Housing Policy as a Tool of Social Policy*

NAOMI CARMON, *Tel-Aviv University*

BILHA MANNHEIM, *Israel Institute of Technology—Technion*

ABSTRACT

   Studies of the long-term social effects of housing have not reached firm conclusions on sound empirical bases. Yet, while considering policies for social change, a distinguished sociologist declared that "housing is a resource that has little effect in overcoming other social deficits."

   Data from a study of newcomers to Israel provided a rare opportunity for an empirical study of some social effects of housing policies in a setting in which the distinction between cause and effect is clear. We found that neighborhood composition policy influenced both social integration and the interethnic distance between western and eastern Israelis. Population dispersal policy affected economic integration, social integration, and rootedness in the town of residence. We concluded that housing has a multiplier effect, and that housing policies can be manipulated to achieve social goals.

Although housing in our urbanized society has high visibility, sociologists have not intensively studied the relationship between housing policies and social processes. The need for such work has increased recently, since housing has been recognized as one of the major public services, along with health, education, and welfare. What is the social utility of the rapidly growing public investment in housing compared to investments in the other social services? Since we are not yet equipped to deal with the real utility problem, this study concentrates on providing some reliable empirical evidence on the social impact of housing policies.

   The immediate consequences of housing and its environment are clear: a certain number of square meters for each family, a certain percentage of families within a five-minute walk from a shopping center, etc. But, as illustrated by the following brief survey of the relevant literature, there

336

is no consensus on the long-run consequences of housing—its influence on broad social goals such as upward mobility and social integration, which are the major foci of this paper.

Social studies of the impact of housing and its environment on upward mobility can be categorized according to channel of mobility—education, political involvement and economic status.

EDUCATION

Only the effects on children and youth have been investigated. Douglas and Blomfield and Wilner et al. (b), found some influences of housing conditions and neighborhood characteristics on children's achievements at school; however, only a few of the expected differences were statistically significant, and these were related to only some of the groups. Sewell and Armer found that the neighborhood had very little impact on plans for higher education of youth, after they had controlled for a few relevant variables.

POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT

Social reformers such as Saul D. Alinsky, and social scientists serving as advisors to the community action programs in the early sixties considered participation in neighborhood political activities to be a major method by which the poor penetrate the power structure. Neighborhood action bodies, which often focus on housing, were expected to open new channels to people who had been alienated from the political processes. However, evaluations in the late sixties were at best inconclusive; in a few cases, they completely invalidated these expectations (Moynihan).

ECONOMIC STATUS

A few studies tested the hypothesis that housing, and especially its location, has an impact on economic status, through the occupational opportunities in the surroundings. Mooney concluded that although the segregated housing of central city blacks significantly reduced their employment opportunities, this factor "does not seem to be important" compared to others (308). Masters found no evidence that segregated housing limits the employment opportunities of nonwhites. But Kain (a, b), using similar methods, presented convincing data on the massive loss of black employment opportunities in urban ghettos, and he explained why the above studies failed to show this (c).

The influence of housing and its environment on the social integration of its tenants has been widely investigated. A few interesting conclusions have been reached about the impact on the attitudes and behavior

of neighbors (Carmon, b). But although there is agreement that the built environment does influence the social life within it, opinions differ on the extent of this influence (Broady; Lipman).

A special subfield of study is the social consequences of heterogeneous residential patterns. Deutsch and Collins, Wilner et al. (a), Meer and Friedman and Pettigrew reached generally optimistic conclusions. On the other hand, Kramer (in Allport), Fishman and Ginzberg found that residential proximity did not have a positive impact on interethnic relations; moreover, they claimed that most of the optimistic results were dubious, since these could not differentiate between differences due to the residents' self-selection (i.e., the less-prejudiced selected homes in heterogeneous areas) and those which were real consequences of interethnic proximity.

On the basis of these insufficient and contradictory results about the social effects of housing, different scholars reached different conclusions. Alvin Shorr concluded that "the type of housing occupied influences health, behavior and attitudes . . . Most of these effects, in turn, place obstacles in the path of improving one's financial circumstances" (31–2). Although some have felt that housing can help achieve desirable consequences in various social spheres, Nathan Glazer's interpretation of similar data prompted James Coleman to conclude that "housing is a resource that has little effect in overcoming other social deficits" (69).

Our study was designed to help resolve this controversy by testing empirically whether Israel's national housing policies are helping to achieve the state's social goals.

Two types of policies were investigated: population dispersal and neighborhood composition. Their selection as the major independent variables was governed not only by theoretical considerations, but also by concern for using what Etzioni called "malleable variables" in order to serve practical social policy decisions.

