, friends and neighbourly relationships (Korte and Guild, 1980).

These beliefs not only appear to fuel the general demoralization about city living, they also appear to be the basis for many social scientific accounts of city life and urban social behaviour. The analysis of urban life and urban environment suggest that density, crowding, pressure, architectural design and structural differentiation in the city are factors converging on urban dwellers in a way that produces profound changes in urban personality reflected in the form of anonymity, loneliness, withdrawal, aloofness, and superficiality and unhelpfulness in their contact with fellow urbanites (Wirth, 1938; Simmel, 1950; Alexander, 1968; Milgram, 1970). Furthermore urban dwellers more essential relationships occurring within the primary group (kin, friendship and neighbourly relationships) have been negatively affected by urban living (Wirth, 1938; Simmel, 1950).

Wirth (1938) argued that the primary group relationship in the city would be different as a consequence of the size, density and heterogeneity of the urban population. These demographic factors lead to social conditions, such as social differentiation, the increased importance of secondary groups and the multiplication of an individual's different roles with the result that the individual's different roles with the result that the individual's contacts become impersonal, superficial and utilitarian; in turn, the individual's

primary relationships (kin, friends and neighbours) become weakened.

According to Wirth (1938) families in the city are smaller, are isolated from the larger kinship group, and do not fulfil the same functions as those in non-urban environments. As a result, individual family members pursue their own diverging interests, and remaining family ties become narrower and unfulfilling (p. 52). As to friendship; although an urbanite is surrounded by people and is ceaselessly in contacts with them, he interests rarely at a personal level, and casual and intimate friendship ties are eclipsed by the superficial, impersonal and transitory character of urban social relationships. Neighbouring, the quality of neighbourhood life, and community cohesion are weakened by anomie and the transitory character of urban living (p. 53).

In contrast, an analysis offered by Gans (1962, 1978), Lewis (1965 and Fisher (1976, 1978) posits that the social behaviour occurring within the primary group and the extent of help and assistance that comes from friends, neighbours and kin in the contemporary urban society must have been underestimated and that the primary group remains a strong force.

Empirical evidence on urban/non-urban (town) differences in these social behaviours, although limited in number, suggest a different conclusion with regard to the above two opposing analysis.

Social behaviours show differences between the two environments depending on their contexts.

The evidence concerning kin and friend social relationships indicates no urban/non-urban differences. Individuals in the urban environments have social contact and supportiveness as frequent as their counterparts in the non-urban environments (in the United States : Reiss, 1959; Key, 1968; Bultena, 1969; Glenn and Hill, 1977; in Britain : Kasadra and Janowitz, 1974; Irwin, 1975; in Japan : Koyama, 1970).

The urban respondents have as many close friends as the non-urban respondents, and socialized with their friends to an

equal degree as did their non-urban counterparts (in the United States : Reiss, 1959; Key, 1968; Empey and Lubeck, 1968; Glenn and Hill, 1977; in Britain Kasadra and Janowitz, 1974; in Australia; Sutcliffe and Crabbe, 1963; for exception, see Gutterman (1966) in the United States).

However, when we turn to the evidence concerning urban/non-urban neighbourly relationships, the empirical findings suggest a conclusion different from what has been observed with that of kin and friends. Urban residents know a significantly smaller number of neighbours and the frequency of social contacts and socializing among urban neighbours is significantly less than that found among non-urban residents (Key, 1968; Fava, 1958; Fisher, 1973; for exception, see Glenn and Hill, 1977, who find no association between urbanization and neighbourly contacts).

Similarly, a recent review (Ayvalioğlu, 1982) has demonstrated that urban/not urban differences in social behaviour are also clearly evident in social contacts between strangers.

Another type of influence of urban living has been found on the social *pattern* of friends and kin. Several studies have pointed to the fact that urban families are relatively smaller (Key, 1968; Bultena, 1969; Koyama, 1970), and urban kin members are geographically dispersed (Bultena, 1969; Koyama, 1970; Key, 1968; Kasadra and Janowitz, 1974). Yet, as indicated, once spatial distance was controlled there were no urban/non-urban differences in the kin social contacts. Friendship patterns were also found to be somewhat different in the city : urban residents drew their friends from a wider variety of social pools than non-urban residents did (eg., the work place, club versus local neighbourhood), and urban friends were more geographically dispersed (eg non-localized : Sutcliffe and Crabbe, 1963; Key, 1968; Kasadra and Janowitz, 1974). However, again as in the case of kin, once distance was controlled, the urban/non-urban dimension showed no influence on friends' social behaviour. One segment of the urban population, working class residents, did not fit this pattern; they tended to have a localized friendship and kinship network (Kasadra and Janowitz, 1974).

- The above conclusions regarding kin, friends and neighbours social behaviour are weakened by the fact that they are based on a very limited number of studies and, furthermore, the majority of the reviewed studies utilized data derived from secondary sources (eg aggregate census and historical works) which did not allow the control of the influence of several potentially important variables (Fisher, 1976). Moreover, most of these data were not concerned with the quality, but rather with the quantity, of urban social contacts (Guterman, 1969).

Finally, these points of evidence are culturally limited as they have been collected in one type of culture : Western and developed countries. specially the generality of these data can be seen to be open to question given the claim that the Western model of urbanization and the character of social behaviour do not apply to cities in the developing world (Hauser, 1965). Thus, what is needed is more evidence concerning whether kin, friends and neighbours in urban environments differ in various types of social relationships, and what aspects of the urban environments and individuals' characteristics affect the occurrence of these social relationships especially in the cities of developing countries. Hence the central concern of the present study was to evaluate the urban social behaviour hypothesis by examining various aspects of social behaviour occurring between kin, friends and neighbours in Turkish environments (cities and towns).

### *The Turkish Setting*

The selection of Turkey for the present study was considered to be appropriate on a number of grounds. First of all, Turkey is a developing country containing rapidly, developing urban centres (eg Ankara and Istanbul). Second, quite different from the cultures previously studied, Turkey is culturally a Middle-Eastern, Islamic society. Thus, it presented a cultural setting suitable for examining the urbanization and social behaviour relationship in order to extend and evaluate the findings from Western and developed cultures.

Unlike Western families (eg the American) which stress importance on the value of autonomy and freedom (Minuchin, 1974;

Bowen, 1976), within the Turkish family structure solidarity, loyalty, interdependence, and emotional bonds are underlying values which govern interpersonal relationships between kin members (Fişek, 1982; 1984; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1984). Minuchin (1974) and Bowen (1976) classify the family with these types of social characteristics-the Turkish family-as a close knit family.

Several analyses suggest that this traditional primary group solidarity has declined in Turkish cities and in response to demands of urban society and environments the isolated nuclear family which comprises only immediate family members (eg husband, wife and children) emerged in the city (Eröz, 1977; Erdentug, 1977). However, some data suggest that despite urban living there exist intense family relationships in the city (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982, 1984; Duben, 1982; Olson, 1982) : for example a high percentage of urban individuals, married and with university degree, reported visiting their parents once or twice a week and the rest reported seeing their parents every day (Duben, 1982; Olson, 1982). Yet these studies are non-comparative in nature hence unsuitable for testing the urban hypothesis. Thus carrying out this study in Turkey to examine the generality of the earlier findings of urban social behaviour from Western cultures as the main concern also provided an opportunity to evaluate the above claim empirically by examining the social behaviour of kin, friends and neighbours in Turkish cities and towns. With this end in view, the present study examined the two main aspects of the hypothesis related to social behaviours in Turkish city and town environments : these were the frequency of social contacts and various types of social supportiveness occurring between each of the three relations in question.

