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ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Sociology of Planned Migration, the subject of this thesis, is the product of a research into the movement of firms and workers from the inner areas of London to new towns. It is mainly a contribution to the sociology of planning, although its broader aims and objectives are:

(a) To develop the concept of planned migration, based on the policy of dispersing and decentralising urban population and industries to new towns; and to use the concept as a framework to develop a distinctive area of knowledge known as Sociology of Planned Migration.

(b) To provide a descriptive account of a typical planned migration process, as the background for studying attitudes to out-migration from the city, and for promoting understanding of the nature of change involved in planned migration to new towns.

(c) To offer a theoretical explanation to planned migration decisions of city residents to new towns, and

(d) To explore the wider theoretical issues in Sociology and the policy implications which planned migration raises.

The chosen locale for the research was one in which migrant firms provided their workers with the opportunity of choosing between moving out of the city to a new town or staying behind. The main issue was, therefore, one of determining how the workers exercised the
choice between these alternatives, through their migration decisions. The problem was not only that of identifying the determinants of and the constraints on mobility, but also and more importantly, that of explaining their migration decisions and the frame of reference on which they were made. It was necessary to adopt a research design which would enable planned migration to be studied as a process of social change, so that conclusions may be drawn about the subjective interpretations and meanings that workers attached to out-migration, their attitudes to moving, the stages of transition and adaptative processes through which they had to pass to move to a new town, the decision-making process itself and the action frame of reference.

The method of study was based on testing the hypothesis that the migration decisions of city residents tend to be motivated by the desire to satisfy non-work aspirations, by carrying out a secondary analysis of the data from the Survey of Migrant Firms. This survey, involving four firms that moved from London to new towns, was undertaken by the author as a member of the research team on the New Towns Project sponsored by the Social Science Research Council. The main findings of the present research can be summarised as follows:-

1. Migration decision-making, as a process, is an adaptive response to a change of environment.

2. Migration decisions of city residents were based on cost-benefit analysis of the relative advantages and disadvantages of moving or staying behind.
3. The drop-out rate was 59%. This means that the firms, on average, transferred only 41% of their staff to their new locations in new towns.

4. Up to 61% of the working class respondents moved, compared with only 39% that did not.

5. Contrary to existing evidence on selectivity in migration, more older workers moved compared with the younger ones; and the skilled manual workers, the professionals and the technicians, as well as respondents with higher qualifications and formal training, tended to stay behind in spite of attractive inducements from employers.

6. Of those who moved, 17% were motivated by the desire to keep their jobs and to maintain their career progression; while the remaining 83% were motivated by the desire to satisfy non-work aspirations which are dominated by environmental quality and housing.

In addition to providing an opportunity for studying the migration process and attitudes to leaving the city for new towns, this research has both facilitated a better understanding of the nature of migration and decision-making, and contributed to the debate on environmental determinism, social mobility, non-work sociology, and the open system theory in industrial sociology. In all this, the aim has been to demonstrate the application of action frame of reference to the study of planned migration and industrial behaviour in a changing situation. In general, however,
the findings have raised more questions than they would have answered. For instance, is environmental quality increasingly becoming a social value and a new route to social mobility? In the near future, will the search for better environment increase the 'retreat into the suburbs' and hasten the death of the cities? How far does the finding about mobility of city residents to new towns by age, class and profession challenge current assumptions and knowledge from migration studies? These questions may seem rather provocative, but they indicate new directions in which planners may have to focus attention in order to improve their understanding of the relationship between the dynamics of urban population movement and future planning policies, with reference to new towns.

In the current debate about the relevance of the policy of dispersal and decentralisation of population and industries to new towns, many have argued that the policy has encouraged the decline of our cities. However, evidence from this research shows that whether or not such policy continues to operate movements out of the cities are inevitable. At the same time, it is also evident that whilst the new towns hold a great deal of attraction for some city residents, many others still find the city a valuable habitat. The policy implication of this situation suggests that to continue new town development simultaneously with the renewal of the cities would provide two equally desirable communities for work and living. The choice as to which is better must remain with the individual. Today,
it is a fact that dispersal and decentralisation of population and the new town development have both become established features of British planning. It seems, therefore, appropriate that a systematic study of the influence of this innovation on social evolution, social policy, economic and regional planning and settlement patterns should now be a subject of academic interest under the title of Sociology of Planned Migration.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

ABSTRACT OF THESIS iv

INTRODUCTION xv

ABBREVIATIONS xxii

PART 1: PLANNED MIGRATION STUDY - HISTORY, CONCEPT, AIDS AND METHODOLOGY

Chapter | Page
---|---
1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CONCEPT OF PLANNED MIGRATION | 1
1.1 Dispersal and Decentralisation to New Towns | 1
1.2 The Concept of Planned Migration | 27

2. RESEARCH AIM, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY | 40
2.1 Aims and Objectives | 40
2.2 Research Problems and Design | 41
2.3 Methodology | 43
2.4 Limitations of the Research Method | 50
2.5 Review of Literature | 52
2.6 Contributions of the research to knowledge | 66

PART 2: PLANNED MIGRATION PROCESS AND MIGRATION DECISION-MAKING

3. THE PLANNED MIGRATION PROCESS: A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS | 68
3.1 The Meaning Attached to Planned Migration | 68
3.2 The Role of Management in Planned Migration | 72
3.3 Planned Migration Model - The Dichotomy and Fallacy of Before-and-After | 101
3.4 The Attitudes of Workers | 121
3.5 Summary | 126

4. MIGRATION DECISION-MAKING: A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS | 129
4.1 Migration Decision-making as cost-benefit analysis | 129
4.2 Structure and Determinants of Migration Decisions of Workers | 138
4.3 Decision-making Unit and Propensity to Move | 154
4.4 Migration Decision-making as an adaptive response | 181
4.5 Objective Characteristics and Typology of Migrants | 199
4.6 Summary of Main Findings, and Conclusions | 215
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. ACTION FRAME OF REFERENCE IN MIGRATION DECISION-MAKING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Migration decision-making as a unit of social action</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 The Action Frame of Reference of Migrant Workers</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Social Status, Life Style and Residential Location</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Conclusions</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART 3: THEORETICAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF PLANNED MIGRATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. THEORETICAL ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGY RAISED BY PLANNED MIGRATION</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 The Environment as a sociological concept</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Environmental Determinism</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Organisation Analysis - System Theory applied to Industrial Relocation</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Workers' Motivation and frame of reference in Migration Decisions</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Community and Urban Theory-- the relevance to Planned Migration</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Conclusions</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF PLANNED MIGRATION TO NEW TOWNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Successes and Failures of New Towns - a Brief Review</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 New Towns Population by the year 2000: Problem of Balance</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Re-Appraisal of the policy of dispersal and Decentralisation to new towns: The Case of London</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Summary and Conclusions</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART 4: DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF PLANNED MIGRATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SOCIOLOGY OF PLANNED MIGRATION</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Sociology of Planning: A Functional Evaluation</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Development of the Sociology of Planned Migration</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Substantive Issues in Sociology of Planned Migration</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS - FURTHER RESEARCH AND PROPOSALS</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES: 1. The New Towns Project and Survey of Migrant Firms</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interview Schedule and Questionnaires</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Migrant Firms Studied - A brief History</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Operation of the New and Expanding Town Scheme (formerly I.S.S.)</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF TABLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Employees in Employment, 1964-1971</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Industry in London New Towns to 1972</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agreed GLC Town Development Scheme as at 30 June 1972</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Age Structure of population movement from GLC to New/Expanding Towns, 1966</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Socio-economic grouping of population movement from GLC to New and Expanding Towns, 1966</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Population: Total Change and Rate of Change 1951-1961-1971</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 S.E.G. of emigrants from London to New and Expanding Towns - 1966 10% Sample Census</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Evaluation of effects of Exhibition Displays, Film Shows</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Effects of Management Orientation Stimuli on Attitudes</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Assessment of Workers' Area/Street</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Relatives living within easy reach</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Frequency of Contacts with relatives</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Importance of Relatives living nearby</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Drop-out rate of workers from migrant firms</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Cost-benefit Analysis, A</td>
<td>133 &amp; 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cost-benefit Analysis, B</td>
<td>136 &amp; 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Housing Tenure in London</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Amenities of London Housing</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Comparable Rent/Rates in London and New Towns</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Length of Service with migrant firms</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22(a) Household Size of Movers and Non-movers</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22(b) Household Type of Movers and Non-movers</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Intentions for contemplated change of residential location</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Choice of area to which respondents wished to move</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Respondents practical steps toward moving</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Residential location of respondents before present address</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Constraints on previous attempt to change residence</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 S.E.G. of GLC, Islington, Stress Area Residents and Migrant Workers</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Ethnic Origin (Birthplace) of Islington, Stress Area Residents and Workers</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Stress Area Residents' Attitude to moving to New Towns</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Reasons for making the right decision to move</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Reasons for making the wrong decision to move</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Age of Heads of Household - Migrant workers, stress area residents, GLC residents, residents in 6 London New Towns</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Age of heads of household - Migrant Firms Workers ISS Registrants, etc.</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 S.E.G. of Migrants to New Towns</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 S.E.G. of Heads of Households</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Ethnic Origins of Respondents - Workers, Residents etc.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Educational Attainment of Migrants</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 S.E.G. of ISS Registrants</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 (a &amp; b) Age Structure of ISS Registrants</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Sex and Marital Status of ISS Registrants</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Family and Household Size of ISS Registrants</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Population of Other New Towns by year 2000</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Jobs Created in British New Towns UP to 1975</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(a) Total cost of new town development (estimated) to 1975</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Employment in three industry groups - 1961 and 1974</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Employment in industry group (GLC) 1961-1974</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 London Households and Dwelling Needs for 1971-1976</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Zoning of London based on the system of concentric circles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A Strategy for the South East based on system of paired axes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Movements to New and Expanding Towns - A classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Planned Migration Process - Before-and-After Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stages in the Migration Process and Levels of Stimuli and Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Factors influencing Migration Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stages and Components of Adaptation Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Socio-spatial Interaction Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Components of Workers' Frame of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Totality of Environment of the Individual (Classification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Nature of Human Environment based on organic concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Operation of the New and Expanding Town Scheme (Appendix 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The original study of migrant firms, undertaken by the author as a member of a research team on the New Towns Project (see Appendix 1), was basically an investigation into the reasons why 'disadvantaged minorities' are minimally represented in new towns. It was a fact-finding, policy-oriented study lacking in theoretical framework. Its hypotheses were neither the deductions of any body of theory nor were they based on any set of sociological propositions. However, the insight which I gained from the study and the data that it generated seemed to suggest that the movement of population to new towns raises interesting theoretical issues in sociology and have social policy implications - which require further exploration and interpretation. It was to remedy these fundamental methodological weaknesses of that study and to be able to pursue the theoretical and policy implications of dispersal and decentralisation that a further research, on which this thesis is based, has been undertaken. This present research particularly re-examines the planned migration process and tests empirically the hypothesis that the migration decisions of inner city residents tend to be motivated by the satisfaction of non-work aspirations.

The broad aim and objectives of the thesis can, therefore, be summarised by five propositions. First, to provide a historical background to the origin of planned population movements, and within this context, to develop the concept of planned migration, and argue the case for the development of the Sociology of Planned
Migration as a distinctive area of knowledge within Sociology of Planning. Second, it is to provide a descriptive account of a typical planned migration process as a background for promoting understanding of attitudes to moving; and to facilitate the study of the various stages of transition undergone by potential migrants before they get to a new town. Third, to provide a theoretical explanation to migration decisions by discovering the determinants of and constraints to migration, and the frame of reference on which the decisions were made. Fourth, to provide a general guide for the possible development of a theory of planned migration. Fifth, to undertake a critical exploration of the wider theoretical issues and social policy implications which planned migration seem to have generated.

The point of departure is taken from tracing the social historical conditions, the philosphical and ideological contributions of social reformers and the advocate planners, and the series of interventionist legislations that permanently established the policy of dispersal and decentralisation to new towns. Following from this, the thesis has focussed attention on how inner city workers exercised the choice between moving to new towns or staying behind in a situation in which they were offered the opportunity of moving. How essential was it for the management of migrant firms to prepare, condition and induce workers in order that they might take the chance to move? How was the ultimate migration decision made in the exercise of that choice? These questions will relate to the mechanics of the
migration process and will constitute the necessary considerations in the determination of attitudes to moving, the explanation of managerial behaviour and the motivations of workers. The movement of a firm has been construed as a particular kind of migration involving the simultaneous transfer of the firm, the job and the worker to a new environment. For this particular reason, relocation provides a social laboratory within which managerial behaviour as well as the reactions of workers to change can be sociologically studied. It is essential to determine how far, in exercising the choice between moving out to new towns or staying behind in the city, were migration decisions rational: rational in terms of using the opportunity to move to a new town as both goal and instrument for the satisfaction of non-work aspirations; or rational in terms of regarding the movement to a new town as a valuable new route to social mobility?

In testing the hypothesis stated above, a secondary analysis of the data from the original study of migrant firms (Survey of Migrant Firms) has been carried out. In addition, data from the following surveys, which were also different aspects of the New Towns Project, have been analysed and linked with the present study: Survey of Stress Area Residents in Islington; Survey of Migrant Workers to New Towns from Islington; and Survey of the ISS Registrants. In some ways, Islington Stress Area residents have served as a controlled group. In order to promote better understanding of the attitudes of migrant firm workers, it seemed necessary to compare their attitudes with those Islington residents who were not similarly offered the
opportunity to move. More so, in order to evaluate the part played by environmental quality in the migration decision of inner city residents, the two environments of the inner city area and the new town needed to be compared. It was therefore, necessary to adopt a research method and design which should enable conclusions to be drawn about migration process itself, migration decision-making, the frame of reference on which they were made, and the non-work aspirations of respondents. To do this, there were obvious methodological problems. In explaining migration decision, no single theory could be satisfactorily applied from economics, social psychology or sociology. Even within Sociology, there could be competing theories seeking to explain the same phenomenon. An inter-disciplinary approach was inevitable; but that implies reliance on a substantive review of literature and drawing together resources from economics, geography, urban sociology, industrial sociology, social psychology, and regional planning. Inevitably, this made the task much more difficult. Furthermore, it did not seem sufficient to determine the non-work aspirations of respondents only from the reasons they gave for either moving or staying behind. It seemed necessary to consider a series of factors that determine the propensity to move: from the specific reasons given, to efforts made in the past in order to move; from the relative significance attached to work and non-work needs, to the responses given to management conditioning and inducements to move. There were also inherent limitations with which the method and design of the study had to contend.
In the strictest statistical sense, the migrant firms that were studied may not be regarded as representative of firms moving out of the inner city areas; nor can it be claimed that migrant workers represent typical inner city residents. Nevertheless, the firms were chosen because they represent manufacturing as well as distributive industries; they were located mainly in the inner city areas prior to their movement; and because all the main socio-economic groups and various ethnic groups were reasonably represented in the total workforce. On the other hand, there were a few instances in which lack of available statistical data, especially from the 1971 Census, inevitably prevented the provision of up-to-date technical information. In spite of these limitations, the findings have been revealing and informative, and in some cases, rather provocative. Far from representing the answers to problems, the significance of the findings lies rather in the questions that they raise. For example, what can they tell the student of migration; who, from the inner city areas are more likely to move to new towns and who are likely to stay behind? How can this knowledge enable modifications to be made in the policy of dispersal to new towns and the renewal of inner city area? Some of these questions and the issues with which they are linked have been considered in the closing chapter.

Social research, invariably does not always lead either to the complete resolution of debatable issues, or to clear guidelines for social policy. Nevertheless, it does add to existing knowledge and often points to deficiencies in policy. It may also reveal the complexities inherent in the interpretation of social policy and could, suggest new lines of action in the light of new evidence.
This research, hopefully, may have thrown some light on the evolution of this society through planned migration. From its findings, it seems to have particularly challenged accepted evidence, wisdom and common-sense assumptions about migration, and directed attention to planned migration as a new area of knowledge. In pursuing its main aims and objectives, the research has applied the theories of social change, adaptation, social action, organisational behaviour and motivation in the study of planned migration and migration decision-making. By their nature, both academic knowledge and social policy tend to become more acceptable through continuing debate. It was with this fact in mind, that this research has been oriented so as to contribute:

a) to the debate on the policy of dispersal and decentralisation, especially in the effect it may have on future new town development and the revitalisation of the inner cities.
b) to a debate on the more academic issues of urbanism and urban sociology, ecology and environmental determinism, and the embourgeoisement of the working class by residential location and life-style.

The text of the thesis is presented in Nine Chapters divided into Four Parts. Part One (Chapters 1 and 2) deals with the historical background and the development of the concept of planned migration; and with the aim, design and methodology of the research.
Part Two (Chapters 3, 4 and 5) provides a descriptive account of planned migration process, a descriptive analysis of migration decision-making, and an assessment of the frame of reference on which migration decisions are made. Part Three (Chapters 6 and 7) examines the wider sociological issues raised by planned migration which are dealt with under theoretical issues and policy implications. Part Four (Chapters 8 and 9) deals with two issues, namely: the development of a Sociology of Planned Migration and the Summaries and Conclusions. The latter includes a number of specific propositions and indications of directions for further research.
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<td>G.L.C.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L.D.P.</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Outer Metropolitan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S.E.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.R.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>C.R.C.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.E.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.o.E.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.S.D.</td>
<td>Civil Service Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.P.C.S.</td>
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</tr>
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PART ONE

PLANNED MIGRATION STUDY: HISTORY.

CONCEPT, AIMS AND METHODOLOGY
Chapter 1

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CONCEPT OF PLANNED MIGRATION

1.1 Dispersal and Decentralisation to New Towns

Ebenezer Howard must be remembered as having prepared the way for a systematic development of planned re-distribution of population and industries from large cities in the United Kingdom. In his book: Tomorrow - A Peaceful Path to Real Reform, he proposed, for the first time, that planned dispersal of population should be achieved by the creation of New Towns: carefully planned, complete and self-contained communities. Howard demonstrated his faith in the new town idea in 1901 when he pioneered the establishment of the Garden City Association (now known as the Town and Country Planning Association) to advocate, propagate and promote the idea of dispersal and decentralisation to new towns not only as a continuing process of permanently altering patterns of human settlement, but also as a mechanism for directing economic and social development. The practicality of his ideas was tried out in 1903 when he influenced the development of the first new town at Letchworth and in 1920 when a second new town was built at Welwyn Garden City. These experimental new towns were a successful test of Howard's ideas, proving beyond doubt that a new town with a rapid population growth can be

---

comprehensively planned and built from a small base by a development agency, and spatially separate from the parent city. For new towns to become innovations of national benefit, they needed to be developed on a substantive scale which only a national government could operate. The earliest signs of government intervention that was to open the way for progressive legislation on the creation of British new towns can therefore be traced to the year 1935, when the government appointed a departmental committee (the Harley Committee) to:

'examine the experience already gained in regard to the establishment of garden cities and satellite towns and to make recommendations as to the steps, if any, which should be taken by the Government to extend the provision of such garden cities and satellite towns'

The most important recommendation of the Committee was the one which advocated the full adoption of the type of development associated with the new town ideas whereby each new town constitutes a complete community fully provided with industry and employment, residence, social services and recreation as an alternative to the congested city.

The next stage of government initiatives between 1940 and 1946, was crucial in laying the foundation for the policy of systematic transfer of population from the cities to new towns. In 1940, the

---

Barlow Commission Report recommended the beginning of a systematic replanning of the congested conurbations; the establishment of a policy of dispersal and decentralisation of industries; the redistribution of urban population, particularly from London; and for a balance in the industrial and economic development of the regions of the entire United Kingdom. Acceptance of these recommendations is apparent from the urban renewal schemes of later years; from the popularisation of the concept of decentralisation and the need for a policy of dispersal; and because they provided the historic starting point for the present policies in regional planning and urban development. Indeed, the Abercrombie Greater London Plan (1944) was the product of an adopted, developed version of the Barlow Report as applied to London. The Plan was based on the zoning of London: a system of concentric rings whereby there would be a series of new towns with a green belt between them and the London built-up area. Zone I represents the Inner or Central Area of London whose high population density would make dispersal necessary in order to reduce the density to a desired size. Zone II represents the suburbs with spaced-out housing and low density. According to the Plan, this zone represents the green belt. Mainly agricultural, it would be


5 Green Belt is defined in accordance with Urwin's concept of surrounding open country; or land bought by large cities in order to provide necessary recreation land for their peripheries, thus compensating for the relative lack of land and space inside the cities. This concept is incorporated in the Green Belt Act, 1938, and elaborated by David Thomas, London's Green Belt (London: Faber, 1970), pp. 80-83.
used for recreational purposes whilst retaining its rural character; but it should be free from industrial development, unaffected by the growth of existing towns and villages around and strictly controlled. It should absorb only a maximum of 300,000 inhabitants. Zone IV, located beyond the green belt will be appropriated for the building of new towns to absorb the population dispersed from the inner areas of London. See (Fig. 1, page 5).

Essentially, Abercrombie's Greater London Plan advocated a policy of dispersal based on the progressive reduction and stabilisation of London's population and employment; and the creation of moderate-sized new towns of about 50,000 beyond the green belt to absorb London's Overspill population. The Plan also envisaged the creation of large housing estates with low population densities and the expansion of existing towns. Whilst both the Barlow Report and the Abercrombie Plan were based on Ebenezer Howard's concept of the Garden City, the Abercrombie Plan, in terms of physical planning, was particularly the most advanced attempt, at that time, to place London in a regional context. In developing the basis for the establishment of a policy of dispersal, the Plan introduced the idea of restricting the further location of industries within the London County and the regulations for controlling the increase of industrial employment in inner areas of London. These were, apparently, the forerunners of planning permissions and industrial development certifications which were later adopted instruments for directing and controlling industrial development in the cities and in new towns. In general terms, however, it is the recommendations of the various committee
Zone 1 ...... Central Area of London with an Inner City Area.
Zone 2 ...... Suburbs, with spaced-out low density housing.
Zone 3 ...... The Green Belt.
Zone 4 ...... Location of the New Towns.
N.T. ...... New Town.
reports sketched above which eventually set the scene for a full-scale government legislation providing the basis for the new town development and confirming the establishment of planned dispersal of industry and population from the cities.