New immigrants were the target population, for two main reasons:

1. They provided a rare opportunity for researchers to control the variable of housing selection, since it was possible to locate newcomers who had not selected their housing, but had been assigned to it by absorption officials. This control is critical, because numerous findings in the literature are questionable due to the uncertain direction of causality: did housing influence the social phenomenon, or did the phenomenon cause people to select housing with certain features? In our case, we knew that our dependent variables could not have affected the selection of housing.
2. Housing for newcomers accounts for over 50 percent of all public housing in Israel (Haber).

Two of our four dependent variables are goals of immigrants in every country: economic integration and social integration. The other two

variables have special importance in Israel: reduction of interethnic distance (between eastern Jews from Asia and Africa and western Jews from Europe and America)[2] and rootedness in town of residence (an important aim of Israeli policy, especially for newcomers directed to development towns by the population dispersal policy).

Methods

OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE VARIABLES

The independent variables were defined as follows:

Population dispersal policy: settling newcomers in development towns distant from the three main cities of Israel.

Neighborhood composition policy: settling newcomers in one of three forms: (1) a homogeneous eastern cluster (in which at least 85 percent of the heads of families were from Asia and Africa); (2) a homogeneous western cluster (in which at least 85 percent of the heads of families were from Europe and America); or (3) a heterogeneous cluster (with approximately a 50-50 balance).

Each dependent variable was measured by an index consisting of several items in a fully structured interviewing schedule. The questions probed each newcomer's personal view of absorption—since the investigated housing policies involved individual families, not groups. The questions covered both factual and perceived evidence (for example: having a job and being satisfied with one's personal economic situation), because both aspects are essential to absorption.

We constructed the indices in the following manner:

(a) Following the Likert method, we computed the correlations between each of the items assigned to an index and the summed score of the index. Items correlating less than .50 were removed from the index; most of the remaining correlations were between .70 and .80.

(b) We computed the alpha test for internal reliability (Nunnally, 196) for each index. The results ranged between .59 and .84.

(c) To establish the mutual independence of the dependent variables, their intercorrelations were computed and found to be negligible: from .030 to .109.

The final indices consisted of the following items:

Economic integration: a permanent job consonant with the family head's education; upward mobility compared to occupation abroad and to occupation one year after immigration; level of family income; and satisfaction with economic situation.

Social integration: number of acquaintances and friends; satisfaction with one's social life in Israel; and number of social ties compared with the number before immigration.

Interethnic social distance: a Bogardus Social Distance type scale, measuring readiness to accept a person from the other ethnic group as a friend, as a neighbor, as a subtenant, and as a relative by marriage.

Rootedness in town of residence: satisfaction with living in the town; intention to continue residing there; and readiness to recommend the town to close friends.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The two independent and four dependent variables were linked in two sets of hypotheses:

A. Neighborhood composition and absorption
1. Living in ethnically heterogeneous clusters reduces interethnic distance. Rationale: according to the theory of interethnic relations, equal status contact between people of different ethnic groups reduces antagonism. Instead of using equal status in each cluster of residents as our common denominator (impossible to obtain in our case) we used length of residence in the new country. Since personal crises and sharp transitions, such as immigration, cause people to disregard differences in status and emphasize the common situation, we assumed that being a newcomer would be a satisfactory substitute for equal status.
2. Living in ethnically hetereogeneous clusters hinders social integration. Rationale: a mixed area would slow down the process of making friends, thereby delaying social integration. According to Gans, "the more intensive form of social interaction (with neighbors), such as friendships, require homogeniety" (134).

B. Population dispersal and absorption
1. Residing near a big city, rather than in a remote development town, helps economic integration.
Rationale: the greater number and wider range of economic opportunities in the city is expected to enhance economic integration. Zilberberg's report of workers in development towns having relatively lower incomes points in this direction.
2. Residing near a big city influences social integration; the study was expected to discover whether the effect is positive or negative.
Rationale: a big city has more public places and events at which a newcomer may meet other people. On the other hand, the big city may cause a newcomer to feel inferior or relatively deprived, and thereby hinder social integration. In an isolated town, where people can hardly avoid knowing each other, a newcomer may find it easier to make friends, especially when

the community is not old and cohesive, but rather new (17 years at the time of the study) and in its developmental stages.

3. Residing near a big city increases rootedness in the town.

Rationale: since immigrants usually tend toward mobility, and the big city provides more chances for mobility, newcomers should prefer a place of greater opportunities. Several Israeli studies (Berler; Kirschenbaum) reported considerable migration from development towns to other settlements, usually near one of the three big cities.