#### *Independent Variables :*

Apart from the urban/non-urban dimension, influences of several potential variables on the occurrence of the behaviours in question were examined. These variables were as follows : the length of residency, marital status, socio-economic status, origin (eg having a different origin from place of residence versus origin from present place of residence), sex, and age.

The local community is viewed as a system of social networks and it has been argued that the length of residency influences the development of friendship and neighbourly relationships (Wirth, 1938; Fisher, 1976; Kasadra and Janowitz 1974) have found that as a result of residential mobility, kin were spatially dispersed and in turn this affected the pattern of social contacts between kin. However they found that as length of residency increased residents developed more extensive networks of friends and neighbour, and participated more in local organizations.

A person's sex stage of life (eg married versus single), and age may influence social behaviour, especially those occurring between neighbours and friends. It is a common observation (see Michelson, 1976) that residents who are unmarried, or aged, may have less in common with their neighbours and, hence, may have fewer social contacts and less social support with neighbours.

The pattern of kin, friend and neighbour relationships may show a variation in socio-economic status. Individuals with lower status (the working class), tend to have more relatives living nearby, have a local-based friendship network and a higher level of neighbourhood social relationships than individuals with a higher social economic status (Kasadra and Janowitz, 1974; Irwing, 1975; Gans, 1962; Young and Willomoth, 1962). However, an exception to these results comes from Smith, Form and Stone (1954) data. Finally, the present study examined the effect of an individual's birth place background on these primary group social relationships. It is hypothesized that non-urban reared migrants are more likely to be away from their kin and friends, as well as having acquired few experiences relevant to urban life and would have difficulty adjusting to urban environments (eg Zimmer, 1955; Jitodai, 1965).

Yet, it has been found that rural migrants to the city socialized with their friends and kin more frequently and engaged more often in neighbouring activities than did their non-urban counterparts (Usui, Lei and Butler, 1977).

#### *Urban village phenomena*

Besides carrying out an urban-non-urban comparison of kin, friends and neighbours' social behaviour in Turkey, this study also

took advantage of an important urban phenomenon, the squatter settlements which have grown up in most of the major cities of Turkey as well as other developing nations. The behavioral characteristics of these urban settlements have been viewed (Abu-Lughod, 1961) as challenging the notion that the behaviour of urbanities adapts toward inevitable forms in response to the influence of the urban environment. Gans (1962) and Jacobs (1961) have also reported the existence of neighbourhoods within Western cities (ag Boston, New York) with village-like social qualities. These city neighbourhoods offer a variety of different types intimate social relationships and social supportiveness which are enhanced by the quality of life there; residents know each other well, are long-term residents and share common rural and ethnic traditions. According to the same analysis, the characteristics of these urban neighbourhoods have protected residents from the influence of urban living and environment.

Several analyses of these Turkish squatter settlements (Suzuki, 1966; Levine, 1974; Karpas, 1976; Tekeli, 1971; Yaga, 1966; for analyses of the squatter settlements of other developing countries, see Abu-Lughod, 1961; Wilson and Mafje, 1963; Turner, 1962; Lewis, 1959) suggest that the residents have retained the mannerisms, attitudes, values, and customs that prevail in the villages of their origin and hence that these people resemble the present-day inhabitants of villages and towns in Turkey more than they resemble their non-squatter fellow urbanities (see Ayvahoğlu, 1982; for more detailed analyses of Turkish squatters).

The development of the Turkish squatter settlements within the city, or Gecekondu as they are called in Turkey, has been a product of the massive movement of rural migrants to the major cities of Turkey under the influence of such factors as high rural birth rate and low rural economic opportunity (Tumertekin, 1968; Karpas, 1976; Yavuz, Keleş and Geray, 1978). At the present 59 % of the total population of Ankara, and 45 % of the population of İstanbul, reside in squatter settlements (Yavuz, Keleş and Geray, 1978). However the presence of such communities within the city runs counter to the urban social behavior hypothesis (Wirth, 1938), which claims a decline in kin friends and neighbours social rela-



tionships. Hence the city squatter settlements provided a good testing ground for the validity of some aspects of urban social impact hypothesis (Wirth, 1938) and «urban village thesis» (Gans, 1962; Jacobs, 1961).

In an earlier study (Korte and Ayvahoğlu, 1980) the urban village thesis was challenged by the finding urban squatter residents showed a greater level of helpfulness towards strangers than did the regular urban residents (non-squatter), and that the city squatters' helpfulness equalled that observed in the towns. The present study further evaluated the urban village thesis and the urban impact hypothesis by investigating a broader range of types of positive social behaviours (eg social contacts and supportiveness between kin, friends and neighbours).

The basic design of the study consisted of a comparison of the social contacts and supportiveness occurring between kin, friends and neighbours across the squatter settlements, the non-squatter city environments and the town environments, to see whether the behavioural pattern of squatters with their kin, friends and neighbours would be more similar to that of their town counterparts than to that of non-squatter dwellers.

#### *Selection of respondents*

The questionnaire was administered to a total of 256 male and female Turkish respondents, who were residents of either a city (n=89), a town (n=66) or a squatter settlement (n=101). The administration of the questionnaire was carried out by the earlier mentioned ten survey workers, under the supervision of the researcher. The collection of the data was completed in the spring through fall of 1980 in Turkey. Systematic sampling was impractical in the particular environments where this study was carried out, due to such factors as the absence of residential listing, and also the general unfamiliarity of the population with survey procedure. Under such circumstances a sample was obtained partly through an informal sampling of households in different locales in the cities, towns and squatter settlements within the cities. Also, in order to ensure an approximately equal number of female and

male respondents from a given locality, the sex content of the household to be contacted for the survey study was predetermined, then in turn either a female or male respondent was contacted. In addition to the enclosed instruction, the questionnaire was explained to the respondents, then left with them to be completed, and then retrieved by the survey workers two or three days later.

A total of 293 out of 325 questionnaires were administered in this way with a rate of return of 89.6 % (293). Subsequently 37 questionnaires were discarded due to an excessive number of unanswered items, leaving a final sample of 256 respondents.

### *Questionnaire*

The questionnaire items were designed to measure the frequency of social contacts and the degree of various types of supportiveness between kin, friends and neighbours. In addition, respondents' background factors were under investigation in this study. The questionnaire consisted of the items covering :

- (a) background data of respondents : sex age, SES, birth place, stage of life (marital status), family household, present locale of residence and the length of residency in the present place;
- (b) the geographical distance between kin;
- (c) the frequency of contacts between kin (eg how often and where kin members meet each other);
- (d) the area of actual occurrence of helpfulness between kin, friends and neighbours in the last six months (eg discussing personal problems, borrowing some items, etc);
- (e) the areas of help in which respondents feel at ease to ask for help from their friends, kin and neighbours (there were 16 types of helpfulness which differed in terms of their cost and intimacy);
- (f) a number of 'close friends' and the origin of friendship;

- (g) the geographical distance between friends and the residents;
- (h) the frequency and intimacy of social contacts between friends;
- (i) familiarity with local neighbourhood residents;
- (j) number of neighbours known.

### *Results*

Characteristics of the sample population : As  $\chi^2$  analyses showed, the composition of respondents' in their background variables such as sex, age, SES, the family size, the length of residency in their present place showed significant differences across cities, towns and squatter environments. The city sample was significantly different in all these background variables than the town sample except in the stage of life; the age and than the squatter sample except in the stage of life; the age, while the town sample were significantly different than the squatter sample in all the background variables except the sex composition, the age variables (See Table 1).