In 1945, Lord Reith's New Towns Committee⁶ was appointed to provide the detailed prescription for the location and form of Abercrombie's new towns, their establishment, development, organisation and administration within a planned system of dispersal. The Committee's report, published in 1946, was to guide the successful introduction of the New Towns Act, 1946, extended by the Town and County Planning Act (1947) and the Town Development Act (1952).⁷ These Acts of Parliament formed the main tools of dispersal policy affecting particularly population redistribution. Legislation directly affecting the decentralisation of industry and employment came earlier in 1945 under the Distribution of Industry Act; giving the Board of Trade (now Ministry of Trade and Industry) the responsibility for and authority over the control of location of industry by granting building permits, planning permissions and the issue of industrial development certificates to industries establishing in new towns for the first time. Between the years


⁷ While New Towns Act (1946) specifically provided for the legal framework and the financial arrangements for new town development, the Towns and Country Planning Act 1947 was an attempt to ensure that cities and their surrounding countryside were planned together so as to ensure a balance between local autonomy and central direction. The Town Development Act (1952) extended new town development ideas to existing towns where the aim is to expand those towns, hence expanding Towns.
1946 and 1960, fifteen new towns (see Table 45) were designated; and between 1961 and 1974, a further fourteen were designated but with greater consideration for regional planning policy and development.

By the year 1960, the third stage of government intervention in physical planning and urban development started. Although it was conceived as the context for relieving congestion and population pressures on the major cities, yet by the mid-fifties, the basic weakness, according to Lloyd Rodwin, was that successive government failed to provide a context for decisions on the dispersal policy. Thus, whereas the original objective of the New Towns Act was to help decentralise London in particular, new towns after the sixties were designated in response to special problems and pressures but without any comprehensive long-term national development plans. Nevertheless, new towns had also developed as an essential means of re-grouping the population and not simply a valuable example in planning. By 1961, it had also become clear from the 1961 census and from the intensity of the continuing crisis in housing in the major cities, especially London, that there was an urgent need to designate more new towns in order that they may contribute to relieving housing pressures, and that the whole concept of central planning needed some review. It was to provide the basis for this kind of re-assessment that two studies were commissioned, namely: the South East Study.

---

9 Ibid., p.162.
and Strategic Plan for the South East. As concern grew about the need for balance in employment and economic development throughout the regions of the country, a policy of dispersal which originally was directed to limiting the growth of major cities, gradually developed into a policy of national and regional development. This second phase, was, therefore, a combination of an extension of the dispersal policy, the adoption of development and regional planning policies that are consistent with those of the national government and the placing of London in a regional context. Basically, the major concern of the South East Study was the continuing growth of London. Looking ahead to 1981, the study, therefore, estimated a probable natural increase of 6 million between 1961 and 1981 for the population of England and Wales, 40% of this (about 2.4 million) being in the South East. Immigration was estimated at 1 million for the whole country, and, allowing for internal population movement, influx into the South East was put at about 1 million, giving an increase of 3.5 million over twenty years and a population increase from 17.75 to 21.25 million for the South East region. It was estimated that planning operations could be extended to provide for 1.5 million people, 250,000 of this in existing developments through the expansion of older new towns and expanding towns. Another

Fig. 2

A STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTH EAST: proposed plan of development

FUTURE BUILT-UP AREAS

APPROVED GREEN BELT

MAIN PROPOSED EXPANSION SCHEMES

SOURCE: A strategy for the South East (1967)

Proposed plan for development is based on the concept of "paired axes" discussed on Pages 11-12.
1.5 million people will have to be catered for over the next twenty years by planning on a scale very different from the Abercrombie Plan. In the light of this re-thinking and forecasting, the study proposed an increase in the number of new towns already in existence, this time, to be able to absorb up to 250,000 people, and an extensive programme in town expansions to take in populations of up to 100,000 people each. On employment, the authors stressed the need to provide new centres of employment on the edge of London (Ilford, Romford, Dartford, Bromley, Croydon, Uxbridge, Watford, etc), as well as in the new and expanding towns. As an alternative to commuting, it was thought wise to provide for increased employment in smaller towns beyond the urban areas, such as Reigate, Guildford, Maidenhead, Tonbridge, Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells.

The South East Study itself was soon to be revised as a result of its obvious limitations and omissions. It covered a ten-year planning period. This was a target too close for the implementation of its proposals and too short a period within which London's problems could be solved. In addition, significant studies and private researches were already going on at that time which looked ahead to the year 2000. The increase in population was still causing public concern and the problem of employment, itself, was inadequately treated in the study. In terms of planning, there was, in fact, an observed discrepancy at regional and national levels. Furthermore, the preference for medium-sized expanding towns as opposed to large-scale new towns was severely criticised. In particular, some experts thought that it was contradictory to encourage dispersal of people and firms from London and at the same time subsidise suburban railways and encourage commuting.
The revision of the South East Study and its assumptions was contained in "A Strategy for the South East". Like the South East Study, it dealt with the future of London and the South East Region, but excluding East Anglia. But on this occasion the proposals were updated and extended to the year 2001. It outlined an overall plan with a general scheme of development, dealt with the siting of activities and facilities and with the main section of the South East region (Greater London and the suburbs and the rest of this region). The originality of the "Strategy for the South East" can be traced to two specific innovations, namely: a departure from the traditional concentric zonal pattern inherited from the Abercrombie Plan, and an adoption of axial distribution of urban planning and development. (See Fig. 2, Page 9). With the need to preserve a widened Green Belt, urban planning and development was to be confined to specific paired axes, one of which is the principal axis and the other (or others) secondary. Thus, the axis to the North East towards Milton Keynes and Northampton was the principal one and that towards Peterborough, the secondary one; to the East and South East, the first axis extends towards Ashford and the second along the Thames Estuary; and to the South West, the principal axis lies towards the new town of South Hampshire and the secondary to Swindon. In terms of development, these axes were designed, among other things, to achieve the best use of existing and proposed lines of communication and the preservation of large open spaces between the corridors for agricultural and recreational purposes. On employment, Strategy for the South East endorsed the
official policy of decentralisation but stressed the need for balance in employment. The report pointed out that dispersal policies should be applied with discretion in the future and that office permits should, therefore, be available to firms that might make a contribution to the overall strategy. The authors stressed, however, that some office building in London itself was desirable if London were to continue to play its traditional role as the capital of the country and to encourage foreign business concerns.

It must be noted that the new dimensions to the new towns policy advocated by the Strategy for the South East, represent a considerable contrast with the objectives of the preliminary stage. Derek Diamond,\textsuperscript{11} explains the radical changes as a result of the revival of Government interest in regional policy which took place throughout the 1960s. This had several causes, important among them were rapid demographic growth, the slow rate of national economic growth, and widening regional disparities. Equally, the need for a connection between regional planning and new development was demonstrated by the changing social environment of urban living. As a result of increasing car ownership, increasing desire for space and concern for the quality of the environment, the increased demand for the provision in new towns of those urban amenities (hospitals, schools, shopping centres, cinemas, etc) with which urban life is generally associated, doubts about whether new towns were satisfactorily performing their envisaged functions and the question about what

constitutes the most appropriate urban form were being raised. This critical stance contributed to the revival of the re-assessment of the wider functions of new towns as experiments in urban development. Eventually the new emphasis on the role of future new towns shifted to being economic. Thus, the second batch of new towns (known as Mark II towns) were to form the focus for economic growth.

The emphasis of the secondary phase of the policy of decentralisation reappeared in the last of the policy instruments, namely: Greater London Development Plan. At best, the Plan is a blend of Mark I and Mark II New Towns. In essence, it is a master plan produced in accordance with the 1968 Act, and consists of a planning policy directed towards establishing a general framework for development within the region. In form and outlook it is Greater London in a national setting and, once more, as a result of the national interest in London's problems, the Plan needed government approval. It is important to note that the Plan looked twenty years ahead and followed the generally accepted policies of dispersal, with emphasis on the continuing decrease in London's population from 8 to 7 million by the year 2001. The aim remained that of progressively reducing the population of London until it is


13 Mark I and Mark II New Towns. These are descriptions used to distinguish the first wave of New Towns after Lord Reith's Report and the New Towns Act (1946), from the second batch from the 1960s. Whereas the population targets for Mark I New Towns were about 25,000, Mark II New Towns had population targets of well over 100,000; e.g. Milton Keynes target population is 250,000. New Towns of the 1960s were based on the concept of planned city regions.
about one-tenth of the population of the whole country; to decrease its jobs from 4.5 to 4.2 million by dispersal beyond the Green Belt or decentralisation into the provinces; and to focus a great deal of attention on London's economic development. It also stressed that central administration, the banks, universities and colleges, centres of research and leisure facilities should remain in London in order to retain its role as capital city and its individual character. It also proposed to improve living conditions and the quality of the environment; and to ensure a closer balance between employment, housing and accessibility by different means of transport. However, the 1971 Census figures clearly indicate that the level of Greater London's population had continued to decline. Consequently, for several years now a new wave of debate has been growing. Many argue that the need for a planned overspill policy would seem inevitably less pressing in this circumstance. Greater concern is currently expressed that not only has the population of London declined rapidly, but also that its professionals, technicians and skilled workers are moving to new towns leaving behind the old, the poor and the socially and economically disadvantaged. Many industries have moved out of London to relocate in New and Expanding Towns, creating problems for job availability and loss of substantial revenue too, especially by the inner boroughs. Considerable doubts have been expressed on the continuing need for encouraging the out-migration of workers and, indeed, for the wisdom of retaining the policy of decentralisation to New and Expanding Towns. It has been suggested that Greater London should now be declared a Special Area to which industries should
rather be attracted. Since the latter part of 1975, the government has repeated its intention to modify the dispersal policy so as to induce industries to return to London in particular. But in spite of these arguments, the case for continuing the decentralisation policy rests on the increasing need to use New Towns to contribute to the relief of the housing problems of large cities, as well as to provide alternative communities for those wishing to live and work outside the large conurbations.

Movement of Industry, Employment and Population to New Towns

The movement of industry, employment and population to New Towns should be regarded as the logical and expected consequence of the creation of new towns and the establishment of the policy of dispersal and decentralisation from large conurbations. In addition, such movement is also influenced by economic considerations and the changing structure of industry, as well as by individual decisions to leave the city for newer environment. Although moving to new towns is considered on a national scale, the movement on which this thesis focusses attention is the one that takes place from London. In pursuing the policy of decentralisation, some firms have literally been forced to relocate in new towns. They particularly include those ones whose premises were acquired by local authorities either because they fall within the category of "non-conforming users" whose presence in predominantly residential areas may be injurious to public health, or because their location might impede necessary
improvements. Their movement therefore, freed valuable sites for relo-
cation and re-development, especially in housing. There are, however,
many firms that operate in cramped and inconvenient premises, leaving them
no room for expansion. They pay very high rents and incur heavy over-
heads, and end up with marginal profits. It is to the advantage of
such firms to move out of the inner areas of the city to relocate in
new towns. By doing so too, they leave room for expansion for those
other firms that need to continue in London. In the latter situation,
the G.L.C., through its Industrial Centre, and the Department of
Environment through the Location of Offices Bureau, have both encouraged
and assisted factories and offices to move to relocate in new (and
expanding) towns by voluntary negotiations.

Even though in general terms, industry and population are encour-
aged to move to new towns, there are controls and constraints that
determine who actually move. Firms wishing to relocate or establish
a branch in a new town usually obtain an Industrial Development
Certificate from the Department of Trade and Industry; but the
Development Corporation largely determines the kind of industries that
should be attracted to a new town, and G.L.C. influences (under the
Town Development Schemes) the decisions as to which firms move to
expanding towns. In these cases, the movement of the workers of
migrant firms is determined by whether the worker has a job to go to,
on which basis he is allocated a house. Where a migrant firm recruits
workers directly, the movement of the worker depends also upon whether
he has got a job and based on it a house is allocated.
In other words, moving to a new town is tied up with securing a job and having a house allocated to the migrant. The official recruitment machinery is the New and Expanding Town Scheme (formerly the Industrial Selection Scheme) described in Appendix 4. The scheme operates in accordance with the observation of its rules and procedures of selection. In two important ways, it is the employer who decides which worker goes to a new town. First, a migrant firm decides who from existing staff will transfer to a new town; and who he will recruit through the New and Expanding Town Scheme. He may install capital intensive machinery and reduce considerably the number of staff he will take. Second, he decides the quality of staff he requires and advises the operators of the recruitment machinery accordingly. The tendency over the years has been for the professionals, the technicians and skilled manual workers to be recruited more than the unskilled. But in the final analysis, the ultimate decision as to who moves and who stays lies with the migrant worker himself. The complexities of making that decision - the processes, the calculations and considerations, etc. form the main theme of the research on which this thesis is based. Before getting on to the detailed examination of migration decisions, it is necessary to assess the volume of movement that has taken place since the designating of the first batch of new towns in 1946 to the year 1972.

During the first twenty five years of new town development, a significant movement of industry, employment and population from the cities took place. A major characteristic of this movement has been the sharp decline in manufacturing industries formerly located
in Greater London. Between the period 1966 to 1971 it is estimated that some 40% of all jobs moving out of London went to New and Expanding Towns as Table 1 shows. The rapid growth of employment opportunities in New Towns reflected in the statistics on industrial growth up to the end of 1972 in Table 2 also confirm this trend. It is particularly noticeable from Table 1 that the distribution of the rate at which change in terms of loss of jobs from different regions is higher in London (-8.9%) compared with the whole of the South East Region (-4.7%) and compared with the rate of decline for the whole country (-5.5%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>4,614</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>4,253</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>+5.4</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>+1.9</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer South East</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>+3.1</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>7,821</td>
<td>8,013</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>7,634</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>22,892</td>
<td>23,301</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>22,404</td>
<td>22,027</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Based on data supplied by D.E and C.S.D. Figures for 1970 and 1971 include an estimate for the number of civil servants in the OMA and OSA. Also an adjustment to take account of changes in the method of allocation workers.
### TABLE 2

**INDUSTRY+ IN LONDON NEW TOWNS TO DECEMBER, 1972**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LONDON RING</th>
<th>No. of occupiers</th>
<th>No. of employees</th>
<th>Size (sq.ft)</th>
<th>No. of occupiers</th>
<th>No. of employees</th>
<th>Size (sq.ft)</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Size (sq.ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>n.k</td>
<td>144,714</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>21,034</td>
<td>5,478,470</td>
<td>19+3 extns</td>
<td>426,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>48,250</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10,430</td>
<td>2,190,384</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>121,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>4,818,214</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>n.k</td>
<td>276²</td>
<td>18,913</td>
<td>6,043,240</td>
<td>4+2 extns</td>
<td>175,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>900*</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20+8 extns</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>438,650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemel Hempstead</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>n.k</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>4,034,297</td>
<td>1+1 extns</td>
<td>28,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>371,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15,690</td>
<td>3,372,000</td>
<td>15+3 extns</td>
<td>309,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn Garden City</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,994,594</td>
<td>23+18 extns</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>1,473,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL: London Ring</strong></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>721+26 extns</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,849,155</strong></td>
<td><strong>43+9 extns</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,061,569</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Revised figure

+ Industry in this table refers to all industrial enterprises covered by Section 21 of the Local Employment Act 1960.  
1 Factories existing before designation have frequently been closed or demolished.  
2 Includes 163 units of warehousing and service industry.
### TABLE 3
LONDON NEW TOWNS POPULATION IN 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>100/105,000</td>
<td>93/98,000</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td>67/70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>68,500</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemel Hempstead</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn Garden City</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>80,500</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>109,500</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>135,500</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total Population which town is planned to accommodate, including natural increase

† Estimates made by Development Corporations and the Commission for the New Towns.
Table 3 demonstrates that the population of the existing New Towns has doubled since designation; by 1972 they had a population of about three quarters of a million, in all. The remaining expansion will fall chiefly to the New Towns - Milton Keynes, Peterborough and Northampton, all of which are expected to reach 250,000 by the end of the century. Table 4 gives the progress of the Expanding Towns, in dwellings rather than in terms of population. By 1972, 48,000 homes out of a programme of 93,000 had been completed. (This compares with 100,000 completions since designation in the New Towns). In the 1966-71 period, 87% of all lettings in Expanding Towns went to Londoners, compared with 42% in the New Towns; overall, the figures in these Tables represent the rehousing of 87,000 London families in the New Towns and a further 43,000 in the Expanding Towns since the end of the Second World War. The annual average of London families housed in Expanding Towns (1966-9) was 4,533 (approximately 14,050 persons, taking family size as 3.1). This falls some way short of the target figure of 20,000 per year, set in 1963.

There are, besides, other forms of planned movement from London. GLC home loans enable families to buy houses outside London. Thus, in 1972, one third of all loans (17,000 in all) were granted for purchase of homes outside London. The GLC also has its own housing estates outside Greater London boundaries. In 1971, 469 new dwellings were completed in such areas, and 580 in 1972. The Council also constructed a limited number of seaside homes for people leaving London on retirement: in 1971, 259 such homes were constructed.
### TABLE 4
Agreed GLC Town Development Schemes: position at 30th June, 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expanding Towns</th>
<th>Total Programmes</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Under Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford U.D.</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury B.</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbury B.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke B.</td>
<td>9,250</td>
<td>5,428</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bletchley U.D.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree &amp; Brocking U.D.</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings C.B.</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letchworth U.D.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton R.D.</td>
<td>3,896</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy U.D.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witham U.D.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total South East Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,346</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,093</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Outside South East</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,723</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,723</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed Schemes</strong>+</td>
<td><strong>2,723</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,723</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>93,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,610</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DoE.


and in 1972, 126. However, even when all these various programmes in the total out-migration process from London are combined, the total flow of population to new and expanding towns and suburban estates, etc., forms only a small proportion of over all volume of movement out of London, which is estimated, on the basis of the 1971 census data, at about 320,000 people per year. Nevertheless, it is a reasonable measure of the success of planned migration from London to new towns.

Almost as important as the size of the population movement and its geographical origins, is its composition. As can be observed (Table 5), the migrant population concentrates, as might be expected, particularly in the younger age group. The socio-economic distribution also differs from that of the existing population of Greater London; but perhaps less sharply than the generally accepted picture of New and Expanding Towns might suggest (See Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>London new Towns</th>
<th>Expanding Towns</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-RA</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA+</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,970</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1966 Census
Notes: 1. Basildon, Bracknell, Crawley, Harlow, Hatfield, Hemel Hempstead, Stevenage, Welwyn Garden City.
3. Retirement Age, 60 for women and 65 for men, thus category RA+ signifies all men over 65 and women over 60.

TABLE 6
Socio-economic grouping and population movement from Greater London 1966

Population movement from Greater London to public housing in New and Expanding Towns (1966) (by head of household)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers and Managers</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-manual</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NON-MANUAL</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foremen, skilled manual</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MANUAL</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>72.6)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces and not stated</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1966 Census

These profiles go some way in establishing the extent to which new towns have attracted a good mixture of the urban population in terms of age and occupational grouping.
Table 7 gives an indication of the total change in population in the South East region, together with the rate of change, between 1951 and 1971. As the Table shows, compared with the previous decade, London's population declined more rapidly from 1961 to 1971. The rate of increase slowed down in the Outer Metropolitan Area; but this was counterbalanced by an increase in the Outer South East. In the decade 1961 to 1971 the rate of increase in the two areas was very similar. The changes in population size once more is a reflection of decline partly attributable to movement to New and Expanding Towns.

TABLE 7


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Home</td>
<td>Mid-Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Pop</td>
<td>8,206.1</td>
<td>7,977.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>8,206.1</td>
<td>7,977.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>3,497.3</td>
<td>4,503.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>15,215.4</td>
<td>16,345.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OPCS/DoE

Over the decade 1961-71, the net annual gains and losses through migration in different sectors of the region, in thousands, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Net Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLC</td>
<td>-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMA</td>
<td>+44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSE</td>
<td>+50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.2 The Concept of Planned Migration

Population movement over physical space, whether long or short, and whether within or between countries, has always been an essential element of a fundamental social change. It may be generated by religious and political or historical event; it may be motivated by perceived chance for better economic opportunities; or the aspiration to be residentially located in a healthy and socially desirable environment. In extreme cases, population movement is caused by the outbreak of wars and pestilence, or natural disasters: earthquakes and volcanoes, hurricanes and floods, and other "Acts of God". From the 1950's, large-scale population movements have taken place from the developing countries of the Third World to the more industrialised countries of the West providing human labour for reconstruction and economic development after the Second World War. Within the industrialised countries, movements from rural to urban areas have continued; movements out of the depressed areas to the centres of growth are not uncommon and movements between towns and between regions add another dimension to the process. At the present moment, the scale of yet another kind of population movement is increasing. In Britain, it is common to refer to a retreat to the suburbs; and in America, people talk about flight from the Cities. In both cases, what is being described is a kind of movement away from older cities to the newer and healthier surroundings of the suburbs. At the same time, between the industrialised countries of the world, cross-population movements also take place whose net effects are usually expressed in the concern over brain drain.
In general, the immediate effects of these movements can be measured by the changes in the shift of absolute numbers and in the change in the pattern of population distribution that emerges without any deliberate planning. Such population movements create new centres of population concentration, they generate new communities and new centres of growth, new contacts and associations; they require new social and cultural networks; and they demand new perspectives for development of all kinds - economic, political, educational etc. Logically, the new centre of growth thus created also attract a continuing need for planning a variety of public services (transport, shopping, recreations, libraries, entertainments, public utilities and social and cultural amenities) which a new concentration of people requires to be sustained. Where the population shift is unplanned, the planning implications are likely to be more specific and comparable to urban renewal. But where the movements are planned, the new centres of population concentration become both a symbol of social experiment and specific examples of planned change. The purpose of this section is to draw a distinction between planned and unplanned movement or migration, and to specifically develop the concept of planned migration as the context within which the main theme of this thesis must be understood.

