

Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology



The Mediate Community: the Nature of Local and Extra-Local Ties within the Metropolis

by

Avery M. Guest
University of Washington

07/04/99

THE MEDIATE COMMUNITY: THE NATURE OF LOCAL
AND EXTRA-LOCAL TIES WITHIN THE METROPOLIS

Avery M. Guest

Department of Sociology

University of Washington

Seattle. WA 98195

Abstract

This paper emphasizes the importance of studying both local and extra-local social ties that are found in community areas of the metropolis. While our knowledge of temporal trends in these ties is limited, both are important in the metropolis, leading to what is described as the "mediate community" where communities often have many endogenous ties but also have strong links to the larger world. In addition, the paper suggests that both local and extra-local ties should be subdivided on the basis of whether they are instrumental or expressive. Unfortunately, much of the previous literature on local areas in the metropolis has emphasized only the importance of local ties and has argued that ties to community can be captured only by one dimension of social organization. Using data from previous community studies, the paper illustrates some of the possible relationships of both local and extra-local social ties to community culture, including efforts to protect the community.

In the contemporary world, many forms of spatial community may be discerned, ranging in a community hierarchy from small clusters of houses to

neighborhoods to cities to states and to nations. In general, the smaller spatial units serve fewer tasks for their members than the larger units, and may be viewed as having a high degree of dependence on them. This paper focuses on one of the smallest units in the hierarchical community, the local area of the metropolis, which I define as a group of residential blocks with at least some institutional form of social integration such as a community newspaper, school, or church. Some scholars (Keller, 1968: 92-102) have denied that unambiguous local areas can be recognized in the metropolis, but research indicates clearly that at least some metropolitan regions can be divided by their inhabitants into relatively discrete districts (Guest and Lee, 1983; Guest et al., 1982; Hunter, 1974).

This paper analyzes the types of social ties (local ties) that link residents within the community and the ties (extra-local) that link the local area to the outside world. Local social ties are obviously crucial to the ability of spatial units to deal with their problems, and most studies of local areas in the metropolis have concentrated on them. But the interdependence of communities means that local areas, through their residents, also have extensive extra-local or cosmopolitan ties. These extra-local ties may be crucial for obtaining information about the community that may affect its fate, and may be important means by which the local community negotiates its fate with representative of the larger units such as governments and corporations. Yet, there is limited research (Granovetter 1973; Guest and Oropesa 1985) that analyzes the role of extra-local ties in the protection of local areas.

For purposes of discussion, local and extra-local ties will be subdivided into those that are based on instrumental needs such as protecting property values or insuring the high-quality education of children and those that are based on expressive needs such as friendship, sociability, and recreation. This conceptualization has a high degree of overlap with the well-known distinction (Tonnies 1887) between *gesselschaft* (secularized means-ends) and *gemeinschaft* (folk or sentimental) social relationships. Thus,

cross-classifying the patterns by each other means that each community may have four major types of ties--internal gemeinschaft (expressive), external gemeinschaft (expressive), internal gesselschaft (instrumental), and external gesselschaft (instrumental).

There are three major concerns in the paper. The first is the degree to which both local and extra-local ties remain important in regard to the local area. Presumably, hierarchicalization or the increasing interdependence of communities is a major social trend of Western civilization (Stein 1960; Warren 1963), and some believe that local ties are largely being effaced at the expense of extra-local ties (Wellman and Leighton 1979). In my opinion, however, both internal and external ties remain strong, although the development of a interdependent hierarchical community may have enhanced external ties while reducing, to some degree, the local social ties.

The second issue is the interrelationships among the four major types of ties when comparing across local areas. One view is that communities are either characterized by strong or weak social organization, in which all types of ties, both instrumental and expressive (and local and extra-local), tend to be found. Thus, communities may be characterized as more or less "organized" on all four types of ties at once. An alternate position, which has some validity, is that local areas may not necessarily have a high correlation between their four types of ties. Indeed, some communities may specialize in one set while others emphasize different organizational characteristics. If this is true, it necessitates more attention to the variety of organizational patterns that are found across local areas.

The third concern is how the strength of these four types of ties relate to the ability of the local area to defend its interests. Typically, community culture or ways of ways are analyzed as consequences of the strength of local social ties. Yet, extra-local ties, especially instrumental, may also be extremely important in understanding community "fate". To what degree do communities protect their interests through each of the four types of ties that have been indicated?

Given limitations of space, this paper does not deal much with the social processes that lead to the development of local and extra-local ties in specific communities. This is a complicated issue that deserves attention in its own right. There are some definitional problems in even determining what are local and extra-local ties. Hunter and Suttles (1972) suggest that boundaries of many local areas are becoming increasingly complex as large numbers of administrative districts with different geographic territories are established in many cities. Local ties may develop "spontaneously" from indigenous social processes within communities, but they may also be created by external sources. Thus, government bureaucracies are well-known for trying to create agencies in local areas such as community action groups to be conduits for governmental programs (Taub et al. 1977). Extra-local ties may arise through associations that have nothing to do with the local area, or may be a means of regulating the local area (such as membership on a metropolitan-wide water board that supervises specific local areas).

THE HISTORICAL LEGACY

During the 20th Century, individuals in local areas of the metropolis expanded the spatial range over which they work, purchase, entertain, and socialize (Hawley 1978). Technologically, cities have moved from primarily foot travel in the early 1800's to much more rapid movement, including the electric streetcar and the automobile. Advances in indirect communications such as the telephone and the computer have permitted low-cost contact over long distances.

At the same time as the expansion in transportation and communications, important organizational decisions in our society have undoubtedly gravitated to higher levels, thus removing another source of community involvement in the local area (Greer 1962; Warren 1963). Few can doubt that the federal and state governments, with their incredible financial and political resources, have become increasingly important forces in the fates of local areas.

Faced with these trends, scholars have argued since the 1920's that the local area as a social unit is in eclipse (McClanahan 1929; McKenzie 1921).

Post World War II observers have described the contemporary metropolis as a "community without propinquity" (Webber 1963). Others (Wellman 1979; Wellman and Leighton 1979) have asked whether the contemporary metropolis is a community saved, where extensive intimate ties remain at the local level; a community lost, where almost all social ties are missing in the metropolis, regardless of spatial dispersion; or a community liberated, where ties are important but only at the extra-local level. Arguing that most friendship ties are not concentrated in close proximity to the home, these observers suggest that the contemporary metropolis is a community liberated. Others (Putnam 1995) have claimed a general loss of social ties in American society, consistent with the community lost perspective.