In the analysis to be reported in this section, respondents of the four towns, two cities and the four city-squatter areas were combined to constitute the town, city and city squatter samples. On each measure of social behaviour, a multiple regression analysis was done to examine relationships between a given social behaviour and several variables such as respondents' sex, stage of life, origin, SES, length of residence and locale of residence. If the locale of residence variable in the analysis showed a significant effect, further analysis on differences between the three samples for the social behaviour was carried out. The computation of multiple regression analysis was carried out by the use of a package program, statistical package for social sciences (SPSS).

### *Kin's Social Behaviour*

*Spatial distance and the frequency of social contacts between kin;* The spatial distance and the frequency of the social contacts

between kin members were examined, and then the influence of the spatial distance variables on the frequency of social contacts was analysed by introducing this variable into the multiple regression analysis. First, the analysis revealed a strong significant association between respondents' locale of residence (city, town, squatter areas) and their kin spatial distance ( $F(7.171) = 2.037, p < .02$ ) when other variables were controlled for.

Since the locales (city, town, squatter) showed a significant association with the kin proximity, a further analysis was carried out to examine differences between locales and this analysis showed a significant difference in the geographical proximity across locales ( $F(2, 253) = 5.728, p < .01$ ). The city respondents had significantly less relatives living spatially closer than the town and the squatter respondents, while town respondents had more relatives living at a close distance than the squatter respondents.

Second, the kin social contact scores were evaluated by the question which asked respondents how frequently they got in touch with their kin. Two separate multiple regression analyses were carried out to evaluate the notion that kin in the city environment are spatially dispersed; hence, it is this spatial distance which may be responsible for a possible city/town difference in the frequency of social contacts, otherwise there would be no major influence of the urban environment per se on this valued relation. This presentation was tested by the two steps of analysis.

In the first analysis (table is not reported here), there was a strong influence of respondents' locale of residence (city its own and squatter areas) on the frequency of kin social contacts. In the second analysis, when the kin spatial distance was introduced, the effect of the locale of residence disappeared, and the kin spatial distance became a strong significant factor for the frequency of kin social contact. This result supported the earlier findings of Key (1968), Bultena (1969), Koyama (1970) and Kasadra and Janowitz (1974) that the spatial distance between kin members influences the frequency of their social contacts, and, as seen, there is no effect of locality of residence on the social contacts between kin.

There was also an effect of respondent's personal characteristics on kin spatial distance. The female respondents lived closer

to their kin, as did unmarried respondents. Respondents' background in terms of birth influenced the geographical proximity between kin; respondents with town or rural birth place background tended to live closer to their kin. The length of residency and respondents' kin spatial distance was significantly related ( $F(7.171) = 2.83$ ,  $p. < .01$ ); the longer a respondents' length of residency, the larger the number of relatives living nearby (ie closer in terms of spatial distance) (See Table 2).

Social supportativeness between kin; the amount of supportiveness was examined initially by asking respondents to recall occasions of having exchanged help with their kin, within the last six months. Respondents reported 706 instances of helpfulness exchanged with their kin, that ranged from «borrowing a small amount of money» to being looked after in the times of illness with an average of 3.05.

A multiple regression analysis for the relationship between respondents' personal characteristics and the occurrence of helpfulness between their kin only showed a significant effect on respondents' locale of residence. However a further analysis adding the kin spatial distance variable was undertaken for the actuality that kin in the urban environment are spatially dispersed (see the result of kin spatial distance), thus the locale effect may simply reflect this spatial distance between kin. As a result, the effect of respondents' locale of residence (urban, non-urban, squatter settlements) weakened (marginally significant) and the kin spatial distance emerged as a very strong influential variable for the occurrence of helpfulness between kin (see Table 2). As in the frequency of kin social contacts, this result is consistent with the prediction of the present study that kin in urban environments as compared with the non-urban environments are geographically dispersed, and this feature of the urban environment influenced the occurrence of the helpfulness between kin, but the locale (eg urban/non-urban) does not have any influence per se.

#### *Expected supportativeness between kin*

Further investigation concerning kin social support was pursued by a series of questions which asked respondents how easy it was

for them to ask their kin for help in various areas. The average rating across the 16 types of requests on a fivepoint scale of difficulty was 2.85.

A multiple regression analysis for the relationship between respondents' personal characteristics and respondents' perception of ease-of-asking help (or the expected helpfulness) from their kin showed no significant influence of respondents' locale of residence on the kin expected supportativeness (see Table 2). Respondents who were unmarried perceived their kin as more a source of help, and the spatial distance between kin, had some effect on respondents' expectance of kin helpfulness. Taken together, the present results suggest kin in the urban environments (as compared with town and squatter environments) were spatially dispersed. The frequency of social contacts, the occurrence of helpfulness (marginally significant) and expected helpfulness between kin were not affected by respondents' living in the city, town and squatter environments, but rather by the spatial distance between kin members.

*Friends' Social behaviour:* Respondents stated the names and addresses of up to six persons whom they considered to be their friends. The multiple regression analysis showed no significant influence on friends' social behavior of the locale of residence, nor of any of other personal variables, except for respondents' birth place background. (See Table 3)

But respondents' origin of these friendship was significantly influenced by the locale of residence variable: The city respondents' friends were mostly work associates or colleagues (45,8 %), and living spatially distance places, while the town and the squatter respondents' majority of friends were originated in their neighbourhood, 61,4 % and 76,8 respectively. Also those respondents who had an origin other than their present place of residence; the lower S.E.S. respondents, and respondents with a long - time residency tended to have their friendships originating more in their locale neighbourhood or from their childhood. The findings supports that of Kasadra and Janowitz (1974) in which respondents with high length of residency and low SES had their friends living in the close vicinity. An analyses on the frequency of social contacts and the pattern of social contacts between friends' scores showed no significant effect of the

locale of residence for the frequency of social contacts once the variable of the spatial distance between friends were introduced. The length of residency had also some influence on the frequency of social contacts, respondents who had a longer of residency tended to have more frequent social contacts with their friends (See table 3).

A further analysis on the pattern of these social contacts showed a significant locale of residence effect (See table 3) : city respondents see their friends at home visiting 30 % or at work 22,9 % or contact on telephone 20.5 %; While the town and the squatter respondents contacted there friends in a locale place 42.8 % and 81. % respectively. Spatial distance between friends also affected significantly their intimate social contacts: friends resided away from each other had social contacts in a less intimate way. Respondents who were female, of a lower age group, having origin other than the present place of residence and having a long-time residence, tended to have social contacts with their friends in a more intimate fashion.

Respondents reported 628 occasions of various types of help exchanges with their friends within six months that was averaged 2.4 per respondents. The analysis indicated, respondents' locale of residence had a significant influence on the occurrence of helpfulness when other factors were controlled for. However, sex, age and social class also had effects on the occurrence of helpfulness. Female respondents exchanged more help with their friends. The respondents with a lower status tended to exchange more help with their friends and this result was consistent with the previous data of Young and Willmott (1962), Gans (1962), yet not with Smith, Form and Stone (1964), who found greater helpfulness among the higher SES individuals. The advanced life-cycle (age) of respondents also had a negative influence on the occurrence of helpfulness which supported the earlier finding of Kasadra and Janowitz (1974). The final variable that influenced the occurrence of helpfulness between friends was the spatial distance between friends. However, as already seen, the locale variable (all other independent variables controlled for) showed an association with the occurrence of friend-helpfulness. This result is interesting, especially in the light of the previously suggested analysis, that locale differences in helpfulness may be a function of spatial distance between friends. Yet, this was not the

case in the present study: even with the spatial distance controlled for, respondents' locale of residence had a persistent influence on the occurrence of friend helpfulness.