In Britain, especially since the early 1940's interest developed in internal population movement. Clifford Jansen shows that between 1951 and 1961, the effect of the drift from the north to the south was a gain of 500,000 persons by migration to South East England;

78,000 persons to South West Region; a gain of 61,000 persons by the Midlands and 65,000 persons by North Midlands. These gains, of course, meant losses to other regions: Scotland, Wales and North East England. Even so, postwar population movement in Britain has been highlighted in relatively few studies. For example, Newton and Jeffrey\textsuperscript{16} found that during the period 1939-1952, 4 million moves were made each year. Using the 1951 census data based on birth places, Osborn\textsuperscript{17} found that 12.75 million people (31\%) of the 1951 population in England and Wales were living outside their native counties. The counties which had the largest migration gains were Middlesex (850,000), Surrey (505,000), Essex (455,000), Kent (240,000), Sussex (205,000), Hampshire (155,000), Hertfordshire (145,000), and Cheshire and Warwickshire (each 140,000). Most net gains took place in counties within the South East Region around London. Correspondingly, the highest net losses were from the County of London (1,840,000), Durham (270,000), Lancashire (245,000), Glamorgan (140,000), Staffordshire (135,000) and East and West Ridings (95,000).

In the 1961 sample census, the first published results on migration (April 1960-April 1961) show that in England and Wales, while 1.4 millions (5.1\%) of the population had changed residence within local authority areas, another 2.2 million (4.7\%) had migrated


\textsuperscript{17} R. Osborn, 'Internal Migration in England and Wales, 1951' in \textit{Advancement of Science}, 12 (1955), pp. 424-434.
between local authority areas. The number of persons that crossed regional boundaries in that year was 725,990 and net losses were sustained by Northern Region (10,540), East and West Ridings (11,270), and North Western region (10,500) and Wales (5,270). These losses from the north, and the net gains for Eastern Region (44,560), Southern Region (28,370), South Western Region (17,610) and the North Midlands Region (6,410) seem to confirm the continuation of the drift to the South by the population of the United Kingdom taken together. Compared with the 1971 (10% sample) census, the migration figures based on usual address at the time of the census, for a comparable period (25th April 1970 - 25th April 1971), show that only 256,000 persons crossed regional boundaries by migration, giving rise to the following regional gains; Northern Region, 17,250; Yorkshire and Humberside, 25,000; North West, 34,250; East Midland, 17,000; West Midlands, 27,000; South East, 98,650; and the South West, 20,450. It is significant to note that over the period of 20 years (between 1951 and 1971) evidence of the population drift to the South remains alive. However, the volume of movement seems to have declined generally although the areas and regions that have either been gaining or losing by migration have continued to do so. During this same period, the age-bracket (20-29) most affected by internal migration has remained constant. For example, the 1971 census shows that about 83,700 (males) and 83,150 (females) aged between 20-29 moved to other regions in England and Wales compared with 26,950 (males) and 27,000 (females) aged between 45 and 59 that crossed regional boundaries during the same period. For all sorts of reason, internal population movements will always take place.
In comparison with other countries, population movement in Britain differs from that of Italy only in the sense that in the latter there is rather a drift to the north. Between 1951 and 1961 about 1.8 million Southern Italians left their places of origin, some going to the north of the country and others migrating to foreign countries. Those who went up north settled in towns like Rome, Turin, Milan and Genoa. In Turin, between 1951 and 1960, an index of the number of migrants from the South rose from 100 to 818. In both France and Belgium, the internal population movement does not seem to depend on regional attraction as in the attraction of one big city. In both countries, the capital cities attract people at rather very rapid rate. It is, for example, estimated that Paris had been gaining from the provinces about 100,000 migrants during the ten year period 1953-1963. Between 1946 and 1954 in-migration accounted for 40% of the increase of the population of the two departments (Seine and Seine-et-Oise) around Paris; and between 1954 and 1962, it is estimated to account for 60% of this increase. In 1962, the net gain from migration into Brussels stands out when compared with gains by other Belgian towns (Brussels 5,841; Antwerp 860; Gant 143; Charleroi -1,540, Liege -339, Namer 441). In the United States of America, 3 out of 100 persons move from one state to another every year; and in the decade 1946-1955, over 100 million movements took place in a westward direction principally from the South, Midwest and the North East. Between 1940 and 1955, California had net gains from migration of 385,000 per year before the War and around 284,000 per year after the war. Florida, mainly

18 Clifford Jansen, Ibid. pp. 5-6.
but not exclusively for its healthy environment, gained from 54,000 persons per annum between 1940 and 1945, and about 13,000 per annum during the period 1950 to 1955. But Pennsylvania near the east coast has been loosing an average of 30,000 or more persons per year since 1950.\textsuperscript{19}

In the developing countries of the Third World, internal migration is heavily and closely linked with the urbanisation processes which are characterised by movements from the rural to the urban areas. As the cities gain population, activities of social, economic and political nature are increasingly concentrated in those cities with a corresponding loss to the rural areas. In Latin America, a sample survey on six cities in Brazil\textsuperscript{20} demonstrates this trend and highlights the social and economic planning problems posed by an apparent over-concentration of the national population in a few cities. The same process is escalating in Africa. In Nigeria, for example, the total population of about 70 million people is increasingly concentrated in the cities of Lagos and Ibadan, Kano and Kaduna, Benin City, Aba and Enugu, Calabar and Port-Harcourt. For the developing countries, a process of deliberate population redistribution seen as a vital instrument of social and economic planning, seems both necessary and urgent if the experiences of the West should be skillfully avoided.

\textsuperscript{19} Jansen, pp. 7-8.

\textsuperscript{20} Jansen, p.8.
Planned and Unplanned Migration

It seems evident from the above review that the main feature of world migration is its general reflection of voluntary movement. For various reasons, people are always moving - changing their residential location, changing jobs and places of work, and moving away from their regions and across national boundaries. These movements are invariably motivated by personal needs and aspirations. Migrants generally choose the destination, make their own arrangements and complete the process of physically shifting to the new environment. Migration of this kind, I have called Unplanned. It is unplanned not because the migrant did not make anticipatory arrangements to move; it is rather because of the absence of a superior authority or agency directing the migrant to move to a particular area, for a given objective, in a particular way under stipulated controls. In other words, unplanned migration is private and voluntary and aimed at the satisfaction of individual goals. On the other hand, where the movement of people is rationally and deliberately channelled from specified areas to particular destinations, as a matter of policy, and with given objectives, then migration so generated, I have called Planned. Characteristically, therefore, planned migration involves a rational and deliberate act of encouraging the movement of national population away from certain areas to other areas, sponsored by the government, and backed by a clearly defined policy. The main distinguishing features of planned migration from unplanned migration are not only that the exporting and destination areas are defined by a superior authority or agency (in this case, the government), but
also the goal of migration is nationally defined, and policy instruments and administrative machinery for controls are provided. The movement of population from the large cities to new towns is a clear example of planned migration. It is backed by the policy of dispersal and decentralisation to new towns. New towns themselves are created by Acts of Parliament, which also create development agencies, policy instruments and administrative controls. Although the broad objective of this kind of planned migration is that of re-distributing the national population, its more specific aims are to decongest the large conurbations and so create the environment for their replanning; to help to provide for the housing needs of the cities in new towns; and to promote a balance in economic development and regional planning through the creation of new centres of growth in new towns.

Based on British experience, the typical planned migration on which this thesis is based is characterised by the following features:

1. It is sponsored by the government and backed by a commitment and a clear policy to reduce and disperse the population of the large cities, and decentralise their industrial and administrative activities to new towns.

2. New towns are purposely-built so as to absorb the overspill population from the cities.

3. The new towns are carefully planned and systematically developed so that they will become self-contained and balanced communities for work and living.
4. Planned migration to new towns involves a progressive reduction of the population of the cities to specific sizes judged adequate to provide a good physical environment.

5. New towns, as receiving authorities, can attract migrants only to the tune of the population allocated to them at designation. Ultimate population is achieved by progressive intake of city migrants, over a period of time.

6. The movements of industries, offices and people out of the cities and their acceptance in new towns are subject to regulations and controls. Some of the instruments of control are the Industrial Development Certification, Planning permits, and the Operation of the New and Expanding Town Scheme, which has its rules and procedures in the Selection of migrants to new towns.

7. In terms of aim, planned migration is an instrument of social and economic planning; directed towards the achievement of national goals, namely: re-distribution of urban population, the relief of congestion and urban renewal, creation of new centres of growth, the promotion of regional planning.

8. Planned migration involves the movement and relocation of the firm or office, the job and the worker i.e. the transfer of an entire organisation to a new environment.

Official records by which the process of the movement of population to new towns is monitored enable the further distinction to be drawn between planned and unplanned migration.
Fig. 2 is a crude classification of movements to new and expanding towns. While planned migration includes movements that take place when workers transfer with their relocating firms, movements facilitated by selection through New Expanding Town Schemes or Special Housing Allocation Schemes, or movement as a result of direct recruitment by firms already in a new town, unplanned migration often refers to movement achieved through unofficial means - i.e. through special arrangements with and private recommendations of workers, or through direct recruitment not involving the selection scheme. Planned migration records only those movements that are made through the administrative machinery and do not always reflect the total volume of movements to new towns. Therefore, some movements may be classified as unplanned simply because they are not officially recognised but not necessarily because they are irrelevant to the concept of planned migration. Thus, based on the 1966 census figures, Table 8 shows the number of migrants from London to London new and expanding towns, classified as planned because their movements were recorded officially; as compared with those that moved but were officially unrecorded. The second sense in which this classification is made is on the basis that unplanned movements, by definition, take place privately to unrecognised destinations.

The fundamental distinguishing factors between planned and unplanned migration are therefore, based on presence of deliberate direction and policy objective. In planned migration, movement of population is deliberately directed in order to achieve clearly defined policy objectives; whereas, unplanned movement is privately
motivated and the destination determined by individuals in search of the satisfaction of their private needs. But even in the case of planned migration, in which a supreme authority controls the determination and direction of movement, individuals may still find themselves complying with the direction and controls but may retain the determination of their own objectives in taking the opportunity offered them to move. Given this situation, it is certainly to be expected that individuals may find government policy standing in their way to realise their personal objectives; and on the other hand, government policy in planned migration may be frustrated by the pursuit of private ends. In other words, the objectives of public interest may be at variance with individual needs and aspirations. The realities of these conflicts will become apparent when the determinants and constraints on migration decision-making, as well as the defects of the recruitment machinery to new town population are critically examined.
Fig. 3. MOVEMENTS TO NEW (AND EXPANDING) TOWNS - A CLASSIFICATION

PLANNED MOVEMENT

Transfer of workers of firms relocated in new/expanding towns

Special schemes for moving special groups

Direct recruitment by migrant firms to new or expanding towns

NEW & EXPANDING TOWN SCHEME (FORMERLY I.S.S)

UNPLANNED MOVEMENT

Movements Movement Direct recruitment by special arrangements private recommendations already in new towns

Direct recruitment by special arrangements private recommendations already in new towns
## TABLE 8

SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUP OF EMIGRANTS FROM LONDON TO ALL AREAS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND TO NEW AND EXPANDING TOWNS - 1966 10% Sample Census*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economically Active</th>
<th>Planned Migrants</th>
<th>Unplanned Migrants</th>
<th>All Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To public housing in</td>
<td>To all areas in G.B.</td>
<td>To all areas in G.B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Original New Towns</td>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly non-manual workers:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed professional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed professional</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total professional</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers &amp; Managers</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-manual workers</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mainly non-manual workers</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly manual workers:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled manual workers</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service, semi-skilled manual &amp; agricultural workers</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual workers</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other self-employed (non professional &amp; farmers)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mainly manual workers</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequately described</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total miscellaneous categories</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economically Active Persons</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economically Inactive Persons**</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>6,230</td>
<td>107,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons**</td>
<td>8,970</td>
<td>11,520</td>
<td>218,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
* The numbers of persons are based on a 10% census count. The totals recorded are therefore approximate.
**Excludes children under one year of age.

NOTES: 1. Percentages are subject to wide margins of sampling error for new and expanding towns due to the small numbers involved.
2. Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100.

**SOURCES:** 1966 Sample Census, Migration Regional Report, S.E. Region 1966 Sample Census, GLC Special Tables.
Chapter 2
RESEARCH AIM, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims and Objectives

The aims and objectives of the research are as follows:

i) To develop the concept of planned migration, and later using it to propose and argue a case for the development of a Sociology of Planned Migration as a distinctive area of knowledge within Sociology of Planning.

ii) To provide a descriptive account of the planned migration process. This will act as a valuable background for promoting understanding of attitudes to moving out of cities as well as the various stages of transition through which potential migrants may have to pass in order to move to a new town.

iii) To provide a theoretical explanation to migration decisions of city residents by discovering the determinants and constraints on decision-making and the frame of reference on which the decisions were made.

iv) To critically explore the wider theoretical issues in sociology and the social policy implications which planned migration seems to have raised.

The pursuit of the aims and objectives listed under (ii) and (iii), will be based on testing empirically the following hypothesis: that the migration decisions of inner city residents tend to be motivated by the desire to satisfy non-work aspirations.
2.2 Research Problems and Design

As moving firms present their inner city workers with the opportunity of choosing between moving to new towns or staying behind, a social situation emerges in which workers become actors. To be offered the opportunity to move out of the city is not only a situation in which the worker has been called upon to exercise a choice between two alternatives - moving or staying, but also one in which he has inevitably to respond to an imminent change. In this context, the actions of the workers, in that given social situation, will be governed, according to Max Webber, by the following assumptions:

i) That the worker as an actor, has goals, aims or ends and that his actions are directed to the attainment of such goals.

ii) That action often involves the selection and use of means to achieve the goals.

iii) That action is influenced not only by the situation but also by the actor's knowledge of the situation.

iv) That the actor has certain sentimental dispositions which affect both his perception of the situation and the choice of his goals, and

v) That the actor has certain norms and values which govern the selection of his goals and the order of priorities for satisfying them.21

---

In his classic contribution to the theory of action, Webber conceives of sociology as a comprehensive science of social action.\(^{22}\) To him action must be subjectively meaningful: so that to understand the action of the workers, it is necessary to observe how they react to the situation and what meaning they attach to their action. In other words, their actions: that is, attitudes to moving and migration decisions, must be seen as the product of the situation, the ideas that they have within it, and the goals which they wish to pursue. Part of the actions of the workers may also be the response to the actions of the migrant firms themselves. It is to be expected that the management of the firms in their concern for adequate staffing, might try to persuade some of their workers to move, and as they think fit, may also decide to drop others - reactions which are likely to lead to pressure, and the creation of fear and anxiety.

How workers interpreted the opportunity to move was most likely to determine their attitudes, the goals they pursued, the choice of the means of realising the goals and the ultimate decision that they made. The research problems were, therefore, mainly two, namely: explanatory and methodological. It is fundamental to explain both the attitudes of workers towards out-migration and the actual migration decisions that they made. Methodologically, what was required was a research design which will enable conclusions to be drawn about the contributions that the following factors could make in

providing the explanation outlined above: planned migration process itself, determinants and constraints on decision-making, the action frame of reference on which those decisions were made, and the non-work needs and aspirations of workers which provided the basic motivation. Probably a third problem is one of approach. In explaining the actions of workers, in terms of the migration decisions that they made, it is obvious that no single factor or theory can be relied upon to accomplish the task satisfactorily. Thus, neither physical nor social factors, and political nor economic factors alone can explain the migration behaviour of the workers; nor in theoretical terms, can a sociological, psychological or economic theory alone explain it. Even within the single field of sociology, there are bound to be competing theories that try to explain the same phenomenon in migration. Given these problems, the research design must adopt an inter-disciplinary approach drawing resources from Sociology, economics, geography, psychology, politics and other related subjects in the Social Sciences. This was bound to make the task of the research much more complex and difficult.

2.3 Methodology

The original study: Survey of Migrant Firms, was undertaken in order to establish the main reasons for and the constraints on the mobility of 'disadvantaged minorities' to new and expanding towns. Before that survey, there was evidence showing that while some sections of the public - the elderly, unskilled, black people, unmarried mothers and people from large families were in poor housing, in new and expanding towns there was a large number of
houses that remained unoccupied for months. More so, since there was a current policy of encouraging people to move from the cities to new and expanding towns, there must be reasons, factors or circumstances which worked against the movement of this group referred to as 'socially disadvantaged'. Certain assumptions and common-sense suggestions were made which tended to explain the situation, such as lack of financial assistance, a high cost of living and high rent for houses in new and expanding towns, lack of the usual urban facilities, loss of contact and probable lonely lives of migrants; lack of jobs and necessary information about new and expanding towns. It was to find out why the disadvantaged were not taking the opportunity to move, and in particular to test out the validity of these hunches that the Survey (as only a part of the New Towns Project) was mounted. The study tested the following suggestions and assumptions:

a) That the decision to move is a function of the worker's degree of attachment to his surroundings.

b) That the decision to move is a function of the worker's attachment to his employer/firm.

c) That the decision to move is a function of the worker's pressing housing need.

d) That the decision to move depends on skill, availability of social facilities, rent and cost of living in new towns; and

e) That the decision to move depends on the amount of information available to the worker from his employer.
The Survey, was, therefore, policy-oriented, and a fact-finding exercise. It was not strictly a scientific inquiry, because it lacked a theoretical framework. Nevertheless, its findings and the insight I gained from it convinced me that its data could be used to pursue other wider sociological and policy issues. To do this, I have, therefore, undertaken a further research into the subject of planned migration based on the hypothesis stated above, which I formulated from the data of the survey described.

The present research, is, therefore, based on testing the hypothesis that the migration decisions of city residents tend to be motivated by the desire to satisfy non-work aspirations. In testing this hypothesis, a secondary analysis of the data from the original survey will be undertaken. According to Goode and Hatt, this is common, permissible and necessary because it is an invaluable process of generating plausible statements that will serve as hypotheses for subsequent verification in more stringent terms. Besides, in the same way that theory can define the kinds of data to be extracted, or summarise facts into empirical generalisations, or predict facts and point to gaps in our knowledge, facts themselves play important roles in the development of hypotheses and theories. Indeed, facts initiate hypothesis and theory; they may lead to the reformation or rejection of existing theory, or they may lead to the redefinition, clarification or to questioning the validity of theory. Data from the original


24 Ibid., Chapter 2, pp. 7-17.
survey has already led to the formulation of a hypothesis. The analysis that will follow may lead to the development of a theory of planned migration.

The method of carrying out the present research follows the one used in the original study, details of which appear under Appendix I. But whereas the original study was restricted to identifying reasons for and constraints on moving, the present research tests the hypothesis by re-examining:

a) the migration process, so as to determine attitudes and identify stages of transition,

b) the migration decision-making process, in order to understand the cost-benefit analysis involved,

c) the frame of reference on which the decisions were based,

d) the work and non-work aspects of the basic motivations to the decisions,

e) wider theoretical issues in sociology and the policy implications raised by planned migration.

In addition:

i) Attitudes of workers from the migrant firms have been compared with attitudes of residents in the Stress areas of Islington who were not similarly offered the opportunity to move out, as well as those who already left Islington to new towns.
In other words, attitudes of migrant firms respondents are compared with those respondents from the Stress Area Residents Survey (Islington) and the Survey of Islington Migrants to New Towns. Respondents from the Surveys served as a control group.

ii) The two environments of the inner city areas and the new town environments are compared in order to assess the influence of environmental quality on the decision to move.

iii) Given the general belief in the immobility of the working class, the analysis seeks to provide evidence of the willingness of the working class to move and the meaning they attach to such movement to new towns. The decisions of the working class group in the firms are compared with the expressed intentions of those working class residents in Islington who had not been offered the opportunity to move out. Similarly, the decisions of middle-class people from the two situations are compared.

iv) In order to test whether or not the workers from the migrant firms were atypical, they were compared, in terms of their socio-economic grouping, with those who moved from Islington, with those who registered to move on the GLC Selection Scheme (NETS), and with the S.E.G. of the rest of the United Kingdom. Similar comparison has been made on ethnic composition of movers from the migrant firms, Islington area and the rest of the GLC area.

v) The researcher visited workers in their new locations (St. Neots, an expanding town; Milton Keynes, a new town) after the move.
Twenty-five workers from both locations were interviewed in order to ascertain their assessment of the decisions they took to move. The results were useful in analysing and commenting on returnee-rate and its correlation with mal-adaption in new town environment.

vi) It is not enough to depend upon reasons people gave for moving or staying in order to determine their attitudes and frame of reference in migration decisions. The whole question of propensity to move was additionally brought into consideration.

vii) The secondary analysis relies heavily on a substantive review of the literature, not only for divergent views but also to draw together different approaches from different disciplines for the purposes of the research.

The Sample Involved

1. The Migrant Firms

Four migrant firms whose movements have been studied.

A brief historical note about them is attached as Appendix 3.

2. Survey of Migrant Firms

The Survey involved the interviewing of a sample of 200 workers who were given the opportunity to move. Only 162 of the workers were actually interviewed.