How accurate is the perception that the localized area is increasingly characterized by few social ties? Unfortunately, social scientists have few truly longitudinal studies of social ties in local areas of the metropolis, making the question difficult to answer. To some degree, the debate is definitional since analysts of cross-sectional data must reach conclusions that have no temporal reference points. For instance, in a survey study of social networks in Northern California, Fischer (1982) finds that 57 percent of the "friends" of respondents lived within five minutes travel time; by itself, is this a "high" or "low" number?

Recently, Guest and Wierzbicki (1999) have analyzed responses between 1974 and 1996 in the U.S. General Social Survey (GSS) to separate questions on frequency of getting together socially with friends inside and outside the neighborhood. They find that a slight decline in social ties with neighbors occurred during this time period which was matched by a even slighter increase in social ties with friends outside the neighborhood. Others (Hunter 1975) report even more constancy of local social ties in case studies of individual local areas over a quarter of a century.

My position (admittedly somewhat subjective) is that a significant proportion of the population retains strong neighborhood ties relative to those who have strong extra-local ties. To overstate a bit, the contemporary

population contains a significant proportion of individuals who specialize in neighborhood ties, while individuals with at least some extra-local ties are found more ubiquitously. Consistent with this, the 1998 GSS reports that 21.2 percent of respondents get together socially at least several times a month with neighbors, while 22.0 percent do the same with friends outside the neighborhood. However, 28.0 percent of the GSS respondents never get together with friends inside the neighborhood, compared with only 8.5 percent for friends outside the neighborhood.

Urban scholars have even less information about trends in local voluntary association memberships, which probably taps better the importance of instrumental ties. In one exception, Lee et al. (1984) report that the number of community associations in Seattle remained relatively constant between 1929 and 1979. What did change was the orientation of the groups, involving a shift from mixed social and political functions to more political purposes. While the evidence is not conclusive, local expressive ties may have declined for local areas, but have been replaced to some degree by instrumental ties.

The continued existence of local ties suggests a type of community that is not recognized in Wellman and Leighton's description of three possibilities—the community saved, the community lost, and the community liberated. Local areas in the metropolis might be described, for lack of a better term, as “the community mediate”, in which the local community is intermediate in attracting local and extra-local social ties. Many local areas and their residents are involved in localized social networks, including both instrumental “gessellschaft” and expressive “gemeinschaft” relationships. At the same time, individuals have many social ties and involvements beyond the local area. Their worlds are hardly limited to the local area.

Given the revolutions in technology and social organization that have decreased the constraints of physical distance, one might ask why local ties continue to be strong for many urbanites. One urban theorist, Greer (1962), accepts the demise of local areas as sites for gemeinschaft social ties, but describes the local area as a community of limited liability where social life

is based on instrumental ends, basically a need to protect one's functional investment. Of particular importance are home ownership and the socialization of children, which lead individuals to take a "functional" interest in territory. Consistent with this, Oropesa (1987) shows that individual-level membership in local area voluntary associations primarily reflects individual investments in territory, while membership in extra-local associations is more strongly related to "general" statuses such as educational attainment.

There are, nevertheless, continuing features of local areas that may encourage more expressive social ties. Residents of local areas frequently share some homogeneity of socio-economic status, family, and ethnic characteristics. Since individuals are likely to select friends on the basis of similar social characteristics (if not necessarily personalities), a ready made market for friendships is available in most communities (Laumann, 1973). Consistent with previous research (Festinger et al., 1950), physical proximity may be a very powerful predictor of social interaction in primarily homogeneous populations

As Suttles (1972:266) has argued, the local community may also be perceived as a kind of defended refuge from the problems of work. Many workers, particularly in manual occupations, probably have a modest intrinsic interest in work, and may have little in common with fellow employees. Other workers, especially in non-manual work, may find themselves heavily competing with co-workers to get ahead, thus emotionally unwilling to strike up sincere friendships. For instance, Wellman (1979) found that only 5.6 percent of the intimate ties of residents of East York, a local area in Toronto, were based on work.

A strong trend away from localized social ties may also be deduced by romanticizing the past as involving the existence of pristine local areas with extensive social networks. Studies of American cities in the late 1800's suggest that they were characterized by very high rates of out-mobility, both from individual residences and from the total city (Thernstrom and Knights 1970) Such high rates of mobility undoubtedly discouraged the development of

strong social bonds among many urbanites. Furthermore, in the past, many more Americans must have lived on the economic margins. Given the high rates of absolute poverty which characterized the past, many individuals undoubtedly had little time to do frivolous things such as socializing; they had to worry about making basic ends meet.

A SINGLE LOCAL DIMENSION?

Many studies of the intercorrelations of different types of local social ties for *individuals* (Guest and Lee 1983) are available. Most show that different forms of neighboring have low positive relationships, and neighboring behavior has only weak relationships with membership in voluntary associations. While useful, such data on individuals does not centrally answer the question of how communities differ in their aggregate patterns of local ties. While individuals may show one pattern of relationships, communities may be characterized by other aggregate-level relationships. Unfortunately, little is known about community-level variations in local ties because so few studies have actually compared patterns across multiple areas. This shortage of research undoubtedly reflects the monetary and personal costs of such studies. It is difficult to conduct surveys with large numbers of residents in several communities and then characterize aggregate patterns of organization.

In analyzing variations at the community level in local ties, there are essentially two approaches that may be taken. One is to view various indicators of social organization such as neighboring, friendship ties, and membership in voluntary associations as being at least moderately correlated with each other. In such a case, a single dimension of localized ties is suggested. Communities either have localized ties of all sorts or they lack them.

A few empirical examples of this approach are available (Elliott et al. 1996; Taylor 1996; Warner and Rountree 1997; Warren 1977, 1978; Warren and Warren 1975). Researchers gather data on various localized social networks from a set of communities and show that a high standing on variable U (say, borrowing the proverbial cup of sugar from neighbors) has a high correlation

with variable W (say, having a high propensity to belong to neighborhood protective organizations).

Two of these studies (Elliott et al. 1996; Warren 1977 1978) will be described and analyzed, partly because they were extremely thorough on how localized ties were operationalized and partly because they present data that may be reanalyzed.

A recent example (Elliott et al. 1996) of a single-dimension approach to local ties is the work in Chicago and Denver of the MacArthur Research Program on Successful Adolescent Development. Aggregate-level measures are developed for 58 neighborhoods in Chicago and 33 in Denver.