When we turn to further analysis of the locale variable, the three samples showed significant differences in the occurrence of helpfulness between friends ( $F(2,253) = 16.46, p < .01$ ). The city respondents exchanged significantly less help with their friends than the town respondents and the squatter respondents, and the town respondents also exchanged less helpfulness than the city squatter respondents.

With regard to the question «how easy is it for you to ask friend for help», the average rating across the 16 type of social support that respondents reported easy to ask friends was 3.12. A multiple regression analysis showed no effect of respondents' locale of residence on the expected helpfulness, while there was some influence of life-cycle (age) and birth place origin (See Table 3). In sum, then, the present results suggest that the urban environment has a limited influence on the social behaviour between friends, when other potential influential variables are controlled for. Only in a few measures of friends' social behaviour did city respondents differ from the town respondents and the city-squatter respondents, while the city-squatter respondents matched in all ways to the town respondents. Overall, this result supports the previous findings in this area of research that city living has no significant influence on friends' social behaviour (Key, 1968; Reiss, 1959; Sutcliffe and Crabbe, 1967; Kasadra and Janowitz, 1974).

#### *Social contacts and supportativeness between neighbours*

*Familiarity with locale*: two aspects of neighbourly relationships were examined. The first aspect involved respondents' familiarity with their locale neighbourhood, while the second concerned several types of respondents' social behaviour with immediate neighbours (eg neighbours in the same street or block of flats). The analysis of the relationships between respondents' personal characteristics and their familiarity with their neighbourhood residents showed strong influences of respondents' locale of residence on their knowing a



number of neighbourhood residence well (see Table 4). As expected, respondents' length of residency had a very strong effect on their familiarity with neighbourhood. Also, respondents' personal characteristics such as sex and origin were associated with this measure. Those who had a birth place origin other than their present environment tended to know more people in the neighbourhood.

#### *Knowing a number of neighbours*

The next question examined was 'how many neighbours do you know well?' (eg those in the same street or block of flats). Multiple regression showed a significant effect of respondents' locale of residence when other variables were controlled for (see Table 4). Also, length of residency, as expected, had a very strong effect on knowing a number of neighbours.

A further analysis for locale differences in number of neighbours showed a significant difference across the city, town and squatter environments ( $X^2 (6) = 30.26, p < .01$ ). The city respondents know significantly fewer neighbours well compared to the town respondents ( $X^2 (3) = 18.25, p < .01$ ), while the town respondents did not differ significantly from the squatter respondents in this respect ( $X^2 (3) = 1.77, ns$ ). This result confirmed the findings or urban non-urban differences by Key (1968), Fisher (1973) and Fava (1958).

*Frequency of social contacts between neighbours;* Turning to the questions 'how much social contact do you have with your neighbours?' and 'how intimate were these social contacts?', respondents indicated this by checking five response items (ie 'almost every day' to 'occasionally' rated 5 to 1, respectively), against four versions of the question (ie 'home visiting' to 'some other means' rated 4 to 1, respectively). These two scores were combined, weighting combinations from 1 to 20, to produce a single score for the neighbour frequency and intimacy of social contact. The inter-correlation between item scores was high, ranking + 0.98 to + 0.32 and averaging + 0.78, which indicated the reliability of this measure for the neighbour social contacts.

A multiple regression analysis on the frequency of neighbourly social contacts showed a significant effect of respondents' locale of residence (see Table 4).

Respondents' length of residency, as expected, significantly influenced the neighbourly social contacts: respondents who were long-term residents knew more neighbours (see the previous result) and tended to have neighbourly social contacts more frequently and in an intimate way. Also, female respondents had more frequent and intimate contacts with their neighbours.

A further analysis of the frequency of neighbourly social contacts across locales showed a significant difference ( $F(2,253) = 11.85$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The city respondents had significantly less frequent social contacts with their neighbours than the town respondents ( $t(153) = -3.69$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and the squatter respondents, ( $t(187) = -4.64$ ,  $p < .01$ ), while the town respondents did not differ significantly from the squatter respondents in this respect ( $t(166) = -0.31$ , ns).

The occurrence of social supportativeness between neighbours was evaluated by the question that asked respondents to recall what types of helpfulness they exchanged with their neighbours within the last six months. Respondents reported an average of 2.49 occasions of helpfulness between their neighbours. The most frequently reported incidences of helpfulness between respondents and their friends were: (a) doing household jobs (17.8%), (b) borrowing small household items (17.5%), (c) doing shopping (16.8%), (d) using neighbours' telephone (14.31%).

A multiple regression analysis on the occurrence of helpfulness between neighbours showed a strong significant effect of respondents' locale of residence. Respondents' length of residency, as in the analysis of neighbourly social contacts, had a strong significant effect on the occurrence of neighbourly helpfulness which supported the expectation. Also, being female and married with children influenced the level of actual occurrence of neighbourly helpfulness.

An additional analysis was carried out to test the view that the degree of social contact between neighbours is a crucial factor

for the occurrence of the degree of helpfulness. With the level of neighbourly social contact held constant, respondents' locale of residence showed a significant effect as before. An interesting result was that earlier significant effect of respondents' length of residency (ie before neighbours' social contact was introduced) became non-significant leaving the significant effect to the level of neighbourly social contacts (see Table 4). This result clearly showed that the length of residency played an important role in the development of neighbours' social contacts and, in turn, the level of social contacts determined the degree of occurrence of helpfulness between neighbours. Yet, above all, this social behaviour, as the hypothesis suggested, was influenced by city living.

Since the locale of respondents' residence had a significant influence on the occurrence of neighbourly helpfulness, separate analyses for differences in helpfulness between the three environments were carried out. The occurrence of helpfulness between neighbours showed significant differences across environments ( $F(2, 253) = 5.013, p < .01$ ).

The city respondents exchanged significantly less help with their neighbours than the town respondents ( $t(153) = -3.05, p < .01$ ) and the squatter respondents ( $t(187) = -3.63, p < .01$ ) while the town respondents did not differ significantly from the squatter respondents in this respect.

#### *The expected helpfulness between neighbours*

As in the examination of kin and friend helpfulness, a further investigation into respondents' perception of ease-of-helpfulness (expected helpfulness) was carried out by the questionnaire. The average rating across the 26 types of helpfulness requests on a five-point scale of difficulty (eg 'no problem' to 'very hard' rated 5 to 1, respectively) was 2.43.

A multiple regression analysis on the expected neighbourly helpfulness showed a significant effect of respondents' locale of residence (see Table 4). The length of residency was again strongly associated with perception of neighbours as a source of help. The female

respondents and respondents married with children saw neighbours more as a source of help.

A further analysis for the locale differences on the expected neighbourly helpfulness showed a significant difference across the three settings ( $F(2, 253) = 8.57, p < .01$ ).

The city residents expected to exchange significantly less helpfulness with their neighbours than the town residents and their neighbours' residents, while the town residents did not differ from the city squatter residents in this respect.

In sum, then, in all measures of neighbourly social behaviours, city residents were significantly different: they had less familiarity with locale neighbourhood, knew a smaller number of neighbours and had fewer social contacts and exchanges of with them than both the town and the city squatter respondents, while the city squatter respondents were invariably matched to their town counterparts in all neighbour social behaviour.