SAMPLE SELECTION AND DATA COLLECTION

The subjects had all three of the following characteristics:

1. They came to Israel between 1960 and 1971. Absorption problems were still acute, but they were probably over the shocks of the initial two or three years.

2. They lived in towns of about 20,000 inhabitants. Similar town size is the central factor in determining the range of economic and social opportunies.

3. Their apartments were assigned to them by public officials.

Budgetary constraints and the need for meaningful comparisons between clusters of residence and within them led us to study only two towns: one close to a big city, and one in a development area. The first, with 22,000 inhabitants is in the Haifa metropolitan area; the second, with 19,000 inhabitants is in the Galilee mountains. They have similar demographic and economic features.[2] Both are average among towns of their type, neither the most prosperous nor the most backward. Thus, they may be considered representative.

In each town we located stable residential clusters[3] of the required ethnic composition in which most of the families had immigrated to Israel between 1960 and 1971. The research setting demanded three housing clusters in each town, hence a total of six clusters.

The interviewers called on each dwelling unit in the clusters and administered a mini-questionnaire within 3–5 minutes. If they found that the family had immigrated to Israel between 1960 and 1971, and had been assigned to its apartment by public officials, the interviewer continued with the full questionnaire.

In order to control for the sex variable without enlarging the population, only women (heads of households or spouses of heads) were interviewed. Women were chosen because it was assumed that they are the better reporters of the housing environment (See a similar argument in Deutsch and Collins.)

The interviewing took place in the summer of 1974. The interviewers evaluated the responses of most of the interviewees as very good (83 per-

cent) and good (13 percent). After three different tests of interviewing reliability, 579 questionnaires were confirmed, roughly 100 in each housing cluster.

Findings[4]

Although "strictly speaking, no proof of causation is ever possible" (Blalock), most researchers try to provide causal interpretations. We attempt to make such interpretations in the following report.

Our study is a survey analysis, but it has one important advantage of experimental research: the dependent absorption variables could have occurred only *after* the housing decisions (our independent variables) had been made by public officials. For 93 percent of the respondents, their home was their first permanent residence in Israel. Most of them had been sent there directly from the port of arrival. The remaining 7 percent were also settled by public officials, although not immediately upon their arrival in Israel. (Every repsondent who selected his apartment himself was removed from our sample).

One can argue that although these people had not been free to choose where they wanted to live, they were free to move; and that those who were studied were the residue of newcomers who had accepted the officials' selection. However, we managed to find stable areas with the original populations, not residues.

As a substitute for an experimental control of other independent variables, we used the statistical control of a regression analysis. The major purposes and results of the analysis are outside the scope of this paper; what we want to point out here is that it determined the hypothesized significant effects of the housing policy variables when many other relevant independent variables were controlled[5] (e.g., ethnic origin, age, education, time in Israel, religiousness, size of family, occupation, relatives in the area, usage of local services, neighboring and others).

The careful selection of the research subjects, the order of the events, and the statistical control of possibly relevant independent variables provide a reasonable basis for our contention: whenever there is an association between our housing policy variables and absorption variables, the former caused the latter.

The tables below present the differences in the dependent variables between the neighborhood composition patterns (Tables 1–2) and between the localities (Tables 3–5). Three demographic variables were controlled: ethnic origin (easterners versus westerners), age (up to 40 versus over 40), and education (up to 8 years of schooling versus over 8 years). These controls will enable us to draw practical conclusions for different groups of newcomers.

HYPOTHESIS A-1

Table 1 partly supports our hypothesis that heterogenous clusters reduce interethnic distance. In both heterogeneous and homogeneous clusters, most easterners have low interethnic social distance scores, which means that most of them have no reservations concerning westerners. In contrast, the percentage of westerners who have no objections to close relationships with easterners is almost three times as high in the heterogeneous clusters

Table 1. PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS HAVING LOW SCORES OF SOCIAL DISTANCE* BY NEIGHBORHOOD COMPOSITION