This research primarily draws its inspiration from the social disorganization perspective of the Chicago School of Urban Sociology, which flourished in the pre-World War II period. Kasarda and Janowitz (1974: 329) and Sampson (1997) call this the systemic model, in which the local community is viewed as a complex system of friendship and kinship networks, as well as formal and informal association ties rooted in family life and ongoing socialization processes. The essential argument is that "neighborhood advantage" as measured by community stability in residence, moderate economic resources, and some population homogeneity creates a social environment in which various types of local ties have an opportunity to flourish. Alternatively, high mobility and marginal economic conditions will create an environment in which patterns of social control and levels of social organization are weak in the community.

The MacArthur researchers posit the unidimensional nature of local "social integration" by combining four different scales together: (1) for social support, (2) neighborhood organizations, (3) general informal activity, and (4) number of children known by name. In combination, these four scales indicate the degree of local social organization (social integration). Social support is indicated by whether there is "anyone you could talk to or go to for help" under specific conditions; the scale of neighborhood organizations is indicated by the presence of various employment, recreational, and

political groups. General informal activity seems to tap actual interaction in various domains with community members.

In this research, consistent with the systemic model, "social integration" is clearly high where "neighborhood disadvantage" is low in Denver, but little relationship between the two major dimensions is found in Chicago. In fact, the weak Chicago relationship shows "social integration" to be high where "neighborhood disadvantage" is high. In turn, social integration, as measured by the one aggregated dimension, has little relationship by itself to adolescent developmental outcomes in either Denver or Chicago.

As noted above, social integration is a summary measure of four different scales of organizational activity. The fact that it does not relate well in the predicted way to various other community characteristics, as discussed in the above paragraphs, has two possible interpretations. One is that the systemic theory is wrong. The other is that the highly aggregated measure of social integration is hiding relationships that exist for the four summary parts. It is impossible to tell from the data which conclusion is correct.

The researchers (Elliott et al. 1996) do report stronger relationships between community "culture" and adolescent developmental outcomes when "culture" (measured independently of social integration) is quantified by variables indicating "informal control", especially measured by attitudinal reports on the nature of social order in the community. A lack of informal control was related negatively to "successful" adolescent development outcomes. Another variable, informal networks, indicated the localization of friendship ties, and showed weak relationships with developmental outcomes in Chicago, but stronger relationships in the predicted direction in Denver.

More direct means of evaluating the question of a single versus multiple dimension conceptualization of local ties is possible by re-analyzing data that are reported in a study of community organization in Detroit. In an aggregate-level study of 28 neighborhoods, Warren (1977, 1978) takes a similar approach to the above discussed MacArthur study of Chicago and Denver. The neighborhoods are distinguished quantitatively by a unidimensional measure of

local formal and informal ties with the area, using a variety of indicators of organized activity.

However, aggregate data for the 28 areas, as presented by the author (Warren 1977: 158), show that voluntary organizational activity has a .40 Pearsonian correlation with the degree of "informal interaction", as measured by the number of neighbors known and the frequency of contact. Using the reported data, it is possible to separate the neighborhoods by predominant racial group. Among the 12 predominantly white neighborhoods, the correlation is only .15, a disquieting finding if local ties are captured by one dimension. Among the 16 black neighborhoods, the analogous correlation is a more respectable .55. Given residential segregation patterns, blacks may be more limited than whites in finding any types of social ties outside their neighborhoods; thus, the higher correlation among black neighborhoods may be expected. In my opinion, formal and informal local ties do not seem well correlated in the Detroit study, especially to argue that local organization is unidimensional.

One way of evaluating whether items form one conceptual dimension is the use of predictive validity. In this circumstance, one is interested in whether the items that make up the alleged index of local ties have similar relationships with some predicted criterion variable. Warren's data show that informal ties ($r=.73$) correlate much higher than formal ties ($r=.36$) with a "social context" index, indicating "both commitment to stay in the neighborhood and attitudes about neighbors". Apparently, informal interaction is much more efficacious than formal ties in creating neighborhood loyalty. An implication, then, is that the use of a single index of local ties may obscure the fundamental importance of informal ties in creating commitment to the neighborhood.

Warren (Warren and Warren 1975) uses his single measure of social organization to create six types of urban neighborhoods, when they are also characterized by (1) social ties outside the local area, and (2) by attitudinal perception of the area in a positive way. Warren's attempt to

integrate the idea of extra-local ties into a conceptualization of local areas is an important advance, and will be discussed below.

LOCALIZED GEMEINSCHAFT AND GESSELSCHAFT

What evidence actually supports the idea that localized ties need to be measured by multiple dimensions? Three studies, of Seattle, Pittsburgh, and Chicago, will be discussed because data from them directly permit us to confront this issue.

In previous published work on 20 local areas in the Seattle region, Guest and Lee (1983 b, c) have argued in a manner very consistent with this paper that local ties may be defined along two dimensions --- a gesselschaft dimension, involving ties for instrumental-functional purposes, and a gemeinschaft dimension, involving ties for emotional-socially supportive reasons. When comparing aggregate patterns across communities, indicators of the gesselschaft dimension include membership in organizations organized for political or quasi-political purposes and "knowing" the names of neighbors (useful for protective purposes). Indicators of the gemeinschaft dimension include chatting with neighbors, and having high proportions of friends and relatives in the area (Guest and Lee, 1983c).

However, what Guest and Lee describe as gemeinschaft ties are not necessarily identical to the classical conception as propounded by theorists such as Tonnies (1887). The Seattle-area communities with high rates of informal interaction were not characterized by extensive and diffuse ties among all segments of the population; rather individuals appeared to be involved with small segments of the community.

These two dimensions of organization varied somewhat independently of each other. That is, some communities were gesselschaft without being gemeinschaft; however, gesselschaft and gemeinschaft properties could be found together, or neither characterized some communities.

These results were sociologically reasonable to Guest and Lee because the contemporary gesselschaft features of the community responded to different social forces than the gemeinschaft features. Previous analysis in Seattle

(Guest and Lee, 1983c) found that gessellschaft (instrumental) organization is particularly prominent in communities with high investment in terms of home value or the presence of children. Of these two predictors, home value is clearly the stronger. This seems to support Greer's (1962) view that communities serve "investment" needs for their residents. In contrast, gemeinschaft social organization was much more strongly influenced by long-term residence of the population, and also a high rate of patronage for commercial services within the community, suggesting a low rate of daily out-mobility from the community. This seems consistent with the predictions of the systemic model which emphasize such factors as community stability in creating local social ties.