### *Discussion*

The present survey study evaluated the urban social behaviour hypothesis by examining differences in kin, friend and neighbour social behaviours among city, town and city squatter residents in Turkey. This study bears on the urban social behaviour hypothesis, in particular on whether the range of its findings are limited to cities in western, developed cultures or can be generalized to other populations and to other cities in developing nations. The present findings based on the sample in Turkey suggest that urban residents and non-urban residents in a developing country are in some respects similar and in others dissimilar in their social behaviour to those living in the West. In the Turkish cities, neighbour social contacts and supportativeness were clearly less frequent than in the town and the city squatter environments. However, inhabitants of these environments differed only slightly from town and squatter residents in their social behaviour with their friends and did not differ at all in their social behaviour with their kin, while the city squatter residents differed from the non-squatter city residents

and invariably reassembled town residents in their pattern of kin, friend and neighbour social behaviours.

The present findings from Turkey on city/town kin, friends and neighbours' social behaviours closely paralleling the pattern of differences reported elsewhere (see Ayvalıođlu 1982) give limited support to the urban social behaviour hypothesis of Wirth (1983) and Simmel (1950). According to this hypothesis, the principal characteristics of the urban environment - size, density and heterogeneity of population - led to a distinctive way of life in which the secondary group versus primary group and multiplication of an individual's roles become important. The behavioral consequences of these changes in the urban society are decline in significance of kin, friend social behaviour as well as decline in the locale community and neighbour relationships characteristic of country life. This hypothesis has been substantiated in the Turkish sample only for neighbours' social behaviour, not for those social behaviours occurring between kin and friends. Thus, the Turkish data support the view that behavioural differences between urban and non-urban environments may, indeed, be a general phenomenon over and above those cultures previously observed. Yet, the Turkish urban environments were not homogeneous in their social behaviours, one segment of the urban population - the city-squatter settlements - showing a different level of social behaviour. Their social behaviour strongly resembled that of the town residents rather than that of the non-squatter city resident. This supports the view that the city squatters behaviorally are «urban villagers» (Mauser, 1965; Karpert, 1976). The present findings of an extremely helpful environment within the city environments - the squatter settlements - contradicts the empirical findings in the area of research and urban theory. However, this demonstrates the extent to which social behaviour can vary within an urban environment. Discussion of the question why the city-squatter residents were more helpful in their social behaviour will be deferred to a later section. Now let us turn to a more detailed analysis of the observed city/town differences in social behaviour with regard to the question why differences in social behaviour occurred between the two environments, and what specific factors may have led to this outcome.

*Neighbours' social behaviour*

The city residents were clearly different from both town and city-squatter residents in their neighbourly social behaviour; the city respondents know a significantly smaller number of neighbours, had fewer social contacts and both exchanged and expected to exchange significantly less helpfulness with their neighbours. These findings offer support both for the empirical evidence and the hypothesis depicting residents as engaging in infrequent neighbour social behaviour and helpfulness.

There are several possible explanations for these results. One line is that of the urban impact hypothesis of Wirth (1938) and Simmel (1950) which lays emphasis on urban personality. According to this hypothesis, differences between urban/non-urban social behaviour exist on account of the underlying general urban trait of anomie, impersonality and distrustfulness which develop as a result of structural differentiation resulting in ceaseless secondary types of contacts (eg contact with strangers) in the urban environment. In turn, this outlook of urban dwellers' dispositions is supposed to influence urban dwellers more intimate types of relationships, eg neighbours. An earlier study (Ayvahoğlu, 1985) reported findings of differences between city/town residents' attitudes of distrust, suspiciousness and helpfulness: the Turkish city residents hold attitudes of distrust and suspiciousness towards others significantly more than the town residents. In line with this hypothesis, it may be suggested that these attitudes and feelings of the city residents have a negative influence on urban residents' formation of neighbourliness. However, it is also clear from the present data that these city residents who had a number of neighbours also did not socialize as much as did their town counterparts. This was possibly again in line with the hypothesis that urban dwellers with this disposition may be less willing to make the transition from anonymity or a type of neighbourly interaction, guided by particular norms (Reed, 1974) which restrict the range of conversational topics and the locale and the time of chats between neighbours. Hence all these may account for the urban respondents' less neighbourly social behaviour.

Another line of explanation for the present results can be made by reference to the city residents having more alternative sources of social relationships. It seems that the larger the size of local residence (eg city), the more freedom exists for an individual to choose his friends and acquaintances from within or without the neighbourhood (Fisher, 1976), making the locality a 'community of limited liability' (Janowitz, 1967). Individuals can choose to be locally anonymous and yet have friends or acquaintances outside the immediate neighbourhood. By contrast, in non-urban environments (village or town), individuals often lack these alternatives. Thus, one knows one's neighbours, and neighbours often are friends, beyond the individual's choosing. As Keller (1968, p 48) put it, 'in the city this type of neighbour ... is mandatory on longer'. Probably the present result of the city residents' infrequent neighbourly social behaviour was a simple reflection of this situation in the city. In fact, the present findings that the city respondents have relatively more friends, their friends are geographically dispersed in the city, and these friends provide a wide range of assistance, seems to support this interpretation that in the city, unlike in the town, an individual has alternative sources of relationships available, and the local neighbourhood is not necessarily the only source of social relationships.

Finally, a tentative explanation for these results might be suggested in terms of general environmental characteristics of the urban neighbourhood. The city environments exemplified by such housing developments as high-rise public housing are reducing 'functional distance' (eg, bringing residents into physical contact) and thus are not conducive to the development of intimate social relations amongst (Alexander, 1968; Newman, 1973). Also, adding to this, a high level of dissimilarity among urban residents in terms of background (Young and Willmott, 1962; Hartman, 1963) may prevent the development of neighbourly relationships. Indeed, in the present study the city environments where the data were collected (eg Beyazit, Karaköy, Göztepe, Kadiköy in Istanbul, and Kızılay, Maltepe in Ankara) were mostly characterized by apartment housing where residents of these environments were fairly mixed in terms of their socio-economic status. Thus, these characteristics of city environ-

ments might be suggested as one other explanation why the city residents had lower neighbourly social behaviour.

Altogether, then any one of the above explanations or a combination of these may account for the present observed city/town differences in neighbourly social behaviour, although none of these was evaluated directly by the present study.

Independent of urban/non-urban dimension as predicted, respondents' length of residency showed a significant strong effect on all neighbourly social behaviours examined. Those residents who were long-time occupants had more familiarity with local people, knew immediate neighbours well and had more frequent social contacts with their neighbours. This is consistent with Kasarda and Janowitz's (1974) findings that a long-time residency provides residents with opportunities to share common experiences in the local neighbourhood and, in turn, this common experience may lead to the development of intimate social relationships among residents.

In the present study, the city residents had a significantly lower length of residency than both town and city squatter residents, while the latter two samples did not differ from one another in this respect. Thus, it appears that the city residents' level of neighbourly social behaviour may have been also influenced by their relatively low length of residency. Nevertheless, as already seen, even when the length of residency was controlled, there were still strong significant influences of the locale variable indicating the effect of the city per se on neighbours' social behaviour.

#### *Friends' social behaviour*

The present sample of city residents did not differ significantly from their counterparts living in towns on the majority of measures of friends' social behaviour studied.