Workers were interviewed as Movers and Non-Movers.

The questionnaires for the two groups are attached as Appendix 2.
3. Survey of Stress Area Residents (Islington)
   This survey involved 500 residents of the Parkway Ward in Islington, a typical inner city area. Its purpose was to find out not only the kind of people who live there but also their attitude to moving to new towns if they were offered the opportunity.

4. Survey of Islington Migrants to New Towns
   This Survey involved 201 respondents, mainly migrants to new towns who originally came from Islington. The purpose was to find out whether they thought that they made the right decision to move and what they think about the new town as a place to live and work.

5. Survey of I.S.S. Registrants
   A sample of registrants (2,557) obtained from the GLC Housing Department dealing with movements to New and Expanding Towns was analysed by age, sex, socio-economic grouping, etc. Registrants were drawn from all parts of London.

6. Revisits to new locations and interview of workers
   About six months after the firms and their workers have moved into their new locations, two of the firms were revisited and twenty-five workers altogether were interviewed with regard to whether or not they made the right decision to move. The two firms were Samuel Jones Ltd. (St. Neots) and Brown Brothers (Milton Keynes).
2.4 Limitations of the research Method

In the strictest statistical sense, the four migrant firms studied are not representative of moving firms from London, nor can it be said that the migrant workers and the Stress area residents in Islington are representative of city residents. Nevertheless, the firms were selected because they satisfied criteria vital to the study, namely: they were located in the inner city areas of London prior to movement; they were drawn from both manufacturing and distributive industries; their staff was composed of a good mixture of socio-economic groups in accordance with Registrar Generals Occupational Classification, and a reasonable ethnic mix. Migrant workers interviewed were randomly selected from lists provided by the employers; and Stress area residents were similarly randomly selected from the Voter's List. In view of the fact that only 162 workers from the firms were actually interviewed, a number too small for generalisations to be based upon, it is necessary to add the precaution that the interpretations on the data must be treated with caution. However, this limitation is compensated for by the large number of people interviewed in the stress area representing both residents and immigrants who already moved to new towns. In addition, the comparisons between workers from moving firms and respondents from the stress area gave greater weight to the significance of attitudes to moving.

Yet, since the research is based mainly on attitude survey, it is to be expected that ideally, rigorous and sophisticated methods
of measuring attitudes would have been adopted. This was not the case. To compensate for this limitation, a reasonable systematic participatory observation was undertaken involving attendance at meetings and film-shows, trips to new towns, lunch-time and informal discussions, and re-visits to the new town after the move. This was in addition to the structured and depth interviews with workers and the senior members of the management of moving firms. Above all, the opportunity to move, the conditions under which relocation was contemplated can be seen as a situation of fear, tension and anxiety and yet one in which the reactions and behaviour of workers and management can be studied sociologically. There was, therefore, two practical problems: one involving the study of a firm already under pressures of change; and the other, the constraining effect of time. Enthusiasm and pressure for information occasionally threatened the privileged access to that information; and because the project was financed for a limited period, a lot was hurried over that needed much more prolonged examination. In that situation, important dimensions of the problems being investigated could not at all be probed and vital details were lost. This research offers the opportunity of taking a cool look at the issues that the original study was unable to consider. However, there are still statistical details which would have usefully enabled other comparisons to be made in the present research which, regrettably, were unavailable. These, for example, were certain statistical tables on migration based on the 1971 Census.
2.5 Review of Literature

1. Migration as a social change

Research into planned migration must be placed in the context of social change because population movement has generally been recognised as and remains an essential component of economic and social development, political organisation and a symptom of social transition. But although shifts in physical and social space potentially and actually affect spatial and social relationships of people within their total environment, yet sociological studies of migration have hardly treated population movement as a significant social change. Too often, sociologists are quick to admit that their interests in migration ought to stem essentially from a concern over the sociological implications for social status, occupational change, re-socialisation and adaptation following the movement from one environment to another. Such academic gesture has not been translated into a systematic inquiry and those stated implications have not yet been subjected to empirical verifications. According to Jackson:

"Very little systematic study has been made of the disassociation or desocialisation process involved in moving from one social milieu to another".25 Eugene Brody has taken this point much further when he pointed out that a shift in residence involves not only new places but also new faces and new norms; and that movement over distances implies the crossing of regional subcultures and re-socialisation

which include negotiations for new friendships, kinship and social network and ties. Whilst the potential migrant is excited by new stimuli and perceived opportunities, he is also fearful of new threats and the unknown. It is, similarly, conceivable, that for the burgess, the reluctance to move may be based on the fear of the loss of the support of physical and social familiarity; or of the loss of those established values and relationships, and urban amenities and facilities which he regards as part of his entire heritage and which have hitherto coloured his social and cultural life. The migrant to a new environment carries with him much of the old and how much of it will depend upon his age, career, life style, the circumstances of the move, and perhaps his personality. He might be influenced by current social values or inspired by his future needs and aspirations. A new environment will confront him with the redefinition of new roles, and conformity with new patterns of life and new values. A new environment will generate new demands and may impose on the migrant new pressures and altered relationships; the loss of an old world and the acceptance, understanding and adaptation into a new one.

A change of familiar environment directly alters human interaction with the physical world around. The cumulative effect of the disappearance of social and physical familiarity on human behaviour

---

has been referred to by Alvin Toffler as "the shattering stress and
disorientation that are induced in individuals subjected to
fundamental change".27 It needs to be demonstrated in this research
that the typical tensions, stress, resistance, and other forms of
social pathology shown by potential migrants are generally an
adaptive response to environmental change comparable with the process
of homeostasis: a process which is directed to restoring the
equilibrium of a system disturbed by internal change.

A systematic study of migration as a social change cannot be
effectively undertaken without an adequate descriptive analysis of
a typical migration process based on the experience before, during
and after the event. The process has the actual and potential
advantage of revealing the meaning that is attached to and the
direction of the change as seen by those affected. For example,
social change, however it is caused could either result in individual
advantages, or the destruction of an established value, life style
or future prospects. Change is likely to generate tension as it is
likely to have been caused by it.28 For a firm that is relocating
its activities, the problem is one of both making a change and
maintaining the organisation's equilibrium through effective
management of the tensions created by that change. An important
dimension of the process of adaptation becomes, in this respect,

27 Alvin Toffler, Future Shock: A Study of mass bewilderment in
the face of accelerating change, (London: The Bodley Head, 1970),
p.4.

28 E. Moore, "Adaptation and Tension-Management" quoted by Percy
Cohen, Ibid. p.194.
tension-management. It must be expected that a change of work environment should be followed by resistance, stress, tension and fear of the loss of earnings and career, and valued contacts and connections. Staff may be lost by voluntary withdrawal of labour or through redundancy and retirement; and the firm may face the problem of manning during the period of transition. In both situations, survival and maintenance of the stability of the firm are necessary. Moore's theory of tension-management may not require any criteria of success since it emphasizes as a sufficient condition that tension produces some processes that require management. It will be a vital aspect of the analysis of the migration process to examine the way in which a migrant firm manages and controls both the tensions created by a change of location and the problems of re-socialisation and adaptation into a new environment.

2. Migration Theories and Migration Studies

Academic interest in population movement in the 1880's produced the earliest kind of migration theories based on Revenstein's Laws or Trends in Migration. The next stage, within the first half of this century, dealt with the development of the push and pull theories (Bogue, McDonald and Rossi), and further added the theories

29 Revenstein's 'Laws and Trends in Migration' are a set of propositions which have provided valuable testable hypotheses for many important studies. They are summarised by Jackson, Migration, p.283.

of intervening and competing opportunities (Stouffer, Isbell, Bright and Thomas).\textsuperscript{31} These theories are summarised by Clifford Jansen.\textsuperscript{32} Characteristically they are mainly concerned with the size and direction of migratory movements of individuals and groups. In more recent years, demographers have moved towards establishing hypotheses for migration differentials which should have universal application for all times in all countries. In general, however, these theories suffer from three main defects. First, their level of generality cannot stand up to rigorous tests because they are too vague in what they predicate. Second, they apply to individual movements and presuppose that such individuals are free agents. Third, the application of these theories has not been extended to industrial migration involving the movement of firms with their workers as on-going social systems. There has been the tendency to apply migration theories to the two different types of migration without any distinctions. In this research this distinction has been drawn through the concept of planned migration and the ways in which their implications challenge existing theories are discussed.

The pattern of migration research in post-war Britain varies in terms of approach, purpose and content. In terms of approach, it is inter-disciplinary, drawing resources from economists, geographers


Economists have typically examined migration at the macro-level, conceiving aggregate movements as mechanism of adjustment in the labour market. Geographers tend to concentrate on socio-economic studies in which population trends are related to broad physical changes. In terms of content and purpose, the bulk of migration research commissioned by the public sector in particular, are geared to producing data on which policy decisions could be based. There was for example, a clear recognition of the relevance of migration to physical, social and economic planning to motivate the appointment of the Barlow Commission, the Reith Committee, the South East study, the Greater London Development Plan, already mentioned, and the Dispersal of Government work from London. But by their nature, these studies are policy-oriented and generally lack theoretical framework. Similarly, in the private sector, studies on industrial mobility have been largely feasibility studies for use in the solution of immediate problems. By their own nature too, they are 'industry-centred' and concentrate on the 'economics of industrial movement'. The use of studies and data as policy-making instruments follow the tradition of 'survey-before-decision'.


34 See footnotes to Chapter 1, pages 3, 6 and 8.


It is this ideologically-backed tradition in social planning which has determined the current policy-oriented nature of most researches and studies on internal migration. In order to enrich the interpretations of data from migration studies on which policy decisions are based, there is an urgent need to draw resources from theoretically-backed research. This present research, it is hoped, would contribute to the bridging of this gap.

3. Approaches to explaining migration behaviour

Literature on population movement contain different approaches to the explanation of the decision to move. These approaches do not only reflect differences arising from the emphasis of different disciplines but also differences in schools of thought. Thus, there are: Urban and Community Sociology approach, Sociology of Migration approach, and approaches borrowing from industrial sociology, from planning and urban renewal, and from social ecology. The urban and community sociology approach explains out-migration as a function of the degree of attachment to the community. The Bethnal Green Triology of the Institute of Community Studies, confirm the fact that majority of residents in a traditional working class community such as Bethnal Green are so attached to their local areas that they invariably do not wish to move out. Intensive social interaction,

fostered by extended family and kinship relationships as well as the availability of social facilities, help to keep the people within these areas. However, the studies also indicate that the prospects of better housing often persuade such people to move out. Yet, although many welcome out-migration, there have been the well known crisis of adjustment into new environments following migration, manifested by social isolation, loneliness, retreat into family, home-centred life. In the case of migrants to new towns, these have been referred to as 'new town blues'. How do we explain this phenomenon? Is it attributable to deprivation from social interaction; loss of a sense of place and neighbourhood, disappearance of a familiar environment or loss of a sense of community? This research will try to offer some explanation to those behavioural manifestations.

Sociology of Migration approach has tended to explain migration decision as a function of the migrants' motivation and the need to adjust into the new environment. Motivation is usually limited to economic objectives and adjustment to the problem of re-socialisation. The much wider issues of the general response to change and the events before, during and after migration are inadequately dealt with. In recent years, the study of motivation had branched off into what is commonly known as Selectivity in Migration, which attempts to relate migratory behaviour with the needs of specific categories of migrants, according to their age, sex, life cycle, social class,
career and occupational categories. Of particular interest is the probe into the reasons why people move, an aspect of the study of motivation epitomised by Peter Rossi's study. Rossi's study, though fundamentally useful in the understanding of motivation, is restricted to housing choice and does not take into account the relationship between spatial movement and social mobility. One of the questions that this research explores is whether there is evidence to show that movement out of the inner cities is, for some social groups, an instrument of social mobility. That is, to say a means of improving their social standing as a result of the quality of the environment in which they become residentially located. Or, were they any group of inner city residents who moved to new towns in order to maintain an already established social status and style of life?

Industrial Sociological approach would explain migration decision as an adaptive response to the change of the environment of a work-organisation. This approach is based on the organic concept and the open system theory both of which treat the organisation as a living organism that must be related to its physical and social environment if it must survive. A.K. Rice, has argued that an enterprise, like an organism, must work to live. During the existence


of the enterprise, Rice explains that it employs human beings in a variety of roles; and that the organisation relates to its workers, and workers relate to each other and to their tasks. Parts of the organisation must relate to the whole and the whole to its environment. In this organisation-as-organism approach, management is the brain that makes decisions which enables the organism to adapt to its environment in order to continue its existence and maintain a stable position. The reactions of management are, therefore, as important as the reactions of the individual workers within the organisation for the survival of the whole system. It becomes immediately apparent that a firm that plans migration finds its social structure, its stability and its survival threatened by the very fact that it will have to uproot from its familiar environment and face the problem of adapting into a new one. As can be expected, the employees of a migrant firm face exactly the same problem. The threat to stability can be traced to the interaction with and the interdependence of the firm and its workers on their environment. An alteration of this interdependence through the process of migration threatens survival and generates an adaptive response from the firm and workers. On this ground, the open system theory emphasizes the need to study organisations not in isolation but by relating them to their environment. Emery and Trist have demonstrated this need by studying enterprises as 'socio-technical systems'.

least these characteristics of open systems: they grow by processes of internal elaboration and manage to achieve a steady state while doing work, i.e. achieve a quasi-stationary equilibrium in which the enterprise as a whole remains constant with a continuous throughput, despite a considerable range of external changes”.

Implicit in the open system theory are the notions of functional interdependence and interaction between the organisation and its environment. Both notions draw their strength from Functionalism and the Action Theory. Their empirical relevance can be traced to the fundamental assumption that the orientation of the actor is geared to the gains and costs of interaction which he might have calculated and discovered in the past, finding the results satisfactory. Whilst the explanatory value of the industrial sociological approach is substantive, its weaknesses need to be adequately highlighted. The environment, on which the approach focuses attention is never clearly defined as a concept. This weakness has been stressed by R.H. Khan who points out that the problem lies in deciding where the environment begins and where it ends. If the environment is something that we experience and to which we must continuously relate as of necessity, it is hardly necessary to draw a clear boundary, yet necessary to provide a working definition. Often this definition is limited to market and political environments - i.e. conditions which affect productivity and marketing and political decisions affecting the

industry. Less thought is brought to bear on the organisation's relations with its physical and social surroundings - i.e. its relations with other institutions (family, education, religion), the community (social ties); - the various ways these bodies may affect the organisation, and the worker and his contributions within the organisation. In particular, less attention is often paid to the attitudes and aspirations which the worker brought into work from the external environment of the organisation and the ways they affect the worker's relationships within the organisation. In other words, the limited notion of the environment fails to account for the work and non-work needs and aspirations and the way these factors affect the major need for adaptation following migration. In this research, the Socio-spatial Interaction model has been developed to explain adaptive response in migration by showing that migration decision involves relating to influences outside work organisation.

Planning and Urban Renewal approach explains the movement of population out of the inner city areas, for example, as a function of the unattractive physical appearance of the areas; the age of the property within them and the increasing cost of maintaining them; and as a function of the effect of planning and redevelopment programmes taking place in them. At the same time, the migration behaviour of inner city residents is often difficult to understand. In the case of London, for instance, while some people are enthusiastic about leaving London, others are quite reluctant to
move out even if they were induced to do so. Yet, there are others who previously left for the suburbs years ago, but who are now returning to the very areas that they abandoned. This fascinating migration behaviour is currently referred to as gentrification. The West Midland Regional Planning Council (1967) recognised the effect of this reluctance on the volume of movement when they stated that:

"the difficulty which many conurbation firms face over a move to the new towns is the reluctance of the people in the business on whom they depend to move". The problem is, of course, widely acknowledged by businessmen and industrialists, generally. For example, a Location of Offices Bureau Study (1964) found that office firms considering decentralisation from London thought that staff difficulties were the major obstacle: 36 of the 38 respondents indicated that the firm anticipated losing much of their staff on relocation. Recently a major government report on the dispersal of Government Work from London based on a study carried out by Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, highlighted the significance of the phenomenon of reluctance. The report, in fact, concluded that:

"generally speaking, less than one man in five would welcome a move, although up to 85% disperse with varying degrees of reluctance".42

A growing suburban retreat, the reluctance to move and the process of gentrification are opposing social phenomena operating within the same inner city environment. They are both interesting and intriguing to the planner. Apparently, it was partly, for this reason and partly because of the absence of any systematic study in the sociology of planning which focusses on this trend that the East Anglian study\textsuperscript{43} pointed out that: "there is a serious lack of published research on the operation of planned migration schemes". This remark re-emphasizes the need to develop a sociology of planned migration within which the phenomena identified above can be studied continuously in depth.

Bearing in mind that Human Ecology is a branch of sociology which studies the relationship between a human community and its environments, an ecological approach to the explanation of migration behaviour would logically emphasize the influence of the physical environment. This is particularly so because in modern urban development, it is assumed that human behaviour articulates in some systematic way with the physical environment.\textsuperscript{44} But, in spite of numerous studies and experiments purported to demonstrate that physical surroundings influence behaviour, many still deny the existence of such influence. Partly because of the difficulty of clearly conceptualising the physical environment; partly because existing studies concentrate more on the human aggregates and less on their

\textsuperscript{43} East Anglian Planning Study (London: HMSO, 1968).

\textsuperscript{44} William Michelson, Man and His Urban Environment: A Sociological Approach, (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1970), pp.4-5.
relationship with their surroundings; and partly because ecologists exclude attitudes, sentiments, and motivations, the ecological approach to explaining migration behaviour seems to make very little impact.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 17-23.} This research therefore, will be looking for direct evidence from people involved on the extent to which physical environment influenced their migration decision. If such evidence is available, the claim by human ecologists would have been empirically vindicated.

2.6 Contributions of the research to knowledge

The contributions to knowledge which I hope this research would make can be summarised as follows:-

1. It will, for the first time, develop the concept of planned migration and based on it introduce and develop a Sociology of Planned Migration as a distinctive area of knowledge.

2. The migration process will be systematically studied in such a way as to demonstrate that migration involves different stages of transition; and that migration decision itself is a process of adaptive response based on cost-benefit analysis. This study will therefore enable migration study to be placed in the context of social change.

3. The research shall develop a framework on which a theory of planned migration can be deduced.
4. In the light of the findings, the research will
   a) Contribute to the debates on urban and community
      sociology, the embourgeoisement of the working
      class, the sociology of work and non-work, the
      sociology of migration, and the issue of
      environmental determinism.
   b) Contribute to a critical appraisal of the
      relevance of the policy of dispersal and
      decentralisation to new towns, especially in
      the light of new evidence.
5. It will provide empirical evidence which demonstrates the
   influence of the physical environment on migration decisions,
   thus vindicating the claim of human ecologists, and contributing
   to the development of a theory of the environment.
6. Looking ahead to the year 2000, the research will focus
   attention on the contributions that the new town development
   can make to social policy, economic development and regional
   planning; and to the combined effects of these influences on
   the demographic structure of new towns, as well as on the
   national pattern of population distribution.
PART TWO

PLANNED MIGRATION PROCESS

AND

MIGRATION DECISION-MAKING
Chapter 3

PLANNED MIGRATION PROCESS - A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

The primary aim of this chapter is descriptive: to give an account of:

(a) The general preparatory arrangements that migrant firms and (their) workers made in the process of moving out from the cities to relocate in a new town, and

(b) The attitudes and behaviour of a sample of both management and workers involved in this process of transition, with particular reference to the meaning which they attach to it and their response. Both the migrant firm and the migrant worker are actors in this situation, and have goals (needs and aspirations) which determine and explain attitudes to moving and ultimate migration decision. This account is extended to Chapter Four which considers the decision-making process itself; and to Chapter Five which discusses the frame of reference of workers in making their decision.

3.1 The Meaning Attached to Planned Migration

The sociological significance of the 'meaning of meaning' is based on the fact that 'meaning' is a fundamental determinant of and a frame of reference for the explanation of social action. The thing that has meaning to an actor may be 'a situation', 'an act', 'an idea' or 'an object'; and the particular meaning attached to each of these,
determines and explains the behaviour of the particular actor in the given situation. 'Meaning' has a central importance in interactionist sociology whose origin goes back to Max Webber's Action Theory. Symbolic interactionist sociology emphasizes the importance of (subjective) meaning and the interpretation that individuals acting under a given situation attach to their action. Whilst it will be apparently an error to adopt a simplistic behaviourist approach by looking at behaviour as a response to environmental stimuli alone; or by over-emphasizing the constraining effect of any range of social facts in the determination of social action, experience of a real situation may show that social action could be the effect of a combination of rational action, value-oriented action, emotional action and traditional action following Webber's typology. 46

'Meaning' has a number of attributes. The notion of meaning may imply 'significance', 'shared categories of perception', 'variable interpretations'. 'Meaning' must have some historical continuity, i.e. socially generated and sustained; and 'meanings' mark the essential difference between 'behaviour' and 'action': the first being the product of need for conformity and the second, the result of the exercise of judgement. Given the situation in which the firm has proposed to relocate in a new town, one way of understanding and explaining the attitudes and behaviour of the migrant firm's workforce in terms of the decision to move or not to move is by a close

46 Raymond Aron, Sociological Thought, P.180; Percy Cohen, Social Theory, p.81.
examination of the subjective meanings that different workers attach to relocation. It is possible, for example, that movers may have interpreted movement to a new town as a significant occasion to satisfy given aspirations. Similarly, for those who decided not to make the move, the shared category of perception may have been different from being simply an opportunity. Within the entire workforce, it is likely that the interpretation and subjective meanings attached to relocation would vary between the various occupational categories and between the working class and middle class. In each case, the subjective interpretation represents not only the classificatory factor that puts workers into categories, but also the main determinant of the behaviour pattern of each category.