The distinction between gemeinschaft and gessellschaft takes on additional significance when some of the possible consequences are considered. The Seattle research suggests that the gessellschaft communities are especially successful in protecting their political and social interests (Guest and Lee 1983c; Guest and Oropesa, 1984). Furthermore, on a number of quality of life measures, they are viewed as very satisfactory places in which to live. In short, large numbers of community residents are willing to mobilize over political issues, and the community is effective in protecting its interests. In contrast, gemeinschaft communities are not distinguished by community "quality" or politics; rather they are primarily communities of the heart, where people feel a strong sense of emotional and social bonding. These claims are largely supported by the theorizing of Granovetter (1973) who argues that strong social ties within a limited network make one "provincial" about larger social events and trends. Highly gemeinschaft communities may be shut off from the issues and policy makers that influence their fates.

To some degree, the aggregate-level Seattle findings are supported by classic case studies of communities within the metropolis. Here, one can point to ethnographies of working class districts such as Fried's (1973) and Gans' (1962) West End of Boston, Suttles' (1968) Addams area of Chicago, and Whyte's (1943) North End of Boston, where expressive gemeinschaft ties seemed

important, but the residents showed little collective tendency to participate in highly structured community organizations or in conventional political activity. Firey's (1945) study of Boston's upper status Beacon Hill also showed strong evidence of *gemeinschaft* local organization, but, in this case, *gessellschaft* ties were also important, and they helped protect the area from invasion by alternate land uses.

In some respects, the Seattle findings stand alone since no one has found highly similar patterns using survey data to compare aggregate patterns across several communities. Yet, some of the major findings are supported to some degree by other research. For instance, using survey responses of individuals, Ahlbrandt (1984:100-105) compared aggregate patterns of local social ties across 74 neighborhoods in Pittsburgh. In general, he found that indicators of *gemeinschaft* ties did not always correlate well with what I consider *gessellschaft* ties. For instance, the mean number of friends per neighborhood had a Pearsonian correlation of only .22 with the percentage of the population belonging to neighborhood voluntary associations. In contrast, the mean number of friends had higher correlations with the percentage workshopping in the neighborhood (.45), and relatives in the neighborhood (.46).

Ahlbrandt (1984:108) argues that "Social fabric is shown to consist of at least two distinct components. One element is formed by intimate bonds between people in the neighborhood, so-called primary ties. The other, a type of secondary relationship, is created by a more superficial form of interaction between neighbors, the neighboring that is developed through borrowing, visiting, and helping activities...The research findings show that these two elements of social fabric are not closely related."

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The correlation matrix for the aggregated 74 neighborhoods in Ahlbrandt's book-length study offers an opportunity to quantify the major dimensions of local social ties in Pittsburgh. Undertaken solely by me, a principal components analysis (varimax rotation) shows in Table 1 three major dimensions of social organization: first, a *gemeinschaft* dimension that is indicated by

the strong covariation of the number of relatives in the neighborhood, the presence of the best friend, the presence of the major provider of emotional support, and (to a lesser extent) the number of friends per neighborhood. A second dimension indicates the covariation of localized church attendance, various exchange activities with neighbors, and (to a lesser extent) the number of friends per neighborhood. There is also, clearly, a third dimension, indicating the covariation of membership in neighborhood organizations that are concerned with neighborhood "issues" and membership in other neighborhood organizations.

From the data in the study, it is impossible to calculate the correlation of each of these three dimensions with other sociological characteristics of the community. However, from the correlation matrix in the monograph (Ahlbrandt 1984:102-105), there is persuasive evidence that they may have different determinants and social consequences. Clearly, years living in the neighborhood is strongly related to the first dimension, so that length of residence is associated with the development of intimate ties, consistent with the systemic model. Home ownership has the strongest relationship with voluntary association membership (the third dimension), consistent with the community of limited liability thesis. Importantly, length of residence and home ownership each correlate well with one of the three dimensions of organization, but they do not do so with all three dimensions.

While the Ahlbrandt measures and data for Pittsburgh are not highly comparable to those in the Seattle study, it does appear that there are somewhat parallel findings that deserve further research.

The other Pittsburgh dimension (number two), indicating the covariation of localized church attendance, various exchange activities with neighbors, and (to a lesser extent) the number of friends per neighborhood, appears somewhat anomalous in regard to the Seattle study. However, percentage Catholic is strongly related in a positive manner to this dimension, consistent with the generally greater religious attendance among Catholics than non-Catholics in American society. In addition, Catholic parish churches are generally

organized on a localized basis. A similar pattern may be absent in Seattle due to its proportionally small Catholic population and its low general levels of religious involvement.

Other evidence of the multidimensionality of local social ties is found in the study by Taub et al. (1984) of eight local areas in Chicago. While the authors describe overall patterns of "community cohesion", they indicate clearly that various types of ties are not necessarily found together. Using data reported in their monograph, it is possible to calculate Pearsonian correlations across the eight communities among aggregate measures of social ties. In some respects, their study of Catholic-oriented Chicago is reminiscent of Ahlbrandt's findings for Pittsburgh. The percentage of community respondents who report they "chat with neighbors on the street" at least once a week has a .92 correlation with the percentage reporting they attend religious services in the community. Both of these variables are highly related in a positive manner to the percentage Catholic of the respondents.

At the same time, other measures of local organization for the eight Chicago areas have much weaker relationships. Thus, the percentage of community members who report they have good friends living in the neighborhood correlates only .31 with the tendency to chat and .20 with attending local religious services.

Since few data are reported on instrumental local ties, it is difficult to determine whether they may be separated from expressive local ties. Somewhat contrary to the thesis in this paper, across the eight local areas, the percentage with "good friends" in the area is correlated positively (.57) with membership in organizations that are concerned with the local "quality of life", but these organizations are not defined further.

One conclusion is clear from the Taub et al. Chicago data, namely that various measures of local ties correlate differently with various aspects of "local culture", a pattern also evident in the Seattle study. For instance, across the eight local areas, the aggregate percentage considering "their neighborhood to be a Real Home," an obvious measure of psychological

attachment, has a Pearsonian correlation of only .34 with the aggregate percentage having good friends in the area, while frequent chatting with neighbors ($r=.94$) and high religious attendance ($r=.90$) are related quite positively to considering "their neighborhood to be a Real Home". This pattern suggests that levels of Catholicism in Chicago must be highly related to subjective attachment to community.

EXTRA-LOCAL TIES

To understand the social role of the mediate community, it will also be necessary to study directly the relationship of extra-local ties to each other, to local ties, and the consequences of extra-local ties for community life. As indicated previously, attention to these extra-local ties is notably limited in previous research, perhaps due to difficulty in obtaining data that measure their importance across communities (for some related research, see Heitgerd and Bursik 1987; Taub et al. 1977). But this research deficiency may also arise from the assumptions of some researchers that only internal ties are important for local areas.