However, in some areas of friends' social behaviour, the city residents did differ from both town and city squatter residents. First of all, the city residents had friends who were drawn from relatively larger social pools, and they were geographically dispersed. For example a relatively large proportion of the city resi-



dents' friends were work associates, while the town city-squatter residents' friendships were more locally-based.

This finding, as suggested in the discussion of neighbourly social behaviour, can be explained with the notion that increase in community size affects the degree of one's choice in friendship. Unlike the town, in the city the immediate neighbourhood may not be a satisfying source of intimacy as seen in the present results. This is due to the fact, as suggested by Fisher (1976), that urbanization gives rise to a variety of social worlds constructed on the kind of association not found in non-urban places. In the present results from the Turkish city residents having friends drawn from a variety of social pools seem to reflect this phenomenon in the city.

#### *Kin social behaviour*

Finally, in the present study, the Turkish city sample studied did not differ from the town and the city-squatter samples in several measures of kin social behaviours. However, consistent with earlier findings elsewhere (Reiss, 1959; Key, 1968; Bultena, 1969; Koyama, 1970; Kasadra and Janowitz, 1974), one dimension of kinship showed differences across city/town environments; that is, the city respondents' kin were geographically dispersed. As is the case with other social behaviour, this is likely to be a result of the length of residency. This factor (the geographical distance between kin) significantly affected kin social behaviour. Yet, when geographical distance between kin was controlled there was no influence of the city itself on the residents' kin social behaviour.

Altogether, the findings from Turkey strongly suggest that, as observed in urban friendship, there is no effect of urban living itself on kin social behaviour, except insofar as it increases the geographical dispersion of kin which somewhat lessens social contacts and supportativeness between kin.

#### *The city-squatter settlements*

The city squatter residents, significantly differing from their non-squatter city counterparts in all measures of social behaviours

examined, resembled those residents living in non-urban environments. It is clear from this result that factors responsible for the observed lower level of social behaviour (i.e. between neighbours and some measures of friendship) among Turkish city residents do not exert their influence in the city squatter environments. This behavioural outcome of the squatter residents clearly demonstrates the extent to which social behaviour can vary within an environment. In the present study, the city/town differences in social behaviour examined were strong; the city/city-squatter environments. This behavioural outcome of the squatter residents clearly demonstrates the extent to which social behaviour can vary within an environment. In the present study, the city/town differences in social behaviour examined were strong; the city/city-squatter differences were even greater. This observed social behaviour of the city squatters, especially their failure to show a decline relative to the town residents in their neighbourhood and some measures of friends' social behaviours presents us with the challenge of several possible explanations.

First, according to the 'urban village thesis', all forms of social behaviour are enhanced in the neighbourhood where residents are long-time residents, quite familiar with each other, and share a common cultural background (eg rural ethnic). It is easily conceivable how these circumstances could lead to the development of social involvement between squatter residents, and there are findings to show the relationship between some of these features, eg between similarities in terms of background and friendship (Gans, 1967; Newcombe, 1961), and between length of residency, friendship and neighbourliness as revealed by the present study as well as Kasarda and Janowitz (1974). In the Turkish city squatter settlements, a key feature of residents lies in the fact of their being long-time residents, cohesive and homogenous. Most of the squatters are migrants or the offspring of migrants from the villages or farming areas of rural Turkey. They have a single Moslem ethnic identity and reflect traditional Islamic norms and values which are quite strong in rural Turkey (Yasa, 1966; Karpas, 1976). Hence, the squatters' social characteristics are likely to explain why the level of social behaviour was high in the city-squatter settlement as compared to that of the regular urbanities.

An additional cultural characteristic of these rural migrants to the city should also be mentioned to account for the present finding. There is a highly emphasized concept of townsmanship or countrymanship (in Turkish *Hemşerilik*) among squatters. This concept of townsmanship indicates the sentimental bonds between a group of people based on a common geographical origin, mainly rural, and the common status of living away from their home land (Türkdoğan, 1977). The value of this relationship can be viewed as almost that of kinship. A townsman expects, or is expected to treat a fellow townsman in the same way as he/she has relations with his own kin; this involves mutual expectations and obligations between townsmen in almost any aspect of daily life, eg any types of assistance in the time of need (Dubsky, 1976; Tezcan, 1974; Erdentuğ, 1977). The high level of help and social-ability between townsmen manifests itself clearly in such a place as where they are away from their home land and where the feeling of solidarity of these people is heightened by the presence of non-townsmen, eg in the city. Thus, altogether these cultural characteristics of the squatter residents seem to account for the obtained high level of neighbours' and friends' social behaviour amongst the squatter residents.

Finally, this result may be explained in a more simple manner with the use of the squatters' impoverished economic circumstances. It may be that helpfulness increases in a neighbourhood as a function of low economic circumstances. When the economic situation is low such as in the squatter settlements there may be greater needs for help among residents. Hence, this may lead to the residents' interdependence on each other in terms of helpfulness; relying upon neighbours and friends as well as kin for help. The present observed greater level of friends' and neighbourly helpfulness among the squatter residents may also be seen to reflect this circumstance.

In sum, then, as already seen, there exist several possible explanations, one or both of which may account for the results obtained in this study, yet none of which can be directly tested in this study. In any event, the present study add a further support to the earlier reseach (Ayvahoglu 1985) for the urban villager thesis by demonstrating that the social behaviour of the city-squatter residents

does resemble that of their town counterparts rather than that of their fellow city residents. Secondly, this finding disconfirms the urban social behaviour hypothesis (Wirth, 1938; Simmel, 1950) by demonstrating that the city squatters have not adapted their behaviour towards patterns comprising the urban residents.

PRIMARY GROUP IN TURKEY

Table 1  
 Respondents' personal characteristics across three environments

Sex <sup>a</sup>	City	Town	Squatter	Total	Size of Family <sup>f</sup>	City	Town	Squatter	Total
1. Male	68.2	41.0	38.0	49.6	1. Single	20.2	12.5	2.	11.06
2. Female	31.8	59.0	62.0	50.5	2. Family with no children	30.3	15.7	10.	20.1
	(n=88)	(n=66)	(n=101)	(n=256)	3. Family with one or more children	34.8	46.8	35.	45.8
<u>Stage of Life<sup>b</sup></u>					4. Family living together with parents	10.1	19.9	19.	13.8
1. Married	74.7	81.3	98.0	85.0	5. Family living together with parents, sisters and brothers	4.5	7.8	14.	9.09
2. Unmarried	25.3	18.7	2.0	15.0		(n=88)	(n=66)	(n=101)	(n=256)
	(n=88)	(n=66)	(n=101)	(n=256)					
<u>Age<sup>c</sup></u>					<u>Length of Residency<sup>g</sup></u>				
1. Age 25 and below	21.1	18.5	8.4	15.2	1. Less than a year	10.1	10.2	2.7	6.6
2. Between 26-44	55.3	59.3	55.4	55.2	2. Between 1-4 years	20.7	11.9	6.8	11.3
3. Between 45-65	22.5	22.2	36.1	27.7	3. Between 5-9 years	18.3	13.6	11.0	12.1
4. Age 65 and above	1.3	0	0	0.4	4. Between 10-19 years	17.1	18.6	16.4	16.4
	(n=88)	(n=66)	(n=101)	(n=256)	5. Over 20 years	26.8	23.7	63.0	32.0
<u>Birth Place Origin<sup>d</sup></u>					6. Since birth	6.1	22.0	0	7.
1. Present place of residence	64.8	88.4	9.			(n=88)	(n=66)	(n=101)	(n=256)
2. Another place	35.2	11.6	91.						
	(n=88)	(n=66)	(n=101)						
<u>SES<sup>e</sup></u>									
1. Upper middle class	19.5	3.5	0	7.0					
2. Middle class	62.19	57.1	0	28.5					
3. Lower middle class	17.07	30.1	2.	19.1					
4. Upper working class	0	3.0	25.8	10.5					
5. Working class	1.5	6.3	72.18	29.3					
	(n=88)	(n=66)	(n=101)	(n=256)					

Table 2

Multiple Regression Effect Parameters ( $\beta$ ) and Standardized Effects ( $\beta^*$ ) of Respondents Personal Characteristics on the Spatial Distance Between Kin and the Frequency of Social Contacts Between Kin and the Occurance of Helpfulness Between Kin and the Expected Helpfulness Between Kin.