It is important to note that the meaning of the situation and the interpretation of the same situation can be different for each of the actors experiencing it at the same time. This particular point underlines another dimension to the argument of symbolic inter-actionists, namely: that subjective interpretation of the meaning of a situation is a function of the needs and the experiences of the actor. 'Meaning' is, therefore, a dependent variable of social action which can range from 'great significance' to 'arrant nonsense' according to the interpretations of different individual actors. Thus, the actor's definition of the situation emphasizes the essence of the part played by meaning in the understanding and explanation of motivation and attitudes in a given social situation.
And the fact that people may have shared definition of the same situation itself explains why meanings can be transmitted and revived by the process of socialisation and internalization.

Goldthorpe and his associates have, in fact, demonstrated how the actor's own definition of the situation can significantly determine attitude and behaviour. They concluded that the decisive factor as to whether or not their sample of affluent industrial workers are likely to be integrated into their work organisations was the way that they define their work situation by reference to the pattern of wants and expectations that they wish to satisfy in their employment. They further expressed the belief that: "in industrial sociology, what may be termed an action frame of reference could, with advantage be more widely adopted; that is a frame of reference within which actor's definition of the situations in which they are engaged are taken as an initial basis for the explanation of their social behaviour and relationships".47 An action frame of reference, therefore, would direct attention to the variety of meanings which migration, in a given situation, might have for the migrant workers: meanings which will be reflected prominently in the pattern of attitudes and behaviour shown by the decisions they took about moving or not moving. The implications of the notions of subjective meaning and action frame of reference for migration decision-making have been dealt with in Chapter 5.

3.2 The Role of Management in Planned Migration

The role of management in planned migration process deals with the action taken by the migrant firm's management to ensure that the transition is successfully completed. This role compares with Management of Innovation: an expression used by Burns and Stalker\textsuperscript{48} to describe and explain what happens when new and unfamiliar tasks are imposed on industrial concerns organised on relatively stable conditions. Similarly, the movement of a firm to a new location involves a state of transition requiring a particular kind of management. Transition threatens the stability of the firm even though it was also the means to ensure its persistence. Interactions between the firm and its external environment, between management and workers, and between workers and the environment outside work are also disturbed by relocation. In this situation of transition, management is responsible for managing both the internal system and in organising the external environment in order to ensure that the firm (with its workers) survive as an ongoing social system. This requires management to make strategic decisions involving planning, controls and tension-management.

Management Ideology and Assumptions

Each of the migrant firms tended to adopt a common pattern of introducing relocation in a less dramatic way, and of applying an

apparent systematic method of preparing the workers for the proposed transition. All of them also shared a similar style of managing and controlling the tensions and responses which relocation generates. The apparent similarity in approach seems to suggest that there are common assumptions held in management circles about the nature of working people and about the appropriate conventional methods of influencing (manipulating) workers to make them respond in a particular desired way. Management ideology and assumptions were based on the following views:—

1) That man is self-centred and less interested in the work organisation.

2) That man is fundamentally resistant to change.

3) That given the nature of man as in (1) and (2) above, the business of management should consist of directing the efforts of workers: motivating them, controlling and modifying their behaviour, to suit organisation goals, and objectives. That is, in order to achieve organisation goals, people can and must be manipulated. It was on the basis of these interpretations of management function and responsibility that management action was apparently based with regard to conditioning, preparing and assisting workers to accept relocation; to respond favourably to it and eventually to make the move and adjust into the new environment.

Announcement of Relocation and Initial Response

In each of the firms, the announcement, which commonly took place at a special meeting convened for this purpose, was made at least fifteen months before the actual move. In one of the firms, the announcement was made two years in advance of an official meeting with Union executive members. Each of the announcements was then followed by a circular letter to each member of the staff, a copy of which was displayed on the general notice board. Some of the circular letters carried the warning that there will be redundancies and earlier retirements with corresponding benefits. In some other cases those that will be affected by redundancy and retirement were informed directly by the Personnel Department. Workers were free or invited to discuss their problems.

In spite of the carefully planned way of introducing relocation, it was impossible to completely avoid shock, tension and hostility. Invariably, therefore, immediate reactions ranged from resistance and hostility, anxiety and fear, to blatant opposition to the change. Partly because there was considerable uncertainty and uneasiness caused by the knowledge that there will be redundancies and earlier retirements, and partly because of the general disorientation and resistance which a social change brings in its trail, the initial attitude of all workers was one of disapproval and general reluctance to move with the firm to its new location: a response which, as shown later on, can be traced to its biological, socio-psychological and economic foundations. Initial responses had the important function
of putting the workers into two distinguishable categories, namely: (potential) Movers and Non-movers; so that from this stage onwards it was possible to begin to make valuable observations about the attitudes and behaviour of the two groups. Thus, when both groups were asked the same question: "When you first heard, how interested were you in the idea of moving to the new town?", the responses revealed distinct attitudes 'for' and 'against' moving and gave invaluable opportunity of hiving away workers into groups who were further asked how and why they have the identified attitude. In answer to the above question, 35% of the workforce (N=52) said they were 'Very interested in moving' whereas 26% (N=39) said they were 'Not at all interested'. Those who were very much interested in moving, were all movers (41% of the total) and those not at all interested were from the Non-Movers group (55% of the total). The remaining members from both groups (4%) gave 'other answers' ranging from 'Not interested', 'had open mind', to 'don't know'. In the fourth firm, the union was totally opposed to the whole idea of moving to a new town.

It is important to recapitulate the kind of response that followed managements' method of introducing transition. Resistance, anxiety, fear, hostility and blatant opposition were displayed by the various reactions of workers in each of the firms. There was tension as workers worried about their jobs and their future in the firm; morale was low, and the stability of the organisation was apparently threatened.
Management clearly had a job of managing the tensions and controlling the various reactions and responses which transition created or provoked. Nevertheless, the earlier reactions did not only enable an observer to divide off workers into Movers and Non-Movers and to start the important process of evaluating the attitudes of both groups toward relocation, but also it provided a valuable indication to management of the kind of control that was needed to make relocation work. On the other hand, the first stage also generated a sense of curiosity in the workers, pointing in the direction in which information to workers should be fed.

**Management's Orientation Stimuli**

Orientation stimuli combines tension control with the conditioning of workers' attitudes to moving. As a mechanism for tension control it was used to respond to demands for further information after the announcement, and to the clarification of the uncertainties raised by earlier anxieties. As a conditioning process, it served the purpose of preparing workers for transition: providing the vital information, giving the necessary assistance and above all, enabling the workers to begin to internalise the situation and to interpret subjectively the meaning of relocation. Orientation Stimuli were made up of preliminary conditioning, secondary conditioning and familiarisation processes.

The preliminary conditioning process took the form of **Meetings** and **Personal Interviews** with Personnel Manager/Officer at which the worker had the opportunity of obtaining details of the effects of relocation on future staffing, pay and conditions of service,
promotion and career prospects, staff and management relationship, and housing conditions in the new location. While management expected to change the attitudes of Non-movers and to influence those possible Movers who had not yet taken a firm stand, an assessment of the extent to which personal contact with workers through the meetings and interviews, showed partial and perhaps disappointing results.

Although the majority of both Movers and Non-movers knew about the meeting (more than 50% in each case), as much as 92% of Movers and only 43% Non-movers were in attendance. Whilst 25% of Movers thought that the meeting was useful in making their minds up about moving, 71% of them were 'very much interested in moving' after the meeting, only 4% said the meeting made no difference in their attitude (i.e. they were already in favour of moving). Similarly, Movers generally thought that at the personal interviews with the Personnel Manager, discussions covered a lot of important issues and were valuable in themselves in the clarification of most of the uncertainties faced by workers.

For Non-movers, the evaluation of the meeting and interviews was not so nearly as clear-cut as it was with the Movers. Only 14% of Non-movers admitted that the meeting was at all useful; 33% of them would reconsider moving as a result of the meeting. But when asked what they think about interview with the Personnel Manager, Non-movers were unanimously critical of the way the discussions were conducted. Many pointed out that Management seemed to have already decided who to take and who to drop and as one Non-mover remarked: "They wanted Yes and No answers". Such remarks seemed to suggest a confirmation
of the allegation that migrant firms used relocation as an occasion for getting rid of inefficient labour, coloured workers and trouble-makers; an allegation which was, of course, not particularly investigated. Those who were either retired earlier or declared redundant for reasons of age and so on, also expressed the suspicion that they were victims of management re-organisation at the time of relocation. As one of them remarked: "At my age after wasting my life in...(the firm), no one wants to know you at this time"; and another one said: "I have been with the firm most of my working life. But they gave me no chance. I was not even asked to choose to go".

Secondary Conditioning

Secondary conditioning took the form of financial assistance to all workers interested in moving and different kinds of incentives available particularly to those who will like to take the opportunity to move. Financial assistance included removal costs and travelling expenses to the new location, allowances for soft furnishing, family and children's allowances, personal allowances and allowances to meet legal costs of house sale or/and purchase. Incentives included promised wage increases and/or promotions, Rent Rebate for the low-paid, and promise of work for a spouse who, hitherto, had been unemployed. In other words, migrant firms appeared to be saying to its workers: "We are quite prepared to offer cash assistance to enable you to meet the costs of moving and generous incentives if you decide to relocate with us". Assistance and incentives were not
simply empty promises. Indeed, although one firm paid only the minimum removal and travelling expenses of £50, the other three firms paid £170, £200 and £400 respectively to each of their actual migrant workers in order to enable them to meet such expenses mentioned above. It must, however, be pointed out that these allowances (in all the firms) were paid differentially, based on length of service, seniority and status, and on the strategic position occupied by the worker in the firm.

Workers' attitudes to financial assistance and incentives to move, once again, were quite mixed. Generally, those inclined not to move tended to be uninterested in any form of financial assistance or incentives, no matter how substantial and attractive. Nevertheless, a very small percentage of Non-movers (5%) would have reconsidered their attitude to moving if the financial assistance and incentives were reasonably improved. On the other hand, those who were seriously considering moving had different ways of assessing the extent to which cash assistance and the various incentives would enable them to make their minds up. The most important item of expenditure that gave all the workers much concern was furnishing a home in a new town. They were all apprehensive of the high standard of decency that new towns would demand. Consequently, they put the cost and standard of living in a new town (artificially) very high. Less than half of the workers facing the decision to join the relocating firms (49%), however, thought that, on average, it will cost them £150 to make the
move, including soft furnishings; while 51% thought it is nearer the £200 mark. On this basis, 71% of Movers thought that the cash assistance from their firms was inadequate to help them meet the cost of moving, and 29% thought the offer was good enough. In one of the firms which paid an average of £400 per worker, it was unanimously acknowledged that the assistance was generous. And, in the firm that paid £50 to the worker, it seems clearly evident that any dissatisfaction there may have been well grounded. Yet, it is interesting to know that when movers were asked whether they could have moved if there were no financial assistance from their employers, 82% of them said they could have moved anyway without any such assistant; 4% would not move if they were offered less; only 2% said that they will not move at all if nothing was offered to help them make the move. The remaining 12% gave other answers. Compared with Non-movers who, as already indicated, generally tended to show less interest in assistance and incentives, it was not surprising to find only 5% who thought that their finances were inadequate to enable them to make the move and to meet up what they regarded as higher cost and standard of living.

Incentives to move offered to workers ranged from promised or actual promotions and salary increments, to an undertaking to offer jobs to spouses of migrants, and the assurance of the availability of rent-rebate for low-paid workers. In two firms, the wages of Movers were actually increased twice: one before and the other after the move. In one of these firms, the two wage increases averaged a total of £400 per annum. Some of the promised promotions
to higher positions were fulfilled either before or after the move. Up to 63% of Movers would wish their wives to work at the new location: mainly for financial reasons (85%) or only to avoid boredom (15%): and 37% would simply wish their wives to remain at home as housewives. But as many as 57% of Non-movers would not have bothered about jobs for their wives if they changed their mind to move; and 43% of them expressed no interest in such incentives.

Similarly, on the availability of Rent Rebates, as many as 81% of Movers were not at all interested since they felt that they can easily afford the level of rent in the new town. However, 19% of them said they will apply although how many of them that actually did so is not known.

Strikingly interesting is the finding that the major incentives were almost invariably directed to persuading foremen and supervisors and the more skilled manual workers to move. This socio-economic group, usually referred to as key workers, make relocation possible or impossible. Firms were therefore, prepared to make extra incentives available so as to retain them. In two firms, interest-free loans to enable key workers to buy cars and allowances for the heavy furnishing of their new homes were among the 'extra' incentives given or offered. One key worker summarised the situation by saying: "This company needed people like me especially during the transitional period. They had to meet my demand rather than lose me". The attitudes of key workers can be explained by two factors. First, the awareness of their strategic position and the determination to
exploit it during the period of relocation. Second, they seem to be also aware of the lack of alternative jobs to go to in new towns compared with the limitless opportunities in the large and older cities. The remark of one respondent from this group reflects the fear from lack of alternative job opportunities when he said: "It is O.K. if I move now because I must. But what will I do if I lose my job there". But whilst "key workers" were keen to exploit the situation, for some of them moving may not be a permanent thing. It was rather, an adventure. One respondent emphasized this point by saying: "The governor asked me to come along and promised me a rise and promotion. If it does not work out well, I will go back to London in a very good job. You see, I had four years apprenticeship".

Although redundancy pay and retirement benefits are not strictly speaking any form of incentives, yet it is worth commenting on the kind of motives and attitudes associated with such payments. One of the earliest reactions, including hostility and opposition to relocation following the official announcement, were rooted in the warning that there will be redundancies and earlier retirements. Those workers who were ultimately affected (mostly older people) were generally disappointed, and distressed and, in some cases, really bitter. Not only that they lost their jobs and regular earnings, but also because they felt that they were not given the opportunity of exercising a choice between moving or staying. Indeed, for many older people, relocation was an occasion to abandon the rushed life in London to which they have been subjected for many years; an occasion to retire into the quiet suburban life of a new town and into a
country house. Their attitude to redundancy and earlier retirement, no matter the size of compensation and benefits attached, was simply couched with regret and dissatisfaction. Compensation was neither an effective substitute nor an alternative to the possible choice of moving. Yet, for the firms, redundancy pay and retirement benefits were both adequate and suitable compensation. In one firm, in particular, however, the size of the compensation was admittedly good, some workers collecting as much as £4,000 in redundancy money alone. But in that firm, the generous compensation was the result of hard negotiation by a Union which blatantly opposed relocation knowing that a large number of its members will lose their jobs. In this circumstance, the union made sure that if any of its members were redundant or retired earlier, it must be at some extra cost to the employer. There were, of course, instances in which workers opted for voluntary redundancy and earlier retirement. These were instances in which it was much more profitable for the (voluntary) redundant or retired worker to stay behind with a handsome compensation. Workers who took this kind of action did so, for example, confident that they could, in addition, find an alternative job in London. The attitudes of all workers toward management's financial assistance and inducements to enable them to move to a new town, in general, challenge management theory about the nature and wants of the working man, and the general assumptions about why people are generally reluctant to move to new towns. This point has been fully discussed under paragraph 3.4 below.
Familiarisation Process

Relocation involves the movement of a total social system, namely: the firm, its workers and their jobs. Every such movement implies an element of dis-association from a familiar environment, a transition and an involvement with a new environment. It means a new context of physical space and social relationships. To most migrant workers, the new town was totally unfamiliar and distinct; very few have friends already living in it; and others may not have visited one. Thus, to prepare workers for adaptation and adjustment, they needed to get well acquainted with the new location. This familiarisation process is comparable to an initiation ceremony (rites de passage) which, as Jackson puts it, "may act not merely to ritualize the transition but also to prepare and socialize the individual for the changed circumstances he will encounter". 50

Firms showed reasonable awareness of the value of familiarisation and took keen interest to present a good image of the new town. But no matter how efficiently the preparations were, they were never adequate nor complete since the new environment also demanded the making of choices, the definition of new situations and roles, and the making of adjustments brought about by altered physical space and social relationships. Nevertheless, the steps taken by migrant firms to smooth the worker's way into the new situation were, generally, reasonably helpful. They were as follows:

50 J.A. Jackson, Migration, p.2.
(i) Exhibitions and Displays

Each migrant firm, in co-operation with the appropriate Development Corporation and the Greater London Council organised elaborate exhibitions and displays of photographs of factory buildings, council and owner-occupier houses, industrial estates, community centres, schools, shops, and other facilities for leisure, sports and recreation available in a new town. Workers and their families were invited to a meeting to see and to discuss the significance of the objects of the exhibitions and displays with officers of the participating organisations. In two cases, Exhibitions and Displays were combined on the same day at the same meeting with a film about life in a new or/and expanding town. Development Corporations also mounted similar exhibitions and displays but for the wider public, running for days or weeks (e.g. the Milton Keynes Week) and combined with extensive information giving service and advice on how to move to a new town as well as the kind of assistance available to potential migrants.

(ii) Opportunities in a new Town - A Film Show

Either on the same day in which the exhibitions and displays took place or at a separate meeting, workers and their families were treated to a documentary film show on "opportunities in a new town", featuring relatively prominently, the following: housing, work situation, the healthy environment, social facilities and the development of community life, and so on. For many of the workers, the film show, and the exhibitions/displays were the first, and perhaps the best opportunity to obtain a first-hand official/authoritative information about the new town. The management of the firms were fully convinced that a
familiarisation process which did not present a good image of the new town to workers could hardly be effective. To the Development Corporation and the GLC the exercise was not only a necessary publicity and public relations stunt, but also an accepted mechanism of selling the idea of new life in a new environment; something that was in its own way, necessary if a move to a new town was not going to be regarded as 'a tough (impossible) adventure'.

The variation in the attitude and reactions of Movers and Non-movers to the Exhibitions/Displays and the film show is, though not unexpected, yet interesting. Generally, Movers were much more keen to obtain as much information as was necessary to enable them to take a rational decision. On the other hand, Non-movers, already inclined to looking at the darker side of things, were comparatively less keen on all forms of familiarisation processes and generally tended to be both sceptical and critical of management efforts. For example, whereas 57% of Movers were aware of the Exhibitions/Displays and Film. taking place, only 47% of Non-movers expressed that awareness; and of the number of Movers that was aware, 92% actually went to see the Displays and Film at the various meetings; only 4% of them did not. While 53% of Non-movers attended, 47% did not. When workers were requested to evaluate the effect on their attitudes to moving after attending at the Exhibition, etc. the reactions were as shown in Table 9.
Table 9
EVALUATION OF THE EFFECT OF EXHIBITIONS/DISPLAYS, AND FILM SHOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Movers(%)</th>
<th>Non-Movers(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite interested</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Open Mind</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very interested</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views differed (within household)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)

It is important to note that up to 87% of Movers and only 16% of Non-movers expressed the interest to move as a result of what they saw and the information gathered about new/expanding towns from the Exhibitions, Displays and Film Show. Although 74% of Non-movers remained uncommitted to moving, ranging from those who had open mind to the 'Don't knows', those who had open mind (33%) formed an interesting group: a fact which demonstrated the little impact on Non-movers which familiarisation processes had made so far. In spite of the fact that it was Non-movers in particular, who were quick to describe the Exhibitions, etc. as publicity gimmick and public relations exercise which had no relation to helping workers, yet there is little doubt that this was one aspect of management action which proved to be relatively effective, especially on Movers.
iii) Conducted Tours of the New Town

The pictorial introduction of the new town by way of displays and exhibitions and the enhanced image through the documentary film were followed by the most down-to-earth familiarisation process, namely: an actual visit and tour of the new town. On average, each migrant firm organised two coach or bus trips to the new town for its workers and their families. At least, one of the firms organised four such visits for its workers. The main aim of the trips was to enable the workers to visit and to see the new town for themselves, perhaps, for the first time; to see the houses and the total environment; to acquaint themselves with the available facilities: shops, schools, transport, sport and leisure; and to judge for themselves whether they can make a happy living in such a new surrounding. Each visit was a day trip. Limited by what can be seen of a new town covering a vast area in a good part of one single day, the trip, inevitably had to be a conducted tour. As such it was directed in such a way that the visitors were able to see only what was considered important: the new houses, community centres or sites for them, shopping areas, historical buildings (if any), and places of general interest. But in a situation in which the visitor was keyed to look for and to see a range of things he/she considered essential in making up their minds to move to a new environment, it was generally unsatisfactory for some outside authority to decide in advance what and where should be important to the visitor. Thus, whilst officers of the migrant firms, the Development Corporations and the GLC/Local Authority were
extremely helpful in guiding the workers round the new town, they were limited both by time and by advance official selection of the places to be visited. However, since the visit was extended over two or three days, losses in any one day tended on the whole to be compensated for. Nevertheless, the limitations potentially reduced effectiveness of the visits.