As far as I know, only one previous study has attempted to investigate the relationship between local and extra-local ties (however created) over a number of communities --- the previously discussed research of Warren (1977, 1978) on social ties within and outside 28 elementary school districts in the Detroit area. Social ties within the community were measured by combining the indices discussed above, measuring primary interaction and voluntary association membership. I have noted previously some concern about the degree to which these measures of local activity empirically "fit" together. Extra-local ties, not analyzed yet in this paper, were measured by an index combining voting participation in the 1968 U.S. Presidential election, degree of contact with city agencies, and membership in voluntary associations outside the community (Warren, 1971).

From the data provided (Warren, 1971: 270), it is impossible to calculate the Pearsonian correlation between these general measures of local and extra-local ties. However, data on the dichotomized values of each variable

permit construction of a two-by-two crosstabulation of low and high aggregate values on the strength of both local and extralocal ties for the 28 areas in their study. Using the gamma statistical measure, the two types of ties have an association of .91, indicating their close covariation. Of the 14 communities with a strong local orientation, 10 also had a strong extra-local orientation. In contrast, only 2 of the 14 communities with a weak local orientation also had a strong-extra local pattern. As noted earlier, the Detroit study does not clearly separate instrumental from expressive ties, whether at the local or extra-local level; thus, it is impossible to tell which part is most strongly associated with the extra-local ties. Nevertheless, one possible conclusion is that the strength of local and extra-local ties in Detroit may be difficult to disassociate, at least on the basis of the researchers' measures.

A different exploratory test of the relationship between local and extra-local ties is possible by focusing on the previously discussed Seattle data set (Guest and Lee 1983c). Since the ties may be more clearly divided on the basis of expressive versus instrumental orientation, it is possible to determine not only the relationship between local and extra-local ties, as in the Detroit study, but also to determine the interrelationships of instrumental and expressive ties. This research also suggests some difficulty in disassociating local and extra-local ties, even when they are further distinguished by the expressive and instrumental orientations.

For each of the 20 local areas in the Seattle data set, the original data set was used to calculate percentages of respondents who reported membership in six types of voluntary associations. Three of the types refer to groups meeting within the local area as Guest and Lee (1983a) had defined them; the other three types relate to membership in groups meeting outside the local area. Within the local and extra-local types, three categories of membership were recognized: in churches (an especially important tie, even in the highly non-religious Seattle area), in instrumental associations, and in expressive associations. Instrumental associations included groups such as community

clubs, political organizations, PTA's, and will be viewed as gessellschaft in orientation. Expressive associations were defined by activities such as card-playing, recreation, and fraternal lodge meetings, and are viewed as more gemeinschaft. Church membership occupies a more marginal position, although a case could be made that it is either expressive (a way to socialize) or instrumental (a way to inculcate members of the family with "proper" behavior). Admittedly, the distinction in regard to specific expressive and instrumental organizational memberships may be somewhat arbitrary.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

As Table 2 shows, four variables have strong positive inter-correlations. These are the three measures of extra-local memberships and the indicator of membership in localized instrumental groups. In contrast, membership in local expressive and church associations is negatively or weakly correlated with the other variables. Clearly, then, all types of extra-local ties are interrelated, and empirically difficult to disentangle from memberships in instrumental local associations.

Overall, the local and extra-local distinction does not matter greatly in looking at variations in instrumental ties, but is more important for distinguishing among relatively expressive ties. Communities with strong localized instrumental ties also have strong extra-local instrumental ties, but communities with strong localized expressive ties do not necessarily have strong extra-local expressive ties.

Why might local instrumental ties be related strongly across communities to extra-local instrumental ties? Strong community political activism in local organizations may encourage residents to become informed about broader issues that impact the world. Community members may be thus encouraged to join extra-local organizations. Furthermore, membership in extra-local instrumental organizations may inform members about the impact of the outside world on their residential communities. There may be a subtle reverse effect operating to encourage persons with extra-local ties to develop local ties. In addition, other analysis of the Seattle data showed that high average socio-economic

status of communities was an antecedent variable that predicted positively local instrumental ties and both extra-local instrumental and expressive ties, but it actually turns out to be a weaker correlate of local instrumental than the two types of extra-local ties.

CONSEQUENCES OF EXTRA-LOCAL TIES

Previous research on local areas does not indicate clearly the relative roles of local versus extra-local ties in understanding efforts to defend the community's interests. Since instrumental local ties are highly correlated with extra-local ties, one would expect many attributes of community life to have similar relationships with the different variables. Indeed, this turns out frequently to be true; consequently, it is not necessary to regale the reader with relationships that are reported elsewhere (Guest and Lee, 1983c).

Even though some of the local and extra-local ties have similar correlations with some aspects of community culture, it is useful to ask if certain types of ties have unusually strong relationships. In particular, do extra-local ties especially matter relative to local ties? With the Seattle data base of 20 communities and high intercorrelations among some of the variables (Gordon 1968), it is difficult to clearly distinguish the effects of various specific ties. But a perusal of simple correlations may be useful to illustrate some of the analytic issues. Aggregate variation in the six types of organizational membership will be related for the 20 Seattle communities to two aspects of local culture. One aspect of local culture is the average degree of satisfaction with various attributes of the community, while the other is the propensity of residents to engage in various types of political acts.

Subsequently, the paper shows for a subsample of eight of the Seattle communities in the central city how organizational membership is associated with various indicators of crime activity and police protection.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

The "good community" should obviously be associated with high levels of satisfaction. Indeed, previous research has shown that communities with high

local instrumental ties are characterized by high levels of satisfaction with personal safety, housing conditions, and the types of people (Guest and Lee, 1983c). Not surprisingly, areas with a high degree of localized organization in protective groups are able to achieve a good evaluation from their residents.

To clarify the relationship of satisfaction to extra-local ties, I have indicated in Table 3 the Pearsonian correlations between membership in the three types of associations and satisfaction with the three attributes of community. The satisfaction variables are operationalized in terms of the percentage of community residents reporting "extreme" satisfaction as opposed to "moderate", "slight" or "none"

Table 3 indicates that extra-local instrumental and expressive ties are highly correlated with satisfaction in the same manner as local instrumental ties. Extra-local church ties also have a similar pattern of relationships. The other two types of local ties, expressive and church-related, are weakly or negatively related to satisfaction.

It is interesting, though, that both extra-local instrumental and expressive ties are more strongly associated with personal safety satisfaction than local instrumental ties. Personal safety may reflect successful policing, which, in turn, may be especially dependent on ties that communities can exert through contacts outside the community with governmental officials. Nevertheless, substantive conclusions must be drawn cautiously from the data since some of the six types of ties are highly intercorrelated, and it may be difficult to separate clearly the effects of the various variables when they have similar relationships with the satisfaction variables (Gordon 1968).