Variables	Spatial Distance Between Kin (A)		Frequency of Social Contacts Between Kin (B)		The Occurance of Helpfulness Between Kin Within The Previous Six Month (C)		The Expected Helpfulness Between Kin (D)	
	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$
Sex	2.931	0.166 (1)	0.660	0.063	0.249	0.050	-0.362	0.013
Life-Cycle (Age)	-0.870	-0.075	-0.776	-0.089	0.393	0.009	0.513	0.002
Stage in Life	-1.127	-0.139 (2)	-0.670	-0.111 (1)	-0.167	-0.002	-0.914	0.170 (1)
Birth Place	-0.152	-0.151 (3)	-0.451	-0.060	0.421	0.011	-0.483	0.071
S.E.S.	-0.632	-0.106	-0.242	-0.005	0.135	0.078	0.277	0.003
Length of Residency	0.704	0.134 (4)	-0.376	-0.096	0.270	-0.014	0.751	0.001
Locale	1.367	0.153 (5)	0.129	0.019	0.133	0.106 (1)	0.192	0.001
The spatial Distance Between Kin	-	-	0.326	0.437 (2)	0.160	0.230 (2)	0.826	0.124

  

(A)	(B)	(C)
(1) F (7.171) = 4.79, P<0.01	(1) F (8.171) = 2.33, P<0.02	(1) F (8.171) = 1.91, P<0.10
(2) F (7.171) = 3.23, P<0.01	(2) F (8.171) = 37.94, P<0.01	(2) F (8.171) = 4.28, P<0.01
(3) F (7.171) = 3.67, P<0.01		(D)
(4) F (7.171) = 2.83, P<0.01		F (8.171) = 4.33, P<0.01
(5) F (7.171) = 2.30, P<0.02		

Table 3

Multiple Regression Effect Parameters ( $\beta$ ), and Standardized Effect ( $\beta^*$ ) of Respondents Personal Characteristics on Having a Number of Best Friends, the Geographical Proximity Between Friends, the Frequency of Social Contacts Between Friends, Intimacy of Contacts, the Occurrence of Helpfulness, the Expected Helpfulness Between Friends.

Variable	Having a number of best friends (A)		Geographical proximity between friends (B)		Frequency of social contacts between friends (C)		Intimacy of contact between friends (D)		The occurrence of helpfulness (E)		The expected helpfulness between friends (F)	
	F	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$
Sex	-0.373	-0.014	0.133	0.071	0.163	0.074	0.164	0.091 (1)	0.584	0.137 (1)	-0.355	0.014
Life-Cycle (Age)	0.773	0.003	0.742	0.048	-0.306	-0.016	-0.167	-0.113 (2)	-0.466	-0.137 (2)	-0.391	-0.208(1)
Stage in life	0.925	0.063	0.195	0.018	-0.493	-0.038	-0.805	0.078	0.204	0.034	0.439	0.048
Birth Place	0.306	0.169 (1)	0.400	0.050	-0.152	-0.096	0.240	0.187 (3)	0.143	0.004	0.169	0.123(2)
S.E.S	0.311	0.029	0.122	0.091 (1)	0.696	0.007	0.422	0.053	0.328	0.188 (3)	0.522	0.065
Length of Residency	0.417	0.004	0.170	0.243 (2)	0.921	0.115 (1)	0.153	0.196 (4)	0.161	0.104 (4)	0.432	0.096
Locale	-0.213	-0.133	0.432	0.365 (3)	0.291	0.098	0.393	0.226 (5)	0.360	0.137 (5)	0.396	0.080
Spatial Distance Between Friends	-	-	-	-	0.326	0.168 (2)	0.437	0.241 (6)	0.416	0.143 (6)	0.805	0.098
(A)	(1) F (7.171)=4.24 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01	(B)	(1) F (7.171)=1.70 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01 (2) F (7.171)=11.99 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01 (3) F (7.171)=16.72 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01	(C)	(1) F (8.171)=1.86 R <sup>2</sup> 0.10 (2) F (8.171)=4.10 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01	(D)	(1) F (8.171)=1.99 R <sup>2</sup> 0.10 (2) F (8.171)=3.01 R <sup>2</sup> 0.00 (3) F (8.171)=7.72 R <sup>2</sup> 0.00 (4) F (8.171)=16.54 R <sup>2</sup> 0.00 (5) F (8.171)=10.04 R <sup>2</sup> 0.00 (6) F (8.171)=11.54 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01	(E)	(1) F (8.171)=3.59 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01 (2) F (8.171)=3.53 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01 (3) F (8.171)=3.81 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01 (4) F (8.171)=1.89 R <sup>2</sup> 0.10 (5) F (8.171)=2.03 R <sup>2</sup> 0.02 (6) F (8.171)=2.67 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01	(F)	(1) F (8.171)=4.10 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01 (2) F (8.171)=3.16 R <sup>2</sup> 0.01	

Table 4  
Multiple Regression Effect Parameters ( $\beta$ ) and Standardized Effect ( $\beta^*$ ) of Respondents Personal Characteristics on Familiarity with Neighbourhood, Knowing a number of Neighbours well, The Frequency and Intimacy of Neighbourly Social Contacts and the Occurance of Helpfulness, the Expected Helpfulness from Neighbours

Variable	Familiarity with neighbourhood at large (A)		Knowing a number of neighbours well (B)		The frequency and intimacy of neighbour social contacts (C)		The occurrence of helpfulness (D)		Expected helpfulness: (E)	
	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$	$\beta$	$\beta^*$
Sex	-0.280	-0.159 (1)	0.228	0.013	2.287	0.193 (1)	0.590	0.284 (1)	0.267	0.143 (1)
Life Cycle (Age)	0.138	0.095 (2)	0.239	0.017	0.503	0.051	0.221	0.005	0.520	0.052
Stage in Life	0.533	0.000	0.290	0.029	0.247	0.036	0.773	0.116 (2)	0.243	0.138 (2)
Birth Place	0.232	0.184 (3)	0.786	0.064	0.595	0.007	0.893	0.027	0.671	0.101
S.E.S	0.784	0.105	0.233	0.032	0.247	0.014	0.165	0.084	0.466	0.151 (3)
Length of Residency	0.204	0.310 (4)	0.144	0.227 (1)	0.746	0.155 (2)	0.569	0.048	0.452	0.177 (4)
Locale	0.264	0.237 (5)	0.201	0.187 (2)	1.433	0.191 (3)	0.543	0.156 (3)	0.702	0.133 (5)
The Level of Neighbourly Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.652	0.257 (4)	-	-
(A)	(1) F (7.171)=5.10 P<0.01	(B)	(1) F (7.171)=8.29 P<0.01	(C)	(1) F (7.171)=3.46 P<0.01	(D)	(1) F (8.171)=2.182 P<0.02	(E)	(1) F (7.171)=3.29 P<0.01	
(2) F (7.171)=1.78 P<0.10	(2) F (7.171)=3.50 P<0.01	(2) F (7.171)=3.48 P<0.01	(2) F (8.171)=2.05 P<0.02	(2) F (7.171)=2.98 P<0.01						
(3) F (7.171)=6.31 P<0.01	(3) F (7.171)=3.57 P<0.01	(3) F (8.171)=3.57 P<0.01	(3) F (8.171)=3.57 P<0.01	(3) F (7.171)=3.66 P<0.01						
(4) F (7.171)=17.52 P<0.01	(4) F (7.171)=4.71 P<0.01	(4) F (7.171)=4.71 P<0.01	(4) F (7.171)=4.71 P<0.01	(4) F (7.171)=4.71 P<0.01						
(5) F (7.171)=6.34 P<0.01	(5) F (7.171)=2.81 P<0.01	(5) F (7.171)=2.81 P<0.01	(5) F (7.171)=2.81 P<0.01	(5) F (7.171)=2.81 P<0.01						