When workers were later given an opportunity to evaluate the significance of the visits, there were interesting reactions and comments. First, 67% of Movers and only 23% of Non-movers went on the first trip, while 33% of Movers and 72% of Non-movers did not. In the second trip, all Movers (100%) went; only 21% of Non-movers went, whereas 79% of them did not. Once again, the relatively keener interest of Movers compared with Non-movers was apparent. Second, Movers tended to be more impressed by both the new towns and by what they saw, such as houses, shops, the clean and healthy environment, etc. The bulk of Non-movers was critical of the way the tours round the town were conducted, pointing out particularly that "they only took us to see what and where they liked us to see". They generally thought that a conducted tour for workers who were interested in different things in a new town was not sufficiently helpful to people to make up their minds. Perhaps it was for this particular limitation, that many Movers and Non-movers sought for additional (private) means of gaining greater knowledge about the new towns by making extra private visits, getting information from friends or relatives already living in a new town or attending at a public exhibition comparable with the
Milton Keynes Week. For instance, 70% of respondents had visited the new town privately and/or have friends and relatives already living there; and only 30% had not. On their impression of living in the new town, 58% of Movers and 47% of Non-movers were "very keen" and only 5% of Movers and 20% of Non-movers said they were 'not at all keen'. The rest gave other answers ranging from 'Quite keen' to 'Not sure/Not very keen'. Thirdly, when asked how interested workers were in moving to the new town after the first (official) visit: 76% of Movers were 'Very Interested'; 21% were 'Quite Keen' or 'Had an open mind'; whilst only 3% were 'Not at all interested'. On the other hand, only 22% of Non-movers showed interest and may change their minds, and 29% were 'Not at all interested'. It is very revealing that before the second trip took place, workers had almost completely made their minds up about moving or not moving. Up to 67% of Movers and all the Non-movers (100%) at this point were either 'Absolutely certain' or 'More or less certain' that they were going to move or not to move respectively. However, after the second trip, the number of Movers who were 'Absolutely certain to move' rose to 78%, with only 22% still not sure or had an open mind; and 96% of Non-movers were 'absolutely certain' not to move with only 4% that may (possibly) change their minds.

The question that is raised by the response and attitude of workers to the value of the familiarisation processes as a whole is: "When did workers make their minds up from the time the official announcement about relocation was made to the period when they were taken to see the new town?" Although it was impossible to obtain a clear-cut answer from respondents, an insight was gained into the way
that they evaluated each of the familiarisation process. This was arrived at by ranking and weighting the processes mainly by taking into account the significance that the worker attached to each through subjective judgement. The picture that merged is shown in Table 10.

Table 10
EFFECTS OF MANAGEMENT ORIENTATION STIMULI ON WORKERS' ATTITUDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Orientation Stimuli of Management</th>
<th>Movers (%)</th>
<th>Non-movers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After visiting the New Town (First or/and second trips, etc)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the Exhibition/Display and Documentary Film</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Interview with Governor or Personnel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After official announcement of relocation or 'As soon as I knew about firm's movement'</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal circumstances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other undefined influences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New Towns Project (Migrant Firms Survey)

From the table, the extent to which the visits to the new town influenced attitudes toward moving stands out clearly as 34% of Movers confirmed their readiness to move having been to and seen the total environment of a new town. After attending at the Exhibitions/Displays and seen the documentary film on 'opportunities in a new town', 26%
of Movers seemed actually to have made their minds up, while 22% decided in favour of moving just after the official announcement or as soon as they knew about the move, possibly before the official announcement. Thus, before the trips were organised, not less than 66 out of every 100 of the movers had already made up their minds to make the move. It seems that the 34% who said that they were influenced by the trips to the new town was a reflection of the cumulative effect of earlier familiarisation processes, considerations of personal circumstances and other undefinable influences. It may be statistically erroneous to assign undue significance to the trips on the basis of the percentage of workers who said they were influenced by them. For instance, only 67% of Movers thought that the first trip influenced their attitude, which is only 1% up and above their state of mind before that trip (66%). This percentage only moved up to 78% after the second trip. It seems therefore, more reasonable to regard the period after the trips as the period when attitudes of workers became absolutely clear but not the time that these attitudes were formed. The same goes for Non-movers. From the tables, 39% of Non-movers were already inclined not to move from the time relocation was announced. Up to the time of organising the first trip, not less than 90% of Non-movers already indicated in various ways their dis-interestedness in making the move. So, although some of them were certainly impressed by the new town atmosphere and often hinted that they may change their minds, it does seem that, in the end, they stuck to their dis-interestedness.
What conclusions, even if tentative, can we draw regarding the effects of management action in preparing workers for the move to a new town? Any conclusions to be drawn must take into account three main factors, namely: workers' response to all that happened from the time the official announcement was made to the period when visits to the new town were completed; the information which the researchers obtained from a sample of the management through (depth) interviewing; and the knowledge the researcher gained from being a participant observer at meetings, and at the Exhibitions/Displays etc., as well as by going on one of the bus trips to the new town.

As noted earlier, neither the smooth and carefully planned method of introducing relocation nor management's generally helpful attitude to workers prevented the initial reaction of workers from being free from shock, anxiety, fear, hostility, opposition; and from the announcement generating tension and resistance. These reactions were not simply the direct response to change but also the result of the workers' uncertainty about how they will be affected. In addition, the information that workers needed to calm their nerves came either later or was obtained through the 'grape-vine'. The researcher observed that management believed that if much information was released too early, workers' anxiety may be the more provoked; and that it would have generated a greater demand for more information. But too little information produced just the same effect. More so, it was apparent that management tended to show greater interest on Movers and generally tended to be more helpful to them than to those who initially expressed unwillingness to move. It is, therefore, not surprising to observe that Movers on the whole tended to have benefited more from management action in preparing workers for relocation than did Non-movers.
At the meetings between management and workers organised in order to enable the workers to obtain more information about relocation and to have a number of issues clarified about redundancy, retirements, incentives and financial assistance, researcher's observation was that there was little communication between workers and management reflecting the spirit of the get-together. The meetings did not appear to have defined and set objectives and were noticeably unstructured. They were more or less set up as monitoring devices; monitoring and measuring feelings through the kind of questions that were asked, but less geared to bringing together problems that relocation generated which management should then direct its energy to. In other words, there was very little feedback of a fundamental nature from management probably, again, for fear that workers may capitalise on some issues which management may find difficult to control. It is true that some of the questions from workers were either too minor, too particular or generally charged with emotion. This is understandable because respondents formed a group of people in a situation of fear, anxiety and uncertainty; at the same time they were facing perhaps the first and most crucial change in their working lives. Given this situation, it seems inappropriate that the response to the questions put out by workers, no matter how frivolous they appeared, should not have been given with the kind of nervousness that prevailed at the meetings. However, in spite of the general dissatisfaction, especially among Non-movers, the atmosphere was reasonably calm and friendly. Management at least ensured that it was a memorable occasion by providing free tea and biscuits and light refreshments. In many ways, however, they were
very useful meetings in which workers picked up valuable information and exchanged views with one another. Compared with the Exhibitions/Displays and Documentary Film, the latter were very well organised and brilliantly presented. The exhibitions and displays stimulated a great deal of interest and the reality of the pictorial introduction. There was little or no exchange of views at the end because the assumption was that the exhibitions and film show had told the full story. The coverage and depth of information from the documentary film were enough to confirm the assumption. But since workers were individually looking for clues to basic problems, they were understandably critical of the tendency to present a good image of a new town and a utopian kind of life that it offers. Workers also suspected that the exercise had more public relations and publicity function for the new town and less helpful to enable workers tune themselves to the coming change and its problems. Perhaps, with justification, workers needed more individual attention and detailed and carefully planned familiarisation processes.

One of the most surprising findings of the survey was the attitudes of workers toward financial inducements to enable them to move. Majority of Movers did not bother about whether or not they were assisted to make the move which they could have made with or without any assistance or incentives. Majority of Non-movers were not interested in both cash assistance and other forms of incentives to induce them to reconsider their inclination not to move. It is even doubtful whether the 5% of Non-movers who thought that they were not
financially well off to move without assistance could have moved if the cash allowances were improved. When incentives are considered, majority of both Movers and Non-movers were not particularly induced to move because of incentives, whether in the form of wage increases, promotions or 'extra' incentives for 'key workers'. It follows that there must be other considerations perhaps not directly related to work or the work organisation which provided much stronger motivation to move or to stay behind without the attraction of formal incentives. There is little doubt that management's orientation stimuli (preliminary and secondary) had very significant effects in providing the kind of information, assistance and inducements necessary to prepare the worker for a change of work environment, residential location and new community life. But how fat has management ideology, including their assumptions about the working man, effectively guided management action and successfully influenced the attitudes and behaviour of workers? Douglas McGregor, has produced two sets of polemic beliefs in management philosophy which have interesting explanatory value in the understanding of managerial behaviour in work organisations. The first set which he refers to as Theory X underlines the earliest and most conventional theory dating back to the days of F.W. Taylor (the Father of Scientific Management) which states that: "people are passive, even resistant, to the needs of the firm unless they are persuaded, punished or controlled". Underlying

this conventional theory are the implicit assumptions that the working man is lazy and indolent, unambitious and have little need for responsibility. He is innately self-centred and fundamentally resistant to change. There is still, therefore, a wide belief and acceptance among managers in the view of the working man as a biological machine working for survival. For many managers, the working man is an economic man acting rationally only to advance his interests; regarding money as a principal incentive, and can willingly co-operate with management if he can be shown some financial advantage. On the basis of belief in this ideology, management of migrant firms seemed to have put much faith in the power of money and incentives to induce their workers to relocate. At the interviews with a sample of management, some sensitive managers were honest enough to admit that they have at various stages applied the theory with satisfactory results. A combination of the preliminary conditioning geared mainly to controlling tensions with the secondary conditioning process aimed at providing concrete incentives, would have, they claimed, ensured maximum results. Unfortunately, however, the assumptions about the nature and the needs of the workers proved, to say the least, inaccurate. As noted above, workers failed to respond to financial assistance and incentives as expected. This disappointing result can be explained, at least, in three ways. First, workers generally showed very little interest in the various offers of financial assistance and incentives. Second, William F. Whyte and Associates,  


53 W.F. Whyte, Ibid. Chapter 16.
have argued from the premise that the reward-punishment theory of motivation on which an incentive scheme is based, assumes that man responds as an isolated individual to reward or punishment. Tested against a real situation, the assumption has proved to be unfounded. Using Pavlov's experiment Whyte and his associates drew an analogy showing that an incentive can generate co-operation from the recipient but only over a time. Beyond that time, the incentive becomes suspect and rejected. Some managers of migrant firms expressed doubts about the effectiveness of the incentives offered to workers to stimulate the response needed or to change attitudes in favour of moving. Where the incentives were suspected as either a reward, a coercion, a controlling mechanism or even a possible punishment, workers were quick enough to reject them. This was the case in one of the firms with a strong and influential union. The union did not only oppose relocation but also rejected for and on behalf of its members any forms of incentives to induce workers to move. Instead, it negotiated for very handsome sums of money for its members in the form of redundancy payments or (earlier) retirement benefits as compensation for loss of jobs. This last point underlines the misleading belief of the migrant firms in assuming that incentives should rather be given to individual workers.

---

54 Pavlov's Experiment, Ivan Pavlov conducted an experiment with a dog which established that a dog salivates when food is placed in its mouth but not when stimulated otherwise. The experiment shows that humans can be so conditioned as to respond in the desired direction. This finding has been adapted to many uses including brain-washing.
instead of considering the group as a whole. The tendency in all
the firms to deal with workers on individual basis is a reflection
of the firms adopting a unitary frame of reference.\(^{55}\) When managers
applied this theory to preparing workers for planned migration, it
failed to produce the desired effect on any substantial degree.
Third, Douglas McGregor, in describing the second set of management
philosophy propounded what he called Theory Y, drawing attention to
what conventional management theory failed to take into account. In
exploring the weaknesses of conventional management view McGregor
based his argument on Maslow's Hierarchical Theory of Motivation.\(^ {56}\)
McGregor emphasized that the needs of the working man in his work
organisation are spread from physiological and safety needs, to
social needs, ego needs and self-fullfilment needs. Conventional
management view is rather pre-occupied with the physiological and
safety needs, often equating money and career with the other social
and psychological needs. By focusing on this narrow aspect,
management often adopt as a working hypothesis the carrot-and-stick
philosophy and so deny to itself the possibility of appreciating and
exploiting the full range of motives and talents that people bring
into the work.

\(^{55}\) Unitary Frame of Reference is a management ideology which views the
firm or any work-organisation as a one family unit with common goal
and interest, namely: the achievement of organisational objective.
It assumes that the interests of the workers and management are the
same in broad terms. Problems of individual workers are regarded
as domestic or psychological and therefore tackled charitably.
See Alan Fox in "Research Paper 3 (Industrial Sociology and

\(^{56}\) A.H. Maslow, "Hierarchical Theory of Motivation", in Organisation
Behaviour, p.64.
In the 'Survey of migrant firms' the failure to give a wide interpretation of the working man's needs and motives led management to put much premium on changing the workers' attitudes by offering them money and other incentives. Indeed, what McGregor emphasized in Theory Y is that money is not the only thing to which the worker responds, and that responsibility of management (internalized ideologically) should be to organize matters so that the working man can meet and achieve their own different goals by directing their own efforts towards organisational objectives. Where management fails to recognize needs and aspiration brought into work but which must be satisfied beyond the immediate work environment, a conflict situation arises. As it will be shown in Chapter 5, this is what happened to many workers. Some Movers rejected incentives and still decided to move; some Non-movers also rejected financial assistance and still decided to stay behind. These attitudes to incentives seem to indicate that they are other non-financial and non-work needs or aspirations which workers were keyed to satisfying by moving or staying behind. Nevertheless, the fact that some Movers, especially from the middle management group were largely the beneficiaries of the incentives offered by management, demonstrates that money still retains its important role of inducing people to move. But whether this confirms that the working man could continue to be regarded simply as an economic man remains a debatable issue. However, some managers of the migrant firm believed that they might have been influenced by management ideology in their behaviour towards workers; some of them believed that they stand somewhere between Theories X and Y, often forced by various conditions to oscillate between the two. It was, however, clearly apparent that the social and environmental
needs and aspirations of workers were given least attention by management in preparing them for relocation. Cultural lags in managerial philosophies in these circumstances are apparently as real as cultural lags in technology. This simply means that there is urgent need for the basic assumptions of managers about the working man to undergo some revolution.

3.3 Planned Migration Model: The Dichotomy and Fallacy of "Before-and-After"

The study of migration, as a social change, has been rather strangely segmented by the water-tight contrasts between the events "before" and "after" the move has taken place. Little is known or studied about the process involved in the change. The events before migration have been simply regarded as the composite memory of things past and so either ignored or given scant significance. Consequently, studies in migration have tended to take for granted the significance of the earliest reactions and responses of the potential migrant as the consequences of dis-association from his familiar environment and de-socialisation from the values of the society from which he would be departing. Disinterestedness in the events before and during migration is predicted by the assumption that the migrant easily wipes out old memories and readily prepares for full socialisation and assimilation into the receiving society. Such assumption apparently gains support only from the motivation and enthusiasm of migrants already determined to make the move; or from the strength of the rather materialistic push-pull hypothesis. This assumption is wrong in the sense that the
experiences of each migrant before the event are important variables that link the past with the future. To treat those experiences as if they are unimportant amounts to the removal of a significant link in that chain of events which reveals the migration process. Similarly, although the event after migration has relatively attracted the attention of sociologists, nevertheless, it has been rather overladen with concern, and pre-occupation with assimilation, adaptation, adjustment, and acculturation of the migrant into the receiving society. Partly because of what is described simply as a progressive idea and partly because of the assumption that the significant experience is always the present one, the extraordinary emphasis on events after migration have dominated a large part of migration studies.

Motivated by the desire to account for the various ways through which the successful migrant integrates into the host society, sociologists have identified a number of influences. Brown, Schwarzweller and Mangalam have, for example, demonstrated the effect of kinship ties in enabling the migrant to adapt and adjust into the new environment. It is, therefore, obvious that references to the events before and after migration leave a gap which migration studies have, invariably, left unbridged. This gap is accounted for by the migration process, (See Migration Model: Before-During-After, Fig.4).

The fallacy of the dichotomy of the migration event is clearly demonstrated by this model. Instead of regarding the processes as distinct and separate, they are linked with each other. The model indicates three stages in the migration process which correspond with three levels of stimuli and three levels of responses. Thus, although in the second stage, the second level of response deals with the migration decision-making process, it is nevertheless, related to levels of response in both the first and third stages of total events. Similarly, reactions in the first stage influences responses in the second and third stages.

The Events Before

The Events before (planned) migration will refer to the reactions and responses of workers to the management of relocation. For the events to have the appropriate meaning, Management must be seen to provide the 'stimuli' and workers the 'response'. Given the three stages of the migration process (Before, During, After), three levels of stimuli are identified with corresponding levels of responses at every stage of the process.
In Fig. 5, the big square under the second stage (during Migration Process) represents the source of Management Stimuli which are composed of Official Announcement of planned migration and the various Orientation Stimuli - preliminary and secondary conditioning of workers, and the familiarisation processes. The small circles represent worker's
response. Following the official announcement of relocation by Management, the initial reactions (responses) of workers have been described as biological, psychological, economic and social: a classification which albeit, imperfectly puts workers' feelings and attitudes into descriptive categories according to their source of origin. Thus, a biological response refers to the reaction of a worker threatened with detachment from his natural habitat by migration. The announcement of relocation included naming the new location (i.e. the particular new town); so that the response of the worker was reflecting his anxiety and problems over uprooting from a familiar surrounding and to adapt into a new one. The biological nanalogy is important in demonstrating that if an organism is removed or threatened with removal from its natural surroundings (stimulus), then it responds to the imminent change in a number of ways, such as adapting to the change, rejecting the change (and perhaps dying) or escaping from the change (i.e. the response). Workers were precisely in the same position as the organism because the news of imminent change of their work and residential surroundings generated such responses as fear, anxiety, hostility and opposition to the change. They are fundamental responses which came from both Movers and Non-movers at this particular stage of the migration process. Although it is difficult to say where to draw the line, these responses also have some psychological content. Moving away from a house, a street or a district in which one has spent an appreciable length of a life-time can be a painful experience. One
does not realise the depth of emotional attachment to an area until one is about to abandon it. The loss of a sense of place, getting away permanently from the street corners where one played and grew up, and moving away from the little sweet shop, the quaint local library and from the nice green-grocer: all this, can make life in a new surrounding miserable. It may seem trivial, yet these little things can be a source of emotional and psychological upset. In fact, some of the negative responses of workers to planned relocation were based on similar emotional upset from moving away. Equally important is the degree of social attachment of worker to his surroundings. He is part of the community; he is a member of different local clubs and sports associations; he may be a father and a husband; a member of the tenants association. He is a voter, a councillor and may be, a local political leader. Besides, he may have relatives, children and grandchildren who live a couple of streets away. In many ways, the working man might have been an established man in a community which he may have helped to build. Within this community he is surrounded by a web of social relationships. For such a man, the knowledge that his firm is pulling out of the area and the threat of uprooting from this familiar environment, are enough to cause him much anxiety.

The Survey of Migrant Firms' offered workers the opportunity of a subjective assessment of the importance to them of the area in which they lived. As it will be observed, workers responded in a variety of ways, (through answers to questions and personal remarks)
which indicate how they think they will be affected by moving or if they moved. These assessments are based on the extent to which respondents are physically (biologically), psychologically and socially attached to the area. First, 5% of the workers have lived in the present area at the time of the proposed relocation all their lives; 61% have lived there over 10 years; 17% have lived there between 5 to 10 years; 18% have lived there between 2 and 5 years and only 19% have lived there between 6 months and 2 years. Thus, 78% of the workers can be said to be reasonably well established in the area in which they were living at the time of relocation. Second, asked what they think of that part of London and the street in which they lived, the response varied from: "It's O.K"; "we like it here"; "it's decent"; "we have good neighbours and we hope to stay"; to: "well it used to be nice, quiet, and respectable, but now full of wogs and drunken people. It's no longer the same. If we have a chance, we shall move". Third, on a clear-cut evaluation, respondents were asked to indicate how satisfied they are with the area. The response is as indicated in Table 11 below.
Table 11

Assessment of Own Area/Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base N=150</th>
<th>All (%)</th>
<th>Movers (%)</th>
<th>Non-Movers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly satisfied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit dissatisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)

Of particular interest is the indication that 77% of all respondents were satisfied with the area in which they were living at the time; and that up to 63% of Movers and 86% of Non-movers expressed satisfaction. If the majority of Movers were satisfied with their area, why then did they move? This question has been explored in Chapters Four and Five. It is also possible that satisfaction of Non-movers (86%) with the area in which they live may have contributed significantly to their decision to stay behind.

Workers demonstrated the significance of attachment to the family and to the community by their attitudes toward planned migration. Respondents were required to indicate whether they have relatives living within easy reach, when last they saw and talked
to them and their assessment of the importance of relatives living nearby. "Relatives" refer to Mothers, Fathers, Brothers, Sisters, Grown-up Children, Mother-in-law, Father-in-law, with a last contrasting category described as "none of them". Asked whether workers have relatives living within easy reach, the responses are broken down in Table 12.

**TABLE 12**

RELATIVES LIVING WITHIN EASY REACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base N=150</th>
<th>All (%)</th>
<th>Movers (%)</th>
<th>Non-Movers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grown-up Children</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-in-law</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-in-law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)

Although 26% of the workers have no relatives living nearby, 74% of them had, mostly brothers, sisters and grown-up children, mothers and mothers-in-law within the area. Moreover, respondents kept in touch with their relatives quite regularly. So that when asked to indicate the last time they saw and talked to relatives, the picture obtained showed clearly that there were frequent
contacts (See Table 13).