Differences in the importance of local and extra-local ties are more evident when the focus turns to types of political acts. Table 3 reports the Pearsonian correlations between the aggregate percentage of community residents who report that they have ever taken "any of the following actions in response to problems affecting" their local area and membership in the six different types of associations. While respondents could indicate any of seven

specific acts, the table presents the results for only three acts with especially interesting patterns.

The data show clearly that either extra-local instrumental or expressive tie strength is the strongest positive correlate of each type of political act (contacting public officials, contacting neighbors, and attending a public meeting). Relative to the two types of extra-local ties, local instrumental memberships are strongly related positively only to attendance at public meetings. Localized church and expressive ties seem to have little relationship to any of the three types of acts. Again, one must generalize very cautiously from these results given the small sample of communities (20) and the high correlations among some of the six types of organization memberships.

Nevertheless, some reasonable explanations may be developed to account for the fact that extra-local ties, even in comparison to other correlated ties, stand out for their relationships to informal meetings with neighbors and personally meeting with or telephoning a public official or agency. One may hypothesize that extra-local ties are especially helpful in providing information about and contact with public officials. Why, then, the relationship with informal neighbor contact? Certainly, informal neighbor contact may be partly stimulated by organizing activities of formal community clubs or by spontaneous meetings of community residents. But, informal neighbor contacts may also be instigated as a consequence of external information becoming available to community residents through outside ties. Thus, the outside ties may facilitate the information or interest which makes possible informal neighbor action.

EXTRA-LOCAL TIES AND CRIME

Our data suggest that local instrumental and extra-local ties are correlated quite positively with satisfaction with personal safety, but the data do not demonstrate whether this is due to the actual safety of the community or the ability of the community to deal with safety issues. Fortunately, for eight of the 20 Seattle local areas, data (City of Seattle

1981) are available on attitudes about crime and police, from telephone interviews in 1979 with 808 Seattle central city residents, as conducted by the Seattle City Law and Justice Planning Division. The boundaries of the eight areas are identical to those used in the Guest and Lee study, but the research was conducted independently.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Respondents were asked to indicate in open-ended fashion the major crime problems in their areas. For these areas, severity of the crime problem is indicated by the percentage of respondents who report no crime problems in their areas (NOCRIM) and the average number of crime problems mentioned by respondents in areas (CRIMEN). Most of these mentions referred to violent acts or street crimes.

As Table 4 shows, both these variables show relatively weak correlations with the various forms of local and extra-local social ties. Overall, nevertheless, problems of crime (CRIMEN and NOCRIM) generally relate negatively to either local or extra-local organization. This is consistent with previous research on aggregate variations across Seattle census tracts (rather than the larger "local areas" of this study) showing that a unidimensional measure of internal neighborhood social integration was negatively related to perceived risk of crime (Rountree and Land 1996). Related research (Warner and Rountree 1997) found that "social ties" had negative effects on assault rates in predominantly white neighborhoods, but no significant effects in predominantly minority or racially mixed neighborhoods.

Stronger patterns are evident when the focus switches to dealings with the city police. In the 1981 Seattle study, one question asked about the average number of calls to police during the past five years (CALLAV). Another question obtained information on whether the respondent had failed to call police when services would have been useful (NOFAIL). The percentage indicates those who reported no failures in calling. Finally, the variable PATROL indicates whether the respondent had ever observed police patrols in the area.

A quite striking relationship (.997) exists between reporting no failures to call and membership in outside instrumental groups. The relationship is also quite high for membership in outside expressive groups. That is, external ties are most strongly associated with a willingness to call police when necessary. In addition, while the relationships are weaker, there are also moderately strong correlations between external ties and a tendency to observe police patrols in the area. Overall the data suggest that communities with external ties have especially good relationships with the police, an exchange where the police provide good service and the residents feel the police are responsive. This may help explain why external ties were quite positively related to satisfaction with personal safety, even though actual perception of the amount of crime is not strongly related to social ties.

It is also noteworthy that no failure to call police is also related quite positively to local instrumental and expressive ties, but these relationships (while strong) are weaker than those with extra-local ties.

The last variable to discuss is the average number of calls to police during the past five years (CALLAV), which may reflect either real problems of crime in the area OR confidence that the respondent is secure in the community through institutionalized patterns of policing and social control. The strongest correlates of this variables are external instrumental and expressive ties, so that communities with strong external ties are characterized by few calls. This may, then, reflect the fact that residents feel they are protected and do not need to constantly alert police to problems.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

While more research is needed, the development of the hierarchical community has been associated with the maintenance of local and extra-local social networks of at least moderate strength in many parts of the metropolis. The decline of local ties, while occurring, is not inevitably leading to the dissolution of many local areas as sites for extensive social networks. As a

result, the contemporary metropolis is a Mediate Community, both liberated and saved at the same time.

This paper has argued strongly for the recognition of at least four types of social ties for local areas in the metropolis--expressive local, instrumental local, expressive extra-local, and instrumental extra-local. These ties have varying relationships with each other, and have different consequences for understanding the sociology of local areas. A primary argument of this paper is that social scientists must move beyond a conception of communities in the metropolis as only reflections of a unidimensional local social organization. It is not even enough to simply differentiate between local and extra-local ties and between expressive and instrumental ties; researchers must recognize the interrelationships of the two different dimensions.

This analysis does not pinpoint the exact dimensions by which the social organization of local areas should be categorized, but it does indicate that there are probably multiple dimensions. More comparable studies across metropolitan areas are needed, using similar indicators of social organization. The sample size of communities within individual metropolitan areas should also be expanded (for instance, the Seattle area had only 20 local areas), collecting enough data for each area to produce estimates of some reliability. One possibility is that patterns of social organization for local areas are relatively specific to individual metropolitan areas, and are conditioned by the unique characteristics of that area (for instance, strong religious traditions or high racial segregation), but only rudimentary evidence exists at this point.

The tentative hypothesis from this review is that localized expressive or *gemeinschaft* ties are clearly evident in many local areas, and may be important for understanding certain aspects of local culture such as the emotional or sentimental attachment of individuals to community. However, these types of ties have few consequences in themselves for understanding the more political issue of how urban land use evolves.

The important political action in the metropolis for the local area focuses around the local and extra-local gessellschaft or instrumental ties. On the whole, these ties are found correlated across communities, and therefore seem to be re-enforcing. In addition, these local and extra-local ties seem to have similar correlations with community outcomes that mainly have political implications. Yet, in some respects, extra-local ties seem more important than local ties, such as organizing political meetings and efforts to protect safety. The external ties may be crucial in making contacts with representatives of the outside world and in obtaining information about issues that will impact the community.