## REFERENCES

- Abu-Loughood (1961) Migrants' adjustment to city life: the Egyptian case. *American Journal of Sociology*, 67, 22-32.
- Alexander, C (1968) The city as a mechanism for sustaining human contact. In W Ewald (Ed), *Environment for Man*, Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press.
- Ayvalıođlu, N. (1982). *Helpfulness in Cities and Towns: A Cross-Cultural study of the relationship between urbanization and Social Behaviour in Turkey and the U.S.A.* The University of St. Andrews. (Scotland) Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation.
- Ayvalıođlu, N. (1985). Urbanization and Social behaviour relationship : Helpfulness shown towards Strangers as measures of Quality of Life in Urban Environment. *Istanbul Studies in Experimental Psychology*. 14, 105-150.
- Bultena, G (1969) Rural-urban differences in familial interaction. *Rural Sociology*, 34, 5-15.
- Bowen, M. (1976). Theory in the practice of psychotherapy. In *Family Therapy : Theory and Practice*. Guerin (Ed). New York : Gardner Press. 42 - 90.
- Duben, A. (1982). The Significance of Family and Kinship in Urban Turkey. In Kađıtçıbaşı (Ed). *Sex Roles, Family and Kinship in Urban Turkey*. In Kađıtçıbaşı (Ed). *Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*. Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana Univ. Press.
- Empey, L. and Lubeck, S (1968) Conformity and deviance in the situation of company. *American Sociological Review* 33, 760-774.
- Erdentuđ, N (1977) Sosyal adet ve gelenekler Ankara. Kltr Bakanlıđı Yayınları, 254, Halk kitapları, 4.
- Erz M (1977) Trk Ailesi. İstanbul Devlet Kitapları yayını.
- Fava, S (1958) Contrasts in neighbouring; New York city and a suburban community. In W H Dobriner (Ed), *The Suburban Community*, New York Putnam.

- Fisher, C S (1976) *The Urban Experience*. New York Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.
- Fisher, C S (1978) Sociological comments 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.
- Fişek, G. (1984). Türk Ailesinin Dinamik ve Yapısal Özellikleri Üzerine Düşünceler ve Konuya İlişkin Bir Ön Çalışma Raporu. 3. Psikoloji Konferansı. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Gans, H (1962) *The Urban Villagers*. New York, Free Press.
- Gans, H (1967) *The Levittowners*. New York, Pantheon Books.
- Glenn, N and Hill, L (1977) Rural-urban differences in attitudes and behavior in the United States. *The Annals*
- Guterman, S (1969) In defence of Wirth's urbanism as a way of life. *American Journal of Sociology*, 74, 492-499.
- 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* New York Wiley.
- Isui, W M, Lei, T and Butler, E W (1977) Patterns of social participation of rural and urban migrants to an urban area. *Sociology and Social Research*, 61, 337-349.
- Irving, H W (1975) Distance, intensity, kinship; key dimensions of social interactions. *Sociology and Social Research*, 60, 77-86.
- Ittelson, W H, Proshansky, H W, Rivlin, L G and Winkel, G (1974) *Introduction to Environmental Psychology*. New York Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jacobs, J (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York Vintage Books.
- Janowitz, M. (1967) *The Community Press in Urban Setting*. Chicago: University Press of Chicago.
- Jitōdai, T T (1965) Urban-rural background and formal group membership *Rural Sociology*, 30, 75-83.

- Kasadra, J and Janowitz, M (1974) Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 328-339.
- Keller, S. (1968) *Urban Neighbourhood*. New York: Random House
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1982) *The Changing Values of Children in Turkey*. Honolulu, Hawaii, East-West Center.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1985) Culture of relatedness - Culture of separateness. *Papers in Comparative Studies*. Ohio Univ. Press.
- Key, W (1968) Rural-urban social participation. In S Fava, *Urbanism in World Perspective*, New York Thoms Cromwell.
- Kirmeyer, S L (1978) Urban density and pathology: a review of research. *Environment and Behavior*, 10, 247-269.
- Korte, C (1980) Urban-non-urban differences in social behavior and social psychological models of urban impact. *Journal of Social Issues*, 36, 29-51.
- Koyama, J (1970) Rural-urban comparison of kinship relations in Japan. In R Hill and R Konig (Eds), *Families in East and West*, The Hague Mouton.
- Lewis, O (1965) Further observations on the folk-urban continuum and urbanization. In P Hauser and L Schnore (Eds), *The Study of Urbanization*, New York Wiley. of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 429, 36-50.
- Milgram, S (1970) The experience of living in cities. *Science*, 167, 1461-1468.
- Munichin, S. (1974). *Families and Family Therapy*. Cambridge: M.S. Harvard Univ. Press.
- Newman, O. (1973). *Defensible Space*. New York, Collier Books
- Newcomb, T. (1961). *The acquaintance Process*. New York: Molt, Rinehard and Winston.
- Reed, P. (1974). Situated Interaction: normative and non-normative bases of social behavior in two urban residential Settings. *Urban Life and Culture*, 2, 406-487.
- Reiss, J R (1959) Rural-urban and status differences in interpersonal contacts. *American Journal of Sociology*, 65, 182-195.

- Simmel, G (1950) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel* (Kurt Wolff, ed). New York, Free Press.
- Sutcliffe, J and Crabbe, B (1963) Incidence and degrees of friendship in urban and rural areas. *Social Forces*, 42, 60-67.
- Timur, S (1972) Türkiye'de Aile Yapısı. Ankara, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Türkdoğan, O (1970) Türkiyede Köy Sosyolojisinin Temel sorunları. Erzurum Atatürk Üniversitesi Yayınları, No 76, İşletme Fakültesi Ders Kitapları serisi 3.
- Türkdoğan, O (1977) Yoksulluk Kültürü. Gecekonduların Toplumsal yapısı, Korkut Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Tümertekin, E (1968) Türkiye'de İç göçler (Internal Migration in Turkey), İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, No 54.
- Wirth, L (1938) Urbanism as a way of life. *American Journal of Sociology*, 44, 1-24.
- Yasa, I. (1966). *Ankarada Gecekondu Aileleri* (Gecekondu families in Ankara). Ankara: Metu Yayınları.
- Young, M and Willmott, P (1962) *Family and Kinship in East London*. Penguin Books.
- Zimmer, B G (1955) Participation of migrants in urban structure. *American Sociological Review*, 20, 218-224.