**TABLE 13**

**FREQUENCY OF CONTACTS WITH RELATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base N=150</th>
<th>All (%)</th>
<th>Movers (%)</th>
<th>Non-Movers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last 24 hrs</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 hrs - One week</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week - One month</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Month - One year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)

What significance did respondents therefore attach to having relatives living nearby. In Table 14, 56% (more than half) said that it is important to have relatives living nearby, 41% said it is not, and 3% did not know. For the Movers, 32% said it was important, 62% said it was not (and 6% had no expressed view). But up to 72% of Non-movers said it was important to them to have relatives living nearby while only 28% said it was not important. It would appear that Movers were less as attached to their relatives as Non-movers were, a fact which was likely to constrain the movement of the latter more than it did to the former.
TABLE 14

IMPORTANCE OF RELATIVES LIVING NEARBY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (%)</th>
<th>Movers (%)</th>
<th>Non-movers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly important</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)

It is important also to draw attention to the economic base of workers' earlier responses. An outstanding need of the working man to satisfy within a work-organisation remains the monetary reward. Since the official announcement about relocation carried the warning that there will be earlier retirements and redundancies, it was natural that workers should be uncertain and fearful of possible loss of their jobs. For the older workers and the unskilled, the axe was relatively much nearer; and for the younger, the skilled manual and the professional workers, their concern was to ensure continuity in career. During the period of economic depression, the need to stick to one's job is generally pressing. The survey took place at a period of economic recession, a situation to which workers generally reacted with concern and anxiety. Worried about the economic situation, the lack of skill and of alternative jobs in new towns, respondents were naturally aware of the consequences of
their failure to relocate with the employer. It was in this context that the notion of attachment to the employer had circumstantial influence on migration decision in the same way that attachment to a locality had been shown to have. Thus, attachment, defined in terms of relationship with the employer or a locality acted as a constraint on mobility.

The second level of reaction of workers has been described as 'Orientation Response'. As workers start to reconcile themselves to the realities of relocation, the instantaneous reactions and earlier emotional outbursts began to settle into more thoughtful calculations. Orientation response is the preliminary stage of an adaptive reaction - a behaviour pattern which marks the end of a simple emotional outburst. It occurs when the dusts are beginning to settle; and when the actor needs and asks for information that enables him to adjust his behaviour. There is an unmistaken desire and willingness to learn more about the new situation confronting the actor at this stage. It is at this level of reaction that workers sought for more information and greater communication with management about relocation; a level at which they began to interpret the situation in which they found themselves in terms of the gains or losses from moving or staying behind; and a level at which they began to attach meaning to the imminent change in their working lives.

Orientation response in this context is partly a response to management stimuli (Official announcement of relocation, preliminary
and secondary conditioning, etc.) and partly an induced response from management as a result of the perceived and actual demands of workers. In other words, orientation response of workers was both the cause and the effect of management stimuli. In other words, it was both a response and a stimulus. As the attitudes of workers were undergoing reasoned change (whether in favour or against relocation), management stimuli were directed to increased conditioning of those attitudes in favour of relocation by means of personal contacts (meetings and interviews); and by familiarising workers with the new location. When the maximum effect of a combination of the worker's response and management stimuli was reached, the worker's response was translated into an adaptive reaction. The worker became more interested in knowing more about the new location: its work and social environment, the comfort and interests of the family, the polity and government of the new community that will harbour him, concern over the education and training of the kids and the possible influences for developing the usual and familiar social institutions of urban living. How to adapt into the institutions of a new environment became the primary hurdle that a potential migrant worker must overcome. For most movers this was the final problem to overcome. Indeed, for all the workers in this situation of transition (perhaps more so for the Mover), the very anticipation of change was enough to trigger the adaptive reaction. As Alvin Toffler said: "The (very) need to alter one's way of life - which migration and relocation involves - and the need to trade an old
environment for a new one, the social pressures, status shifts, life style modifications and anything that forces us to confront the unknown, can switch on the adaptive response". Management stimuli ensured that the effect of the adaptive reaction is neither underestimated nor delayed beyond the appropriate stage in the migration process. This level of the response of workers demonstrates the inter-link between the various stages and between one level and another.

The third level of workers' response is referred to as the 'Rational Response': a level at which workers actually make up their minds one way or the other about moving. Rational response refers to vital reactions of the worker. First, he is at this level able to determine what he will gain or lose by moving or staying behind (i.e. his goals, needs and aspirations). Second, based on the determination of such goals, he chooses the means for achieving them, namely: either Moving or Staying. Third, the choice of means is then manifested in decision-making: the rational exercise of judgement which is relatively the most crucial and central to migration process.

In Fig. 6, the arrow connecting Rational Response with Management Stimuli indicates that although both reactions occur at different levels, management remained the central source of generating

the stimulus to which workers responded. The connection also demonstrates the extent to which the preparatory measures of management, in spite of their limitations, nevertheless, succeeded in influencing the determination of goals, the choice of means and the actual decision-making. The decision-making process itself is linked indirectly with how workers rated the new location as a suitable alternative environment to adjust into, the adaptive reactions of workers to the basic institutions of the new location and the ease or difficulty with which workers can or cannot be assimilated into the social and cultural matrix of the receiving community. What these linkages demonstrate is that the various stages in the migration process cannot be segmented into the water-tight compartments of events Before and After. On the contrary, each process is one link in a chain. For descriptive and analytical purposes, it has been necessary to differentiate one level of response from the other so as to bring out clearly the appropriate attitudes and behaviour generated by management's preparatory and controlling mechanics.

**Events During the (Migration) Process**

The model (Fig. 4) shows that, in planned migration, three major activities take place during the process, namely: the official announcement of movement, orientation stimuli whose dual purpose is to condition attitudes and prepare workers for change, and decision-
making. Except the decision-making process itself by workers, events during the planned migration process are dominated by managerial behaviour: planning, stimulating, organising and controlling activities as well as the reactions of workers themselves. In keeping with management philosophy of introducing change through careful planning, events during the migration process took place in the three stages noted above. An important function of the events during the migration process is that it reconciles the future with the present. The greatest anxieties of potential migrants are uncertainty and the inability to predict the future. Familiarisation processes are by and large directed to reducing such uncertainties and anxieties. The effectiveness or otherwise of the familiarisation process has earlier been assessed.

**Fig. 6**

Factors influencing migration decision-making
In spite of their limitations, they nevertheless played a crucial part in helping workers to prepare for the move. Beyond that point, it remains to consider the decision-making process itself: how workers took the firm decision to move or to stay after obtaining all the facts and information. It is unlikely that no single worker who wished to make the move had nothing to lose; nor could there be a worker that wished to stay who had no regrets. Inevitably, therefore, the worker's decision-making must be based on some kind of cost-benefit analysis: a calculation of the opportunity cost of moving or staying. The process must reflect and take into account all the reactions and information generated from the time the official announcement was made, throughout the period that workers were preparing themselves for the imminent change. It is a process which responds to actual needs and aspirations of those that make the decision. Thus, migration decision-making is a rational response. (See Fig. 5). In chapter 4, its structure and determinants will be fully explored and discussed.

Events After

Events 'after' migration must not be regarded as a separate activity which takes place after movement is completed. It should rather be understood to refer to the last of the three stages in the process which deals with settling, adjusting and adapting into the new environment. Before this point was reached, it has been shown
that the potential migrant had been making some adaptive responses long before actual settlement occurs. From the time he first knew about the new location, he had been constantly comparing it with the old surroundings, and evaluating its suitability as an alternative environment for living and working: its physical qualities, the expected community and family life and the adequacy of the social and cultural amenities, and facilities that migrants from urban surroundings are used to. He had visted the new location to see things for himself: an opportunity not only to familiarise himself with the area but also to make an on-the-spot assessment of the availability of the basic institutions which make adaptation meaningful: schools and other educational and training institutions, the world of work, family comforts, religious and cultural organisations, political and professional associations. Adaptation and adjustment are as crucial as getting acculturated and assimilated into the new environment. For effective assimilation the importance of re-socialisation cannot be over-emphasized. Margaret Stacey's study of the impact of new industries and the influx of immigrants to Banbury, an expanding Town, draws attention especially to the changes imposed on the social and cultural life of the town. 59 Banbury, once an old established country town with deep-seated traditions, became an expanding town with new industries and immigrants who brought with them new ideas and ways of life that

challenged old tradition. Migrants, therefore, bring with them their norms, values and other ways of life which they must reconcile with those of the receiving society by the process of re-socialisation. In a new town situation, the values and styles of life imported, totally determine the dominant culture eventually. The receiving society, like Banbury, faces the task of absorbing the newcomers and coping with the challenge to local tradition. But, migration to a new town presents a different problem of adaptation and assimilation. Migrants import into the new environment social and cultural patterns of life already known and enjoyed by them. Migration from the large conurbations implies the export of the urban culture: a culture which not only grows with the newcomers but also persists as the predominant way of life. Although most new towns were designated by a combination of core and existing villages, yet as these towns grow, they do so along the lines of urban development. Partly because the new town is a social experiment in urban development and partly because it is developed in such a way as to provide the kind of environment with which migrants are familiar, the new town can, with justification, be compared to the suburbs of the large city itself. Adaptation and adjustment for new town migrants means getting used once again to all the basic characteristics of an urban surrounding. Migrants expect, in a new town, those social and cultural institutions and amenities which have formed part of their urban lives. They expect to have schools, education, and training institutions, some kind of community life, some associations, leisure and recreational facilities, facilities like shops, transport, telephone, libraries, cinema, hospitals, etc., at the new location.
They expected the new town to be a replica of the urban surroundings. Effective adaptation and assimilation for the new town migrants means the availability of those social investments that make the urban environment a natural habitat for urbanities.

What kind of image workers had about the new towns was important in their decision to move to live and work there or not. Workers formed their opinions about the new town by learning about the town through management, visiting the new town privately or gathering information from friends or relatives already living there. The more realistic evaluation of the new town as a place to live seem to have been made by further consideration of what is available in a new town, the environmental quality and, perhaps the expected quality of relationships. The image of new towns that respondents had was considered under 'Reasons for Moving and not Moving' in Chapter 4; as well as when the experiences of migrants were assessed after the conducted tours and the completion of the move.

3.4 The Attitudes of Workers to Planned Migration

The preceding paragraphs of this chapter were devoted to the descriptive analyses of the migration process. The aims were to provide a descriptive account of the migration process: something that migration studies have hitherto taken for granted; and based on that account, to determine the attitudes and behaviour of a sample of the people involved in this process of change. So far, it has
been noted that, in general, the attitudes of a sample of workers involved with a planned migration have been sharply divided between those inclined to making the move (Movers) and those that rather prefer to stay behind (Non Movers). However, when attitudes are viewed much more closely as predispositions which provide the springboard for action and the determinant of behaviour, it becomes pertinent to examine a variety of workers reactions from the initial (emotive) feelings of shock, worry, anxiety, resistance and hostility towards relocation, to the more rational predisposition to the acceptance or rejection of the imminent state of transition. Yet, the sum total of feelings and reactions cannot give any clear indication of any structured attitude capable of analytical interpretation, which can enable conclusions to be drawn about ultimate decisions reached by workers. It is, therefore, important to examine any specific ways in which attitudes of workers were more concretely manifested.

Looking back to the events "Before-during-After" the migration process, the following factors appear to explain the attitudes of workers to planned migration relatively clearly: the initial reactions, responses to management orientation stimuli and the over-all drop-out rate. It is usual to explain away the initial reactions to change by the general belief that man is fundamentally resistant to change. The reluctance to make a change when it is necessary has always been taken as a given innate quality of man. For this reason, the phenomenon of reluctance itself has never qualified as a subject of inquiry and analysis. As the news about the relocation of the firm were broken to the workers, feelings ran high: anger, shock, anxiety, worry, hostility and resistance. The feelings of resistance and reluctance were shared
between potential movers and non-movers alike. This initial reaction represents not just the reluctance and resistance to change, but also a response to the fear of loss that change will bring and the adjustment that it will impose. It has been demonstrated that the initial reactions of workers represent an adaptive response to a fundamental change which affected or will affect the biological and psychological roots as well as the social and economic relationships of the individual with his physical and social surroundings. More than this, the earlier reactions reflect the needs and the aspirations of the workers. At the same time, they explain the root and the strength of the phenomenon of reluctance: why man is usually so resistant to change.

On the other hand, an important part of the attitudes of workers can be accounted for by the effects of what management was doing in order to modify existing attitudes, to change them or to hold them steady according to need. In other words, a significant aspect of the attitudes of workers was the by-product of the responses of these workers to the orientation stimuli of management directed to conditioning attitudes in favour of moving. It was hoped that by offering workers financial and other incentives, for example, they would have been induced to change their minds in favour of making the move. Except for those already pre-disposed to moving (Movers), the extent to which financial assistance, incentives and the familiarisation processes changed or modified attitudes significantly in favour of making the move, remains highly speculative.
It would seem that the most significant way in which the attitudes of workers to planned migration can be said to have concretely manifested itself is in the rate of drop-out that occurred in the firms. The rate at which workers dropped from making the move has a lot to tell about the effect of the preparations made by management to retain a large part of the work-force and to modify or change the attitudes of those who appeared to be undecided. The drop-out rate summarises the attitudes of the workers as a whole with regard to moving or staying. In Table 15, the average drop-out rate for the four firms was about 60%. In Firm B, the drop-out rate of 60.6% was just slightly higher than the firm's internal estimate of 57%. Firm C was the only one in which the number of workers who moved exceeded the number of those who dropped out. From a total work-force of 86, 46 moved whilst 40 did not: a drop-out rate of 46.5%. Compared with Firm D, out of a total labour force of 621, only 74 moved while 547 did not: a drop-out rate of more than 77%. When all the four migrant firms are taken together, the picture that emerged in terms of the volume of movement that took place, seems quite interesting. The four firms involved in the planned migration process had a total of more than 900 workers. Of this number, only about 200 moved and 700 elected to stay behind, a drop-out rate of more than 77%. The firms shared between them a total of about 30 employees recruited through the Industrial Selection Scheme.
TABLE 15

The Drop-out rate of workers in the Migrant Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firms</th>
<th>Labour Force Before Move</th>
<th>No. of Movers</th>
<th>No. of Non-Movers</th>
<th>Drop-out rate (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm B</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm C</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm D</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total All Firm A-D 909 208 706 59.25% (Average for all firms)

Source: Original Table 1 - Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)
Going by these figures alone, many questions can be raised. Why, for example, was the drop-out rate so high? If the drop-out rate is a trend that can be relied upon, how do firms survive after a move has been completed with more than half of the work-force staying behind? Or could it be that both the firms and the workers involved in the migration process studied, were a-typical? In view of the fact that the firms studied, though by no means representative of migrant firms, were drawn from manufacturing and distributive sectors, they can hardly be a-typical simply by the method of selecting them. The figures shown by the table, must, therefore, be a pointer to a significant phenomenon requiring a closer examination. Since workers are reasonably free agents in making a choice between staying in the cities or moving to the newer communities of a new town, a significant factor that must necessarily affect either the volume of movement or the drop-out rate in making such a move to a new town must be the individual decision-making process. In the next chapter (Chapter 4), the structure and the determinants of the individual person's decision-making process will be examined, and will be followed in Chapter 5 by a closer look at the frame of reference on which that decision is made. It is expected that both would have thrown adequate light on why the rate of movement to new towns from the large cities tend to be relatively slight.

3.5 Summary

The primary aim of this chapter has been descriptive: to give an account of a typical planned migration process, and of the attitudes and behaviour of both management and workers to the change involved in relocation. Against the background that migration is a fundamental
social change, the descriptive analyses carried out have been based on the meanings that management and workers attached to the transition. For the management of a migrant firm, the transfer of the firm to a better premises in the clean environment of the new town was construed as the most rational action to ensure the survival of the firm: and to make relocation work, was a management function involving planning, directing and stimulating, controlling and managing the tensions of the change. For some of the workers, leaving the city to a new town was an opportunity to satisfy a life-time aspiration even though it involved a journey into the unknown; but for others, the price that they had to pay by abandoning valued familiar surroundings was too much to make migration worthwhile.

Three stages in the planned migration process itself have been distinguished as:

(i) The period and the events 'before' the move
(ii) The period and the events 'during' the migration process, and
(iii) The period and the events 'after' the move.

Corresponding with the three stages are three levels of adaptive responses from workers generated by the orientation stimuli of the management in the efforts to prepare, condition and change the attitudes of workers in favour of relocation. These adaptive responses (Initial Response, Orientation Response and Rational Response) represent different stages in the vital processes that lead to the ultimate decision to move or not to move. However, each stage in the migration process
does not represent events segmented from and unconnected with those in the other stages. The events are, indeed, so closely linked as to be taking place simultaneously: each stage is merely one link in a chain. It is to demonstrate this link that the Migration Model (Fig. 4) has been used. Additionally, the model demonstrates the fallacy in the dichotomy of 'before-and-after' migration by showing not only that the reference (before-and-after) cuts out the vital event 'during the process itself' but also that there can be no sharp contrasts between the events 'before' and those 'after'.

Lastly, the attitudes and behaviour of workers to planned migration have been manifested in three specific ways, namely: by their initial and adaptive responses which reflect their needs and aspirations; by demonstrating the root of their reluctance and resistance; by their responses to the efforts of management to condition, modify or change attitudes in favour of relocation; and by the rate at which workers indicated their rejection of relocation, i.e. the drop-out rate.
4.1 Migration Decision-making as cost-benefit analysis

Decision-making is a process of the exercise of judgement in the resolution of problematic situations. It requires the decision-maker to have a good knowledge of information about the situation. The process itself involves the sifting of the available information, the weighing of alternatives and the careful assessment of the opportunity cost of satisfying one aspiration in preference to another one of equal importance. In organisational analysis, distinction is often made between organisation decision-making and individual decision-making of people within the organisation. The former takes the view that decision-making is a management responsibility exercised invariably by constant reference to the total organisation. The later takes the view that the individual is a decision-maker insofar as he is a problem solver. The view of the individual as decision-maker originates from the work of March and Simon⁶⁰, who, taking the view of the social psychologist, interest themselves with the influences which impinge upon the individual human being from his environment and the way that he responds to those influences inside the organisation. March and Simon believe that the behaviour patterns of man

---

in a work organisation are determined by the attitudes, values and goals that they bring into work. This view has very much influenced sociological analysis relating to the orientations that men bring into work as the springboard of their actions and the determinant of their (external) behaviour. Just as the organisation itself takes decisions that promote the actualisation of its goals, so does the individual in the satisfaction of his aspirations. Putting our sample of migrant workers in a position in which they have to take decisions that promote their aspirations, needs and the values that they bring into work, they assume the position of problem solvers. Does this make the worker simply a selfish calculating machine only interested in the pursuit of his own goals in the organisation? Although this may not be the case in the strictest interpretation, nevertheless, each migrant worker making a decision to move or to stay was engaged in a creative action not limited simply to the sifting of information but also in the weighing of alternatives and in working out the opportunity cost of choosing to stay behind or to move. The potential migrant at the time of decision-making has all the information he needed; he had been coaxed and induced, he had been conditioned and re-oriented to moving; and he has gone through the familiarisation processes that put him in a position to make a movement away from home less painful. What was his verdict, and how he balanced the advantages of moving against the disadvantages of staying, were achieved by a kind of cost-benefit analysis.
Theodore D. Graves developed three models as bases for the study of urban migration. In one of the models (Decision Model), he demonstrated that migration decisions are rational, conforming to the elementary principles of the game theory. He was, in fact, explaining that migration decision-making is based on a rational choice of strategy which enables the decision-maker to increase the advantages that he would gain but at the same time, reducing to the greatest minimum possible losses that he expected to sustain. Acceptance of this theory puts the potential migrant in a position in which the choice of moving gives him greater advantage than when he rather chooses to stay behind; and vice versa.

That strategy was developed by Kingley Davis and referred to as: a cost-benefit view of migration decision-making which keeps under perspective the specific conditions in which the decision is made and the subjective nature of the decision-making process itself. Kingley Davis holds the view that: "the decision to migrate rests (then) upon a rough calculus in which the relative advantages are balanced against the cost". He thought that in migration, there is, as a rule, an element of emotional and economic cost arising from leaving behind one's friends, relatives, a familiar


surrounding and one's employment in order to take up residence in a strange environment. The advantages seem greater than the cost before a decision to move is taken, and vice versa. Applied to the case of the workers of the migrant firms being dealt with here, whereas the potential migrant workers have got everything fixed up by their employers, many still declined to take the advantage. In Tables 16 and 17 below, the rough calculus on which the ultimate decision was based is demonstrated. The tables particularly 'draw attention to the fact that for the Movers there are reasons for moving as well as reasons why they could also have considered movement unnecessary. Similarly, the tables show both basic reasons for Non-Movers preferring to stay behind, as well as reasons why they would have also considered moving worthwhile. The process of trading off the reasons for with the reasons against, and balancing the advantages of moving or staying against the disadvantages for doing so in order to secure the maximum relative advantage, give a clear indication of the kind of cost-benefit analysis that the potential migrant engages in before arriving at the ultimate decision to move or to stay.