	Neighborhood Composition			
	Homogeneous Clusters	Heterogeneous Clusters	$\chi^{2\dagger}$	$\gamma\ddagger$
Westerners - total	9% (100% = 165)	25% (100% = 93)	xx	-.56
Young Westerners (up to 39)	11% (100% = 71)	28% (100% = 36)	x	-.50
0-8 Years of schooling	15% (100% = 20)	10% (100% = 9)	. .	. .
9+ Years of schooling	10% (100% = 51)	39% (100% = 26)	xx	-.70
Older Westerners (40+)	7% (100% = 93)	23% (100% = 57)	xx	-.62
0-8 Years of schooling	10% (100% = 50)	25% (100% = 32)	x	-.59
9+ Years of schooling	5% (100% = 42)	20% (100% = 25)	x	-.50
Easterners - total	56% (100% = 152)	58% (100% = 78)	. .	. .
Young Easterners (up to 39)	49% (100% = 79)	51% (100% = 49)	. .	. .
0-8 Years of schooling	52% (100% = 54)	64% (100% = 25)	. .	. .
9+ Years of schooling	48% (100% = 23)	38% (100% = 24)	. .	. .
Older Easterners (40+)	63% (100% = 72)	69% (100% = 29)	. .	. .
0-8 Years of schooling	65% (100% = 58)	81% (100% = 21)	. .	-.38
9+ Years of schooling	67% (100% = 12)	38% (100% = 8)	. .	-.54

*Scoring on the lowest quartile of the scale of interethnic social distance.

†The significance of χ^2 is marked by: xx P $\leq$ .01; x P $\leq$ .10; (-)P > .10.

‡γ measure of association is reported when γ > .20; otherwise: (-).

as in the homogeneous ones. The differences are highly significant in five of the six comparisons when age and education are controlled; in the sixth, the number of cases is too small.

This finding that westerners' attitudes toward easterners can be influenced by heterogeneous residential arrangements is important because westerners are known to be prejudiced against easterners,[6] and therefore a change in their attitude is a precondition for the ethnic integration of the Israeli society.

However, the question is why residential proximity has a positive impact on the attitudes of westerners towards easterners, while no such impact is found among easterners. Furthermore, younger westerners tend to have lower interethnic social distance scores (to be less prejudiced) than older westerners, but among easterners the opposite tendency appears. In addition, the least restrictive westerners are highly educated, young, residing in heterogeneous clusters. But those in the parallel group of easterners are least open to close relationships with the group of the other origin.

A possible explanation for these unexpected findings is that an increased knowledge of the western way of life increases feelings of relative deprivation among easterners; as a result, they tend to develop anti-western feelings. This can explain why younger and better educated easterners, who had more opportunities to meet western ways of thinking and acting, emphasized their social distance from those of western origin. Consequently, the reason why we did not find significant differences between the interethnic social distance scores of easterners in heterogeneous and homogeneous clusters may be that the positive impact of the heterogeneous residence was offset by the emergence of such negative feelings.

HYPOTHESIS A-2

Table 2 does not support the hypothesis that living in ethnically heterogeneous clusters slows down the social integration of newcomers. On the contrary, residents in such clusters tend to have higher social integration scores than those in homogeneous clusters. This phenomenon is more prominent among westerners, although it also appears in the eastern population. Only two X^2 tests in the table are significant; however, a few Gamma coefficients are fairly high, indicating this tendency.

Since these findings contradict the conclusions of many researchers (and assuming that they are not a methodological artifact,[7] but point to a real tendency), they call for further research to specify the conditions under which they occur. Several suggestions in this direction are provided in the discussion of the findings.

Table 2. PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS HAVING HIGH SCORES OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION* BY THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD COMPOSITION

	Neighborhood Composition			
	Homogeneous Clusters	Heterogeneous Clusters	$x^{2\dagger}$	$\gamma\ddagger$
Westerners - total	50% (100% = 179)	64% (100% = 98)	x	.29
Young Westerners (up to 39)	47% (100% = 77)	63% (100% = 40)	. .	.31
0-8 Years of schooling	64% (100% = 22)	78% (100% = 9)	. .	.33
9+ Years of schooling	40% (100% = 55)	57% (100% = 30)	. .	.34
Older Westerners (40+)	52% (100% = 101)	66% (100% = 58)	. .	.28
0-8 Years of schooling	63% (100% = 56)	61% (100% = 33)	. .	. .
9+ Years of schooling	36% (100% = 44)	72% (100% = 25)	xx	.64
Easterners - total	37% (100% = 156)	47% (100% = 83)	. .	.20
Young Easterners (up to 39)	41% (100% = 78)	56% (100% = 52)	. .	.29
0-8 Years of schooling	39% (100% = 52)	56% (100% = 27)	. .	.33
9+ Years of schooling	50% (100% = 22)	56% (100% = 25)	. .	. .
Older Easterners (40+)	32% (100% = 77)	32% (100% = 31)	. .	. .
0-8 Years of schooling	34% (100% = 70)	36% (100% = 22)	. .	. .
9+ Years of schooling	14% (100% = 7)	22% (100% = 9)	. .	.26

*Scoring $\geq$ the median of the scale of social integration.