Given the short amount of space permitted for this paper, I have been forced to deal lightly with a number of issues. This analysis has only focused on the number of extra-local ties as a tool for understanding the sociology of community, and has admittedly had little opportunity to deal with how the specific nature of these ties relates to the viability of communities. For instance, how do coalitions of local areas (pooling your ties) influence specific territories? This is a topic which has been pursued both qualitatively and quantitatively by other researchers (Logan and Rabrenovic 1990; Oropesa 1989), with some interesting findings. Even though these studies are often very interesting, few well-grounded conclusions may be drawn from them about how the specific nature of extra-local ties influences the community. It seems that enough unanswered questions exist to keep us all quite busy for some time.

REFERENCES

- Ahlbrandt, R.S., Jr. 1984. *Neighborhood, people, and community*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Bender, T. 1978. *Community and social change in America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Berger, B.M. 1960. *Working-class suburb*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- City of Seattle. 1981. Citizen attitudes toward crime and police by neighborhood. In *1981 Criminal Justice Plan*.
- Elliott, D.S., W.J. Wilson, D. Huizinga, A. Elliott, and B. Rankin. 1996. The effects of neighborhood disadvantage on adolescent development. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 33:389-426.
- Festinger, L., S. Schacter, and K. Back. 1950. *Social pressure in informal groups*. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press.
- Firey, W. 1945. Sentiment and symbolism as ecological variables. *American*

- Sociological Review* 10:140-148.
- Fischer, C. 1982. *To dwell among friends*. University of Chicago Press.
- Fried, M. 1973. *The world of the urban working class*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gans, H.J. 1962. *The urban villagers: Group and class in the life of Italian-Americans*. New York; The Free Press.
- Gerson, K., C.A. Stueve, and C.S. Fischer. 1977. Attachment to Place. In *Networks and places: social relations in the urban setting*, edited by C.S. Fischer, M. Baldassare, K. Gerson, R.M. Jackson, L. Jones and C.A. Stueve. New York: The Free Press.
- Gordon, R.A. 1968. Issues in multiple regression. *American Journal of Sociology* 73:592-616
- Granovetter, M.S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78:1360-1380
- Greer, S. 1962. *The emerging city: myth and reality*. New York: The Free Press.
- Guest, A.M. 1984. Robert Park and the natural area: a sentimental review. *Sociology and Social Research* 69:1-21
- Guest, A.M. and B.A. Lee. 1983a. Consensus on locality names within the metropolis. *Sociology and Social Research* 67:374-391.
- _____. 1983b. Sentiment and evaluation as ecological variables. *Sociological Perspectives* 26:159-184.
- _____. 1983c. The social organization of local areas. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 19:217-240.
- Guest, A.M. and B.A. Lee, and L. Staeheli. 1982. Changing locality identification in the metropolis: Seattle, 1920-1978. *American Sociological Review* 47:543-549.
- Guest, A.M. and R.S. Oropesa. 1984. Problem solving strategies of local areas in the metropolis. *American Sociological Review* 49:828-840.
- _____. 1985. Informal social ties and political activity in the metropolis. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 21:550-574.
- Guest, A.M. and S.K. Wierzbicki. 1999. Social ties at the neighborhood level: two decades of GSS evidence. *Urban Affairs Review* 34:forthcoming.
- Hawley, A. 1978. Urbanization as process. In *Handbook of contemporary urban life*, edited by D. Street. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Heitgerd, J.L. and R.J. Bursik, Jr. 1987. Extracommunity dynamics and the ecology of delinquency. *American Journal of Sociology* 92:775-787.
- Hunter, A.J. 1974. *Symbolic communities: The persistence and change of Chicago local communities*. University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1975. The loss of community: an empirical test through replication. *American Sociological Review* 40:537-552.
- _____. 1978. Persistence of local sentiments in mass society, In *Handbook of contemporary urban life*, edited by D. Street. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hunter, A.J. and G.D. Suttles. 1972. The expanding community of limited liability. In *The social construction of communities*, edited by G.D. Suttles. University of Chicago Press.
- Kasarda, J.D. and M. Janowitz. 1974. Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review* 39:328-339.
- Keller, S. 1968. *The urban neighborhood*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Laumann, E.O. 1973. *Bonds of pluralism*. New York: John Wiley.
- Lee, B.A., R.S. Oropesa, B. Metch, and A.M. Guest. 1984. Testing the decline of community thesis: neighborhood organization in Seattle, 1929 and 1979. *American Journal of Sociology* 89:1161-1188.
- Logan, J.R. and G. Rabrenovic. 1990. Neighborhood associations: their issues, their allies, and their opponents. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 26:68-94.
- McClenahan, B.A. 1929. *The changing urban neighborhood: A sociological study*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- McKenzie, R.D. 1921. The neighborhood: a study of local life in the city of Columbus, Ohio. Part II. *American Journal of Sociology* 27:344-363.
- Oropesa, R.S. 1987. Local and extra-local orientations in the metropolis.