† ‡See notes in Table 1.

HYPOTHESIS B-1

The findings in Table 3 for the total population are in the hypothesized direction: people who live close to a big city have higher economic integration scores than do residents of the development town, but the differences are not large enough to be statistically significant. When the population is divided into demographic groups, a clearer picture emerges. As expected, owing to more economic opportunities in the large city, economic integration scores of westerners (both younger and older, with lower or higher

Table 3. PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS HAVING HIGH SCORES OF ECONOMIC INTEGRATION* BY LOCATION OF THEIR RESIDENCE

	Location of Residence		$\chi^{2\dagger}$	$\gamma\pm$
	Near Big City	Development Town		
Total population	56% (100% = 253)	49% (100% = 216)	. .	. .
Westerners- total	69% (100% = 123)	55% (100% = 126)	x	.30
Young Westerners (up to 39)	78% (100% = 41)	60% (100% = 65)	x	.41
0-8 Years of schooling	62% (100% = 13)	35% (100% = 20)	. .	.50
9+ Years of schooling	86% (100% = 28)	73% (100% = 44)	. .	.38
Older Westerners (40+)	64% (100% = 81)	49% (100% = 61)	x	.30
0-8 Years of schooling	51% (100% = 35)	47% (100% = 34)	. .	. .
9+ Years of schooling	73% (100% = 45)	58% (100% = 24)	. .	.33
Easterners - total	44% (100% = 130)	40% (100% = 90)	. .	. .
Young Easterners (up to 39)	46% (100% = 68)	53% (100% = 58)	. .	. .
0-8 Years of schooling	38% (100% = 37)	50% (100% = 36)	. .	-.24
9+ Years of schooling	54% (100% = 31)	68% (100% = 19)	. . . .	-.28 -.28
Older Easterners (40+)	42% (100% = 60)	16% (100% = 32)	x	.59
0-8 Years of schooling	40% (100% = 35)	15% (100% = 20)	x	.58
9+ Years of schooling	50% (100% = 22)	20% (100% = 10)	. .	.60

*Scoring ≥ the median of the scale of economic integration.

† ‡See notes in Table 1.

education) are significantly higher when they live close to a big city. The same applies to older easterners, but not to younger easterners.

The differences by locality among young easterners are in the opposite direction: more of them have high economic integration scores in the development town than in the town close to the city. Chi-square values are not significant, but when education is controlled the Gamma coefficients are fairly high.

This finding can be interpreted as an indication of economic discrimination against young easterners in the large city. Other data in this

study support this interpretation, although pointing to structural rather than personal discrimination.

HYPOTHESIS B-2

In the total population, there is a significant difference between the levels of social integration in the two towns (Table 4). However, these total percentages reflect different patterns in the two ethnic groups. There is no difference between westerners in the two towns; however, 49 percent of

Table 4. PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS HAVING HIGH SCORES OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION* BY THEIR LOCATION OF RESIDENCE

	Location of Residence		$x^{2\dagger}$	$\gamma\ddagger$
	Near Big City	Development Town		
Total population	43% (100% = 293)	51% (100% = 281)	x	. .
Westerners - total	54% (100% = 141)	52% (100% = 161)	. .	. .
Young Westerners (up to 39)	47% (100% = 43)	54% (100% = 82)	. .	. .
0-8 Years of schooling	75% (100% = 8)	64% (100% = 25)	. .	. .
9+ Years of schooling	38% (100% = 34)	49% (100% = 57)	. .	. .
Older Westerners (40+)	57% (100% = 96)	49% (100% = 79)	. .	. .
0-8 Years of schooling	60% (100% = 47)	56% (100% = 50)	. .	. .
9+ Years of schooling	54% (100% = 48)	38% (100% = 29)	. .	.32
Easterners - total	33% (100% = 152)	49% (100% = 120)	xx	-.33
Young Easterners (up to 39)	41% (100% = 73)	55% (100% = 71)	. .	-.28
0-8 Years of schooling	37% (100% = 35)	51% (100% = 49)	. .	-.28
9+ Years of schooling	49% (100% = 35)	62% (100% = 21)	. .	-.26
Older Westerners (40+)	25% (100% = 77)	41% (100% = 49)	x	-.36
0-8 Years of schooling	28% (100% = 60)	47% (100% = 38)	x	-.39
9+ Years of schooling	8% (100% = 13)	29% (100% = 7)	. .	.66

*Scoring $\geq$ the median of the scale of social integration.

† ‡See notes in Table 1.

the easterners in the remote town scored high in social integration, compared to 33 percent of those near the city. Similar differences by locality in the eastern group also prevail when age and education are held constant.

These findings can be explained in light of the rationale for hypothesis B-2. For western newcomers, whose former way of life did not differ dramatically from city life in Israel, the social advantages of residing close to a big city outweigh the natural convergence of residents in a small remote settlement. But the situation is different for eastern newcomers, especially the older ones, who tend to avoid non-family social contacts when they live near a city—probably because they have difficulty in fitting themselves to the city's way of life. But in the small remote community, where the symbols of western society are less salient, they can afford to be more open—and thus have higher social integration.

HYPOTHESIS B-3

As hypothesized, people who live near the city have higher rootedness scores than do residents of the remote town. However, there are differences between demographic groups (Table 5). Among westerners, the hypothesis is confirmed for all of the age and education groups. But among easterners, the reverse is true: those in the remote town score significantly higher. A breakdown by age reveals that this reverse association is only among older easterners, especially those with lower education; among young, better-educated easterners, there is a fairly strong tendency in favor of the close town, similar to that among westerners.

This finding for young easterners, although in accordance with the rationale for hypothesis B-3, seems peculiar in the light of previous findings on their relative economic success in the remote town, and their high social integration there. It appears that while the remote town is good enough for older easterners, it does not meet the expectations of highly educated young easterners.

Discussion and Applications

Although as sociologists we are interested in all variables which affect immigrant absorption, we limited this paper to those which are manipulable by social planners in Israel—namely, the neighborhood composition policy and the population dispersal policy.

The declared goal of ethnically heterogeneous neighborhoods is to integrate newcomers of eastern and western origin. We found that only 15 percent of the westerners were prepared to have very close contacts with easterners, while 57 percent of the easterners were so inclined toward westerners. Thus, realization of this goal requires attitudinal changes mainly

Table 5. PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS HAVING HIGH SCORES OF ROOTEDNESS IN TOWN OF RESIDENCE* BY THEIR LOCATION OF RESIDENCE

	Location of Residence		$\chi^{2\dagger}$	$\gamma\ddagger$
	Near Big City	Development Town		
Total population	53% (100% = 292)	44% (100% = 276)	xx	.21
Westerners - total	58% (100% = 141)	31% (100% = 156)	xx	.50
Young Westerners (up to 39)	44% (100% = 43)	26% (100% = 78)	x	.39
0-8 Years of schooling	63% (100% = 8)	21% (100% = 24)	x	.73
9+ Years of schooling	41% (100% = 34)	28% (100% = 53)	. .	.28
Older Westerners (40+)	64% (100% = 96)	37% (100% = 78)	xx	.49
0-8 Years of schooling	81% (100% = 47)	38% (100% = 50)	xx	.75
9+ Years of schooling	48% (100% = 48)	36% (100% = 28)	. .	.25
Easterners - total	48% (100% = 151)	59% (100% = 120)	x	-.23
Young Easterners (up to 39)	53% (100% = 75)	46% (100% = 72)	. .	. .
0-8 Years of schooling	51% (100% = 37)	51% (100% = 49)	. .	. .
9+ Years of schooling	57% (100% = 35)	36% (100% = 22)	. .	.40
Older Westerners (40+)	42% (100% = 74)	79% (100% = 48)	xx	-.68
0-8 Years of schooling	46% (100% = 57)	84% (100% = 38)	xx	-.73
9+ Years of schooling	31% (100% = 13)	43% (100% = 7)	. .	-.26

*Scoring $\geq$ the median of the scale of rootedness in town of residence.

† ‡See notes in Table 1.

among westerners; and our findings show that such changes are fostered by heterogeneous neighborhoods.

In addition, we found (in contrast to other researchers) that heterogeneous patterns tend to help the social integration of newcomers more than do homogeneous patterns. The conclusion is that settling newcomers in mixed clusters can serve as an appropriate tool for achieving ethnic integration and, probably, social integration as well.

However, our study (and others) indicates that the positive effect of

ethnically heterogeneous patterns can be achieved only when several social conditions are maintained. The first is that the residents should have some kind of common background factor; in other studies, this was a common SES, while in our case it was a similar period of time since immigration. The second condition is that they should have common problems (in our case, the problems of absorption) which can draw them closer together.

A third condition indicated by former studies is the prevention of threats to status by unexpected neighbors. This can be achieved by planning the neighborhood in advance for mixed population. This was done in our case, and it helped also in creating the fourth condition: a social climate that encourages interethnic contacts. The tenants were aware of the support of the authorities, who planned the mixed housing, and of the people who live in the area.