- Sociological Forum* 2:90-107.
- _____. 1989. The social and political foundations of effective neighborhood improvement associations. *Social Science Quarterly* 70:723-743.
- Putnam, R.D. 1995. Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6: 65-78.
- Rountree, P.W. and K.C. Land. 1996. Burglary victimization, perceptions of crime risk, and routine activities: a multilevel analysis across Seattle neighborhoods and census tracts. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 33:147-180.
- Sampson, R.J. 1997. Collective regulation of adolescent misbehavior: validation results from eighty Chicago neighborhoods. *Journal of Adolescent Research* 12:227-244.
- Stein, M.R. 1960. *The eclipse of community: An interpretation of American studies*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Suttles, G. 1968. *The social order of the slum*. University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1972. *The social construction of communities*. University of Chicago Press.
- Taub, R.P., G.P. Surgeon, S. Lindholm, P.B. Otti, and A. Bridges. 1977. Urban voluntary associations, locality based and externally induced. *American Journal of Sociology* 83:425-442.
- Taun, R.P., D.G. Taylor, and J.D. Dunham. 1984. *Paths of neighborhood change: race and crime in urban America*. University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, R.B. 1996. Neighborhood responses to disorder and local attachments: the systemic model of attachment, social disorganization, and neighborhood use value. *Sociological Forum* 11:41-74.
- Thernstrom, S. and P. Knights. 1970. Men in motion: some data and speculation on urban population mobility in nineteenth-century America. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 1:7-35.
- Tonnies, F. 1887 (1963). *Community and Society [Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft.]*, translated and edited by C.P. Loomis. New York: Harper.
- Warner, B.D. and P.W. Rountree. 1997. Local social ties in a community and crime model: questioning the systemic nature of informal social control. *Social Problems* 44:520-536.
- Warren, D.I. 1971. *Race and community social structure: A comparative analysis of black and white neighborhoods*. Final Report, Project USPHS 1 R0 1 MH-16403. Washington, DC: Behavioral Sciences Research Section, National Institute of Mental Health.
- _____. 1977. The functional diversity of urban neighborhoods. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 13:151-179.
- _____. 1978. Explorations in neighborhood differentiation. *The Sociological Quarterly* 19:310-331.
- Warren, D.I. and R.B. Warren. 1975. Six kinds of neighborhoods: parochial, diffuse, or steppingstone? *Psychology Today* 9: 74-80.
- Warren, R.L. 1963. *The community in America*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.
- Webber, M.M. 1963. Order in diversity: community without propinquity. In *Cities and space: The future use of urban land*, edited by L. Wingo. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Wellman, B. 1979. The community question: the intimate networks of East Yorkers. *American Journal of Sociology* 84:1201-1231.
- Wellman, B. and B. Leighton. 1979. Networks, neighborhoods, and communities: approaches to the study of the community question. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 14:363-390.
- Whyte, W.F. 1943. *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum*. The University of Chicago Press.

TABLE 1
 Component Loadings for Correlation Matrix
 Ahlbrandt Study of 74 Pittsburgh Neighborhoods

	Factor		
	1	2	3
WORS	.201	.867	-.103
NEIG	-.103	.846	.165
RELA	.815	.248	.148
BESF	.834	-.042	.056
EMOS	.870	.068	.058
MFRE	.489	.558	.048
NORG	.010	-.137	.866
OVOR	.188	.242	.702
EIGEN VALUE	2.44	1.92	1.31

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. First three factors explain 70.95 percent of variance in matrix.

WORS: Survey question asked how often respondents attended religious services in or near your neighborhood. Higher values indicate greater frequency of attendance.

NEIG: The index was constructed by summing and weighting equally answers to four survey questions on frequency of borrowing or exchanging things with neighbors; frequency of visiting neighbors; frequency of helping (or being helped by) neighbors with small tasks; willingness to call on neighbors for help in an emergency. Higher values equals greater frequency.

RELA: Percentage of respondents with relatives in the neighborhood.

BESF: Percentage of respondents with primary social friend living in the neighborhood.

EMOS: Percentage of respondents with the person upon whom they rely for emotional support living in the neighborhood.

MFRE: Mean number of friends per respondent living in the neighborhood.

NORG: Percentage of respondents belonging to a neighborhood organization concerned about neighborhood issues.

OVOR: Percentage of respondents belonging to other voluntary organizations located in or near the neighborhood.

Source of Data: Ahlbrandt, 1984, pp. 102-105.

TABLE 2

Pearsonian Correlations among Aggregate Measures of
Voluntary Association Memberships, 20 Seattle Local Areas

	LOCH	LOEX	LOIN	EXCH	EXEX	EXIN
LOCH Local church	1.000	.372	-.408	-.647	-.265	-.345
LOEX Local expressive	.372	1.000	.376	.066	.365	.350
LOIN Local instrumental	-.408	.376	1.000	.659	.451	.656
EXCH Extra-local church	-.647	.066	.659	1.000	.530	.545
EXEX Extra-local expressive	-.265	.365	.451	.530	1.000	.624
EXIN Extra-local instrumental	-.345	.350	.656	.545	.624	1.000
Variable Mean	23.8	33.0	28.3	30.8	37.6	52.6
Variable Standard Dev.	10.6	6.8	12.4	11.0	10.3	11.4

Notes: Pearsonian correlations of .38 are statistically significant at the .05 level, one-tailed F-test. Expressive associations included the following: youth group, cardplaying or other social group, organized sports team or recreational group, musical or artistic group, fraternal organization. Instrumental associations included: labor unions, PTA, community club or neighborhood improvement association, other political or action-oriented organization, veteran's group, service or charitable organization, professional association.

TABLE 3

Pearsonian Correlations among Organizational Ties
And Satisfaction-Information Variables, 20 Seattle Local Areas

	Satisfaction with			Done Following		
	Personal Safety	Housing Conditions	Types of People	Contact Official	Contact Neighbors	Attend Meeting
LOCH Local Church	-.526	-.490	-.325	-.107	-.202	-.171
LOEX Local Expressive	.172	.175	.188	-.014	.079	.217
LOIN Local Instrumental	.494	.624	.477	-.031	.203	.563
EXCH Extra-local Church	.485	.446	.177	.178	.223	.477
EXEX Extra-local Expressive	.603	.589	.450	.287	.561	.528
EXIN Extra-local Instrumental	.531	.549	.444	.421	.414	.599
Variable Mean	25.24	22.83	36.36	37.04	41.77	41.51
Variable S.D.	11.98	15.56	12.51	7.82	9.34	9.74

The satisfaction variables are operationalized in terms of the percentage of community residents reporting "extreme" satisfaction as opposed to "moderate", "slight" or "none". The "done following" variables are operationalized in terms of the percentage who reported they had done the following things to solve problems in their area: (contact official) personally met with or telephoned an official or agency; (contact neighbors) met informally with neighbors to work on solving problems; (attend meeting) attended a public meeting.

TABLE 4

Pearsonian Correlations among Organizational Ties
And Personal Safety Behavior, 20 Seattle Local Areas

Tie Type	CRIMEN	NOCRIM	CALLAV	NOFAIL	PATROL
LOCH Local Church	.029	-.344	.436	.250	-.675
LOEX Local Expressive	-.303	-.044	-.012	.552	-.202
LOIN Local Instrumental	-.324	-.095	.024	.695	.375
EXCH Extra-local Church	.098	-.310	.125	.520	.396
EXEX Extra-local Expressive	-.411	.122	-.682	.792	.504
EXIN Extra-local Instrumental	-.171	-.048	-.467	.997	.503
Variable Mean	1.37	22.41	1.44	79.66	70.55
Variable S.D.	.33	7.72	.45	4.99	7.86

Note: See Table 2 for identification of Tie Type

CRIMEN=average number of crime problems mentioned in local area.

NOCRIM=percentage who mention no crime problems in area.

CALLAV=average number of calls to police during past five years.

NOFAIL=percentage who failed to call police when services useful.

PATROL=percentage who have observed police patrols in area.