These conditions apparently explain the success of our ethnically mixed clusters. We therefore recommend the creation of these or similar social conditions in future housing projects, and further research into the factors which promote ethnic and social integration in mixed neighborhoods.

Another question is how the families in heterogeneous clusters should be dispersed. A few recent studies recommend that a mixed area consist of homogeneous units (blocks and the like). Contrary to this, our clusters were completely mixed; each entrance had families of different ethnic origins. Therefore, our recommendation is similar to Shuval's (a) and Shuval and Levi's. But instead of her demand for a rigid structure of one similar and one different neighbor for each tenant, our findings lead to a more flexible recommendation of several neighbors of each ethnic origin in each entrance.

Locality was our second independent variable of housing policy; we examined the impact of population dispersal on the social absorption of newcomers. A basic difference was found between newcomers of different origins: generally, easterners were absorbed better in the remote town, while westerners were absorbed better in the town near the city.

On the face of it, therefore, only eastern newcomers should be directed to development towns since westerners are integrated more slowly in such a town and, having no local roots, eventually tend to leave. But since this would be counter to the goal of ethnic integration, development towns must be changed to make them more attractive to westerners. We plan further analyses of data from this study to indicate what policies (especially housing policies) can reduce the tendency of westerners and well-educated young easterners to leave development towns.

Conclusions

Scholars and policymakers disagree about the social impact of housing: is it only an expensive consumption good, or does it have a multiplier social

effect—i.e., can it contribute in the long run to the achievement of social goals such as upward mobility and the social integration of its tenants? Many studies have pointed at empirical associations between housing and social developments. But in most cases, the causal order of the association was unclear, because there was almost always the possibility of self-selection.

Our data provided a rare opportunity to study the social consequences of governmental housing policies in a setting where the distinction between cause and effect is clear. We found that policies influenced the social and economic integration of newcomers to Israel.

We conclude that housing policies can be manipulated to achieve social goals. Some suggestions for Israel were presented above. Researchers in each country should investigate the social effects of its policies and the specific conditions in which these housing policies have reasonable prospects of reaching desirable social goals.

Notes

1. The differences and strains between these two ethnic groups have been documented by several studies: Peres (a, b), Shuval (b), and Smooha.
2. The similarities are reported in Hebrew in Carmon (a).
3. The term neighborhood is not used here, in order to avoid the controversy over its definition. Each cluster is a physically recognizable unit, differentiated from others by a clear border (street, public area), or by the shape of its buildings.
4. For descriptive data of the population, see Appendix.
5. A discussion of the regression analysis appears in a separate article, now being written. In addition to the independent variables which appear in the tables of this paper (but age and education distribution by years, not as dichotomies), the regression analysis includes: time in Israel, size of family, level of occupation, religiousness, neighbors, relatives in the neighborhood, use of local services and others.
6. See the references mentioned in note 3.
7. This assumption is supported by the regression analysis of social integration as a dependent variable, in which the beta weight of "residing in an ethnically heterogeneous cluster" is .14 ($F = 13.2$; $P \leqslant .001$ for 539 cases), while 9 other relevant independent variables are controlled.

Appendix. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS (PERCENTAGES)

	Total Population N = 579	Near Big City				Development Town			
		Total N = 296	Eastern N = 94	Western N = 118	Heterogen. N = 84	Total N = 283	Eastern N = 92	Western N = 94	Heterogen. N = 97
Country of Origin									
Europe and America	52	48	12	85	46	57	15	94	60
Asia and Africa	48	52	88	15	53	43	85	6	40
Age									
20-39	48	40	50	33	40	55	48	56	60
40-59	46	52	49	58	48	40	46	39	35
60-69	6	8	1	9	12	5	6	4	5
Education									
0-4 Years	17	15	26	10	10	20	30	21	10
5-8 Years	36	37	43	30	40	35	36	38	31
9-12 Years	35	35	28	40	33	36	31	28	46
13+ Years	12	14	2	20	17	10	4	14	13
Density*									
Up to 1.0	39	41	30	56	35	37	16	38	56
1.1-2.0	47	45	46	39	52	49	48	61	40
2.1-3.0	11	11	20	3	12	11	30	1	3
3.1-3.5	2	2	4	2	1	2	5	..	1

*Number of persons per room (kitchen and bathroom are not counted as rooms).

References

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.

Berler, Alexander. 1970. *New Towns in Israel*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Press.

Blalock, Hurbert M. 1970. *An Introduction to Social Research*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Broady, M. 1966. "Social Theory in Architectural Design." *Architectural Association Journal* 81:149–54.

Carmon, Naomi. a:1975. *Attaining Social Goals through Housing Policy: The Evolution of the Aspiration and an Empirical Study of the Implementation*. Haifa, Israel: Unpublished D.Sc. dissertation: Technion-Israel Institute of Technology (Hebrew).

———. b:1976. "Social Planning of Housing." *Journal of Social Policy* 5(January):49–59.

Coleman, James S. 1971. *Resources for Social Change: Race in the United States*. New York: Wiley.

Deutsch, Morton, and Mary E. Collins. 1951. *Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of Social Experiment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Douglas, James W., and J. M. Blomfield. 1958. *Children Under Five*. London:Allen & Unwin.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1968. *The Active Society*. New York: Free Press.

Fishman, J. A. 1961. "Some Social and Psychological Determinants of Intergroup Relations in Changing Neighborhood." *Social Forces* 40(October):42–51.

Gans, H. J. 1961. "Planning and Social Life." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 27(May):134–40.

Ginsberg, Yona. 1975. *Jews in Changing Neighborhood, The Study of Mattapan*. New York: Free Press.

Glazer, N. 1967. "Housing Policy and the Family." *The Journal of Marriage and the Family* 29(February):140–63.

Haber, Aliza. 1975. *Population and Building in Israel, 1948–1973*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Housing, Programming Department (Hebrew).

Kain, John F. a:1965. *The Effect of the Ghetto on the Distribution and Level of Nonwhite Employment in Urban Areas*. Rand Corporation:P-3059-1.

———. b:1968. "Housing Segregation, Negro Employment, and Metropolitan Decentralization." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 82(May):175–97.

———. c:1975. *Essays of Urban Spatial Structure*. Cambridge: Ballinger.

Kirschenbaum, A. 1972. "Selective Migration and Population Redistribution: A Study of New Towns in Israel." Haifa: Center for Urban and Regional Studies, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology. Working Paper # 2.

Lipman, A. 1969. "The Architectural Belief System and Social Behavior." *The British Journal of Sociology* 20(June):190–204.

Masters, S. H. 1974. "A Note on John Kain's 'Housing Segregation, Negro Employment, and Metropolitan Decentralization'." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 88 (August):505–12.

Meer, B. and E. Freedman. 1966. "The Impact of Negro Neighbors on White House Owners." *Social Forces* 45(September):11–19.

Mooney, J. D. 1969. "Housing Segregation, Negro Employment and Metropolitan Decentralization." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 83(May):299–311.

Moynihan, Daniel P. 1969. *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding*. New York: Free Press.

Nunally, Jum C. 1967. *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Peres, Yochanan. a:1971. "Ethnic Relations in Israel." *American Journal of Sociology* 76(May):1021–47.

————. b:1976. *Ethnic Relations in Israel*. Tel-Aviv, Israel: Sifriat Hapoalim (Hebrew).

Pettigrew, T. F. 1973. "Attitudes of Race and Housing: A Socio Psychological View." In Amos H. Hawley and Vincent P. Rock (eds.), *Segregation in Residential Areas*. Washington: National Academy of Science.

Schorr, Alvin L. 1963. *Slums and Social Insecurity*. U.S. Department of HEW, Social Security Administration: Research Report # 1.

Sewell, W. H., and J. M. Armer. 1966. "Neighborhood Context and College Plans." *American Sociological Review* 31(April):159–68.

Shuval, Judith T. a:1959. *Social Problems in Development Towns*. Jerusalem: The Institute for Applied Social Research (Hebrew).

————. b.1962. "Emerging Patterns of Ethnic Strain in Israel." *Social Forces* 40(May): 323–29.

Shuval, Judith T., and Shlomit Levi. 1966. *Residential Patterns and Social Relations in the Model Neighborhood in Qiryat-Gat*. Jerusalem: The Institute of Applied Social Research (Hebrew).

Smooha, Sami. 1975. *Israel: Pluralism and Conflict*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wilner, Daniel M., Rosabelle P. Walbley, and S. W. Cook a:1955. *Human Relations in Interracial Housing: A Study of the Contact Hypothesis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wilner, Daniel M., Rosabelle P. Walbley, Thomas C. Pinkerton, and Matthew Tayback. b:1962. *The Housing Environment and Family Life: A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Housing on Morbidity and Mental Health*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Zilberberg, Ruth. 1973. *Distribution of the Population of Israel: 1948–1972*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Financing (Hebrew).