Taking the Movers first, Table 16 shows that whilst housing need, new town environment, family considerations, the state of London, work/career and other personal circumstances were the determining influences on the decision to move, there were factors which were equally important but which had to be sacrificed in favour of moving. For example, 12% of movers still valued attachment to their community, 26% had family and personal problems, 15% feared the loss of valuable contacts by moving, 18% had reservations on the effect of the move on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Migrant</th>
<th>Reasons for Moving</th>
<th>Reasons Why Movers Could Consider Staying Behind Also</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of movers mentioning the reason</td>
<td>Weighted Percentage of movers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New Town Environment                | Cleaner, Healthier Surroundings.  
Quieter and Restful away from rushed life in the twon.  
Like Country and small towns; desire to retire in the country. | 48 | 23 | 18 | 12 |
| Housing Need                        | Availability of new and modern houses: centrally heated with garden and other facilities. | 44 | 21 | 
| Work, Career, Profession            | Like my job and my employer.  
Do not wish to lose benefits.  
Don't want to be redundant.  
Moving to a nice modern factory with good conditions of service. | 36 | 17 | 
|                                    | Attachment to Community  
Born and brought here, can't leave. Too old to move, uproot and make new friends.  
My roots are here. | |
|                                    | Family and Personal Problems  
Other members of the family have jobs and roots in London.  
Specific unclassified family Problems. Other members of the family reject moving. | 37 | 26 | 
|                                    | Loss of Contracts  
With members of the family, friends, relatives, neighbours and other social and professional networks | 23 | 15 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF MIGRANT</th>
<th>N=152</th>
<th>Percentage of movers mentioning the reason</th>
<th>Weighted Percentage of movers</th>
<th>N=152</th>
<th>Percentage of movers mentioning the reason</th>
<th>Weighted Percentage of movers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family and Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Towns good for quiet family life. Better place to bring up children: clean surroundings, better schools and good educational facilities.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London Deteriorating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London is congested, dirty and full of socially undesirables. Desire to get out of London.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Circumstances and &quot;Others&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g Moving on health grounds; or because dependants are moving.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work, Career, Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made redundant or Retired earlier. Nearer to retirement - don't want to leave London. Pay and conditions of service not good enough.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities/Facilities in New Towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of amenities and facilities: Hospitals, shops, Transport, Entertainment etc. Poor image of new towns: too quiet, too cold, too open - don't want to be a pioneer...</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of living in New Town</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of moving, and furnishing high. Expensive to live in New Town: low wages, high rent, high cost of living....</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dislike for houses in New Towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooms too small, Houses like barracks, jammed up together. Dislike council estates.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem of adaptation and adjustment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to resettle, to make new friends; disturbs children's education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)
their career and profession, 11% were unhappy about the lack of amenities and facilities in the new town and 18% were worried about cost of living, the type of houses and problems of adapting into the new town. Yet, Movers consider the relative advantages of those reasons given for moving to be greater than the losses they would sustain by the constraining influences.

Non-movers, on the other hand, found themselves in a similar situation in which they had to balance advantages against disadvantages. In Table 17, Non-movers arrived at the decision to stay behind because of their attachment to their community, family and personal problems, the fear of loss of valuable contracts, lack of alternative jobs in new towns, lack of amenities and facilities in new towns, perceived high cost of living in the new town, dislike of the new town and its houses, and the perceived difficulty in resettling and adapting into a new environment. At the same time, some Non-movers admired the cleaner and healthier environment of the new town as conducive to the upbringing of children, some would have avoided redundancy and the loss of benefits and continue their career under the same employer; others were aware that London's surroundings are deteriorating and they would have considered getting out into a better environment, but they could not uproot from London, nor had they the courage to break away from friends and relatives and to abandon those facilities and amenities which have become part of their urban lives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-MOVERS</th>
<th>FAMILY AND CHILDREN</th>
<th>WORK, CAREER, PROFESSION</th>
<th>NEW TOWN ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>PERSONAL CIRCUMSTANCES AND 'OTHERS'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental and other care requirements</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded or disadvantaged</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost of living and furnishing</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested, dirty and full of socially undesirable</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living in New Towns, etc.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Circumstances and 'Others'</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17: Determinants of Migration Decisions: Cost-Benefit Analysis B**

- **N=152**
- **Weighted percentage of non-movers mentioning reason**
- **Percentage of non-movers moving**
- **Attachment to Community**
  - Born and brought up in area, cannot move. Too old to move, to uproot and to make new friends. Roots are here.
  - Family and Personal Problems
  - Other members of the family have jobs in London, etc. Other members of family reject moving.
  - Loss of Contacts
  - With members of the family, etc.
  - Made redundant or Retired earlier, etc.
  - Lack of amenities - Transport, Shops, etc.
  - Hospitals, etc. etc.
  - Cost of living in New Town
  - High cost of moving and furnishing.
## REASONS FOR NOT MOVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-movers mentioning reason</th>
<th>Weighted Percentage of Non-movers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike for houses in New Towns</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooms too small, House jam-packed, etc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of Adaptation and Adjustment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in settling etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)*
The cost-benefit analysis implicit in planned migration decision-making is not necessarily a clear-cut process comparable to the process of preparing "a profit-and-loss account" in order to draw up "a balance sheet". Nevertheless, the principles are the same: both processes involve the evaluation of assets and liabilities and the assessment of profits and losses, before arriving at a satisfactory state of affairs. However, whereas the accountant assembles the facts and figures on paper before striking a balance, the potential migrant sifts in his head (often consulting the wife or the husband and other members of the family) massive information, taps his knowledge of the situation, and draws upon his experience to be able to reach a decision. Nor can we simply assume that the process is carried out with clear absolute or reasonable rationality. While many workers were calculating and clear in their minds as to the best line of action (moving or staying) others either jumped onto the bandwagon or took the wrong decision. Thus, migration decision-making of the workers, whilst fundamentally based on 'a rough calculus' of gains and losses, rests on a combination of emotional and rational expression of needs, desires and aspirations. In a majority of cases, these considerations were un-connected with the tasks they perform in the work-organisations, but rather connected with aspirations they brought into work.

4.2 Structure and Determinants of Migration Decisions

What then were the factors which determined the final choice/decision for moving or staying? In other words, what factors decided the ultimate relative advantage?
(a) Movers

From Table 16, the first factor is New Town Environment: its cleaner, healthier and modern outlook; its suburban and respectable surroundings; its quiet, peaceful and serene appeal and its conduciveness to retirement and for the upbringing of children - these qualities were enough attraction for 48% of respondents who mentioned the factor as a determinant of their decision. This figure is the weighted equivalence of 23% of all the Movers who said that environmental factor was an important reason. Housing need came next: 44% of respondents mentioned it as a determinant (equivalence of 21% of all movers); then Work/Career/Profession (36% mentioned it, equivalent to 17% of all Movers); Personal Circumstances, etc. (32% mentioned it, an equivalence of 15% of all Movers); Family and Children (30% mentioned it, an equivalence of 14% of all Movers) and the Declining state of London: (20% mentioned this, which is an equivalent of 10% of all the Movers). Workers were responding to the question: "Can you tell me as fully as possible why you've decided to move?" It seems evident that the reason that respondents gave are a reflection of their subjective interpretation of the meaning that they attach, to the opportunity for moving: their motivation, needs and aspirations, their knowledge of the situation and a summary of their judgement in terms of residual relative advantage. It is especially important to underline the significant role of environmental factors in the determination of migration decision. The "environment" refers to a variety of things: from the physical state of the immediate surroundings to the strange elements in the street; from traffic build-up to the social activities going on around, and from "the way it was twenty years ago"
to the feeling that "everything has changed for the worse". The environment is people; it is attitude, and it is perception. When any of these attributes suffers, the environment is changed, destroyed or undergoing a stress to which people react by avoiding, i.e. moving away. They move away to another environment which either fits into their expectation or match their aspirations. London, to the movers, possesses the obnoxious stress that must be avoided: congestion, dirt, air pollution, the socially undesirables, etc.; and the New Town provides the alternativesattraction: clean, healthy, quiet, respectable and peaceful etc. In other words, London has "push influences" that forced Movers out and the New Town has the "pull factors" that attract Londoners. It is, therefore clearly evident that "the environment" determined the migration decision of as much as 23% of Movers.

This finding confirms empirically Julian Wolpert's theory that migration behaviour (decision) is an adjustment to environmental stress. Based on an ecological model, Wolpert demonstrated the implications of locational (migration) decisions by individuals and groups under strain caused by noxious environmental forces. Emphasis in the model is given to the urban environment, and most especially to situations of urban threat and stress, and migration decision is

---

63. According to Engel, "a stress" may be influenced, whether it arises from the internal environment or the external environment, which interferes with the satisfaction of basic needs or which disturb or threatens to disturb the stable equilibrium.

This operational definition of "stress" was cited by Langner, and Julian quoted by Wolpert "Migration as an adjustment to environmental Stress", in *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 22 (1966) p.93.
triggered off by stress impetus. Wolpert concluded that environmental stress, whether generated by inter-personal relations or by uncontrollable fluctuations in the physical world, is always present in the action space of individuals and its effect play some role in migration decision-making. This conclusion would therefore validate the ecological view that the environment determines human behaviour. 64

What type of migrants, it may be asked, should be expected to exhibit this behaviour, namely: a clear determination to avoid a surrounding that is perceived to be deteriorating and stressful? This question has been examined in detail below under "Typology of Migrants". In general, they are likely to be the working class impatient risers aspiring to improve their social status by residential location and those members of the middle-class who seek for retreat into the suburbs as a means of status-maintenance.

Housing need was a second important factor that played a significant role in the migration decision, twenty one percent of Movers having confirmed that it influenced their decision to move. But is it the case that Movers were much more badly housed than Non-movers?

TABLE 18

Tenure in London - Movers and Non-movers (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Movers</th>
<th>Non-Movers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupier</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renting:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From local authority</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From private landlords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unfurnished)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From private landlords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(furnished)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From housing associations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Free</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 N = 152 100

Source: Surveys of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)
Table 18 shows the tenure of the London housing of movers and non-movers. It indicates that differences in tenure between movers and non-movers are not very great, except that more non-movers were owner-occupiers (indicating that they may have felt they had sufficient security and a big enough financial stake in London) and rather less of the non-movers were furnished tenants. All the same, about one-third of both groups were council tenants and 20% of the movers were owner-occupiers (four households in this group actually owned their housing outright). Thus insecure tenure is not a sufficient explanation of the motivation to move. Moreover, Table 19 shows that in terms of amenities the housing conditions of movers and non-movers were remarkably similar. About one-quarter of both groups either had no inside lavatory or had to share one, and about three-quarters of both groups had exclusive use of both an inside lavatory and a bathroom. The only difference between the two groups worth remarking on is that rather more of the movers had no bath or shower. However, despite this lack of difference in tenure and amenities between movers and non-movers, it is clear that the movers were rather more overcrowded than the non-movers.

Thirty percent of the movers were living at more than one person per room compared with only 16% of the non-movers.

Seventeen percent of the non-movers were living at less than 0.5 persons per room compared with 10% of the movers.
TABLE 19

Amenities of London Housing - Movers and Non-Movers ( %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Movers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-movers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(Weighted</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(Weighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentages)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Exclusive use of inside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.C.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Bath or Shower</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Inside W.C.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Bath</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive use of Bath and inside W.C.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant firms (New Town Project)

But, despite the fact that there were some considerable similarities between the movers and non-movers in terms of objective housing conditions, the movers were on the whole far more dissatisfied with their London accommodation than the non-movers. Only 22% of the movers were 'very satisfied' with their accommodation compared with 55% of the non-movers. Conversely, 26% of the movers said they were dissatisfied (14% said they were 'very dissatisfied') compared with only 15% of the non-movers. Twenty-four percent of the movers - compared with only 7% of the non-movers - mentioned that amongst the features they disliked about their accommodation was the poor ventilation and damp, and 24% also mentioned
inadequate bathing facilities.

Interestingly, a similar proportion of movers and non-movers (20% and 22% respectively) mentioned over-crowding, but 34% of the non-movers said there was nothing they disliked about their accommodation compared with only 6% of the Non-movers. There are two points to be made here: the first is that the movers seemed to have had very different perception of their housing need and had more heightened dissatisfaction. The second point is that this greater dissatisfaction may have sprung from the fact that they were intending to move away and had come to view their current accommodation as merely temporary and worthy of rejection. Thus their heightened perception of housing need may have been a 'post hoc' rationalisation. If it was, then one could argue that housing conditions, even subjectively perceived, have not been established as a major 'push' factor. I will return to this when I come to look at the reasons people gave for moving, but suffice it to say that housing conditions figured importantly amongst these reasons and thus it seems that the movers were most probably more dissatisfied with their housing than the non-movers before the possibility of moving arose. Thus it can be said tentatively that while objective housing conditions were not a major push factor, the perception of bad housing was. Even so, neither perception of bad housing, nor insecure tenure offer sufficient explanation to housing need being an important determinant of migration decision.

It is, therefore, strongly suggested that a complimentary reason must be the availability of relatively newer and modern houses located
in what must be socially respectable, cleaner and healthier surround-
ings of the new town with its suburban appeal. Perception of bad
housing certainly extends into the notion of "neighbourhood", so
that getting away from an area that is thought to have lost its
original magic and respectability is as much an important aspect of
'housing need' as seeking for housing in a new town where 'it is
conducive to bring up children'. For both the young Mover with
young children to bring up and the older Mover nearing his retiring
age, housing need means more than a house with facilities and a garden.
Indeed, the remark of an older Mover sums up the wider notion when he
said: "After many years of hard work, I need to slow down. I will
do this when I retire into the countryside like ..................
(name of a new town)".

Finally, it is important to briefly examine what importance
respondents attached to their work, occupation or profession. It
is surprising to find that only 17% of all Movers gave, as their
reason for moving, the need to continue in employment with the migrant
firm. This figure, of course, is comprised of a number of reasons
given about different aspects of the respondent's present job which
either motivated him or compelled him to move. Thus, 8% of the
workers decided to move because they liked their job and more closely
attached to their employer; 5% moved because they did not wish to
interrupt their career with the employer and so risk the loss of their
benefits; 2% decided to move because they feared they will be redundant
and would find difficulty in getting an alternative job; and another
2% decided to move because they were proud to move into a nice and
modern factory and because they were satisfied with the conditions of
service. It is reasonable to assume that 17% of Movers were really motivated to make the move for reasons connected with holding their jobs and continuing with their career and profession with their employers. But this percentage of the workforce provides the basis for a sharp contrast with Michael Mann's study. In a comparable study of the movement of General Foods Limited (formerly Alfred Birds and Sons Ltd) from central Birmingham to Banbury (an expanding town), Mann found that the majority of his respondents depended very highly on their employment with the migrant firm for the preservation of their family and community ties. But on the contrary, environmental factors (including housing need) stand out as the determining influence on the migration decision of the majority of respondents of the migrant firms from Central London to new towns: attraction of new town environment (23%), availability of new housing in new towns (21%) and the deteriorating state of London (10%) - a total of 54%. It is possible that the difference in the finding can be attributed to the differences in the circumstances of the moves; or the differences between the two conurbations of London and Birmingham; or the differences between the respondents of the migrant firms in both places; or perhaps in the difference in the management of the relocation. Nonetheless, the analysis of determinants of the migration decisions of relocation in new towns consistently point to an unmistakable prominence which respondents attach to influences outside work environment. As

Michael Mann concluded from his study that there is a growing importance of employment dependence in the preservation of the family and community ties of the working man in advanced industrial societies, the 'Survey of Migrant Firms' invites the conclusion that there is a growing tendency for out-migration from the cities to be motivated by environmental quality which has little bearing on work.

(b) Non-Movers

Table 17 summarises the factors which determined, for the Non-movers, the relative advantages that made moving either unnecessary or made staying behind more preferable. Family and Personal Problems was mentioned by nearly half of the Non-movers (42%) as the major determinant of the decision to stay behind (i.e. an equivalence of 28% in weighted score); the fear of Loss of Contacts with members of the family, community ties, social and professional networks, and with friends and relatives, was mentioned as the next important determining factor by 29% of Non-movers (a weighted equivalence of 16%); Attachment to the Community and Work and Career each was mentioned by 23% and 19% of Non-movers (which are the weighted equivalence of 15% and 14% respectively) as a determinant of their decision not to move; Lack of Amenities and facilities in the new town was important for 17% of Non-movers; perceived high cost of living in the new town was a constraint to moving for 22% of Non-movers. Dislike for the layout and houses in the new town prevented the movement of 10%; and problems of adaptation and adjustment into a new environment discouraged the movement of up to 7%.
Respondents were answering the question: "Can you tell me as fully as possible why you have decided not to take the opportunity to move?" The responses were broken down into eight factors which workers mentioned as having determined their choice to stay behind. Factors which scored highest definitely have high content of familial, community and social relationships: Family and Personal Problems, Loss of Social Contacts, and Attachment to the Community. In Tables 16, and 17, Non-movers indicated the relative importance that they attach to relatives living nearby and the frequency of contact with them. The extent to which Non-movers were so close to their family is demonstrated by 14% of them rejecting movement because some members of the family had jobs in London; and 4% of them said that other members of the family rejected outright the idea of moving, whilst 10% of them had personal problems which increased the constraint on mobility. Different remarks of non-movers brought home the significance of these familial and social relationships. For example, one said: "We do not think it right to move from London and dislocate the education of the kids. We are Londoners with all our roots here - borne and brought up with valuable connections. There is even a small family business we cannot abandon."

There was a definite concern over the imminent danger of uprooting from an established home and community. The degree of physical attachment was measured by the open admission by respondents that by moving away they would have lost both "a sense of place" and "physical interdependence" with a locality which had become part of their everyday lives. "I have lived here all my life and have fallen in love
with the streets and the bricks on the walls", was a remark which appears to explain the biological and physical attachment rather vividly.

The problem of adaptation and adjustment into a new town was one which involved the considerations of different and complex factors and influences. For some Non-movers the problem revolved around age: either they considered themselves too old to move or they thought the move was not worthwhile as they were near the retiring age. A remark like: "At my age, I cannot uproot from London and go to start a new life in a new place ....... If you know what I mean, I can't make new friends now," pinpoints the problem of age. But for others, the problem was rather based on the concern for children still at school; the poor image they have about the new town which they thought too quiet, too cold and above all, lacking in the basic amenities and facilities which are part of an urban environment. It is not surprising, therefore, to hear a Non-mover saying:"I don't like new town. They are lifeless"; or "I don't want to go there. I cannot be a pioneer or a guinea-pig". It is perhaps important to draw attention to one of the fears of Non-movers which turned out to be unfounded, namely: their perceived fear of high rent. Table 20 gives a direct comparison between the rents that respondents were paying in London with the rents they will pay in a new town. Weekly Rents/Rates for similar accommodation in London and the new town were strikingly similar. The table shows that Movers paid an average of £5.50 a week (minimum £3, maximum £7) in London, whereas they have to pay an average of £6.50 per week in the New Town (Minimum £3, maximum £8). For those who moved, it was certainly
### TABLE 20

**Comparable Rent and Rates paid in London and the New Town**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Rent/Rates</th>
<th>London Movers(%)</th>
<th>Non-Movers(%)</th>
<th>New Town Movers(%)</th>
<th>Non-Movers(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1 to £1.99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2 &quot; £2.99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£3 &quot; £3.99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£4 &quot; £4.99</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5 &quot; £5.99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£6 &quot; £6.99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£7 &quot; £7.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£8 and over</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average weekly Rent/Rates 5.50 5.50 6.50

*Source: Survey of Migrant firms (New Towns Project)*

### TABLE 21

**Length of Service with migrant firm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Long Employed</th>
<th>Total% of respondents employed</th>
<th>Movers(%)</th>
<th>Non-movers(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 100 100

*Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)*
satisfactory to pay an additional £1 a week for a modern accommodation of far better standard, with modern amenities in a desirable surrounding. It is obvious that an additional £1 a week could not make all the difference that earned for the new town the description of "a place where the rents are prohibitive", following the remarks of a Non-mover.

The attitudes of Non-movers toward their jobs and career with the migrant firm leaves room for speculation. If 17% of Movers can be said to be attached to their employers so much as to have decided to move with their jobs, Non-movers can logically be said to be less attached. Yet when we measure attachment by the crude index of length of service with the firm, then attachment to the firm cannot offer an acceptable explanation to the migration decision of both Movers and Non-movers based on job and career. Table 21 gives an indication of the length of service of Movers and Non-movers with the migrant firm. In fact, while 18% of Non-movers had spent up to 20 years in their firms, only 8% of Movers had spent the same length of time.

Similarly, whereas 15% of Non-movers had been with their firms for 30 years and 4% had spent more than 30 years only 12% of Movers had spent up to 30 years and 2% over 30 years. For some Movers who were conscious of the effects of the rising unemployment at the time of this survey, and others fully aware that because of their age they could hardly get a similar job if they failed to move, it is understandable that they opted to make the move. But for the Non-movers who were in the same position, it is surprising that they rather took the decision to stay behind. The explanation lies not only in the fact that some of them were actually made redundant, but also because some who were
nearing retirement age took earlier (voluntary) retirement which they preferred to spend within a familiar environment, and it was also because London's labour market offered them sufficient alternative employment to go to. Indeed, some of those who took their redundancy money, also obtained alternative jobs that kept them going in London.

Having sketched through the main determinants of the decision to stay behind, it seems pertinent to explore the sort of people within the broad category of Non-movers who are likely to reject the opportunity of leaving the inner city to relocate in a new town. They are likely to be, according to Gan's typology: the cosmopolities, the unmarried and the childless, the ethnic villagers, the deprived and the trapped and downward mobile.66 These types are bound to include the inner city returnees who are influenced or affected by the process of gentrification. In class terms, they are most likely to be either the middle-class locals or burgesses; they could be the typical working-class residents comparable to the Bethnal Greeners of East London. These typologies have been dealt with in much greater detail below.

4.3 The Decision-Making Unit and the Propensity to move

The Decision-making Unit

The question that needs asking is: who makes the decision? Seen from the eyes of the distant observer, the answer seems obvious, namely: it is the worker, the employee of the migrant firm. But as one reviews all the events of the migration process and evaluates the strength of the factors mentioned by respondents as the basic determinants of the decision-making process, the decision-making unit that emerges appears to be more than one single individual. An understanding of the composition of this unit is essential for two reasons. First, it has implications for the quality of the decision that was reached ultimately. Second, it gives an indication of the degree of commitment and the sense of responsibility with which the migration decision was made.

To be able to determine the decision-making unit, it is necessary to take into account the composition of the household and those of its members that work in the same (migrant-employed-firm) the initial reactions of members of the household to relocation other than the respondent, and the response and attitudes of members of the household to Management Orientation Stimuli. Where there are members of the household working in the migrant firm, an account must also be taken of their attitudes to relocation and the particular influence exerted on the household decision-making process. Table 22 (a and b) summarises the household sizes and type of both Movers and Non-movers. Although both tables show a general tendency towards a similarity in the household size, and household type between Movers and Non-movers, yet some
interesting dis-similarities can be observed and their implications pinpointed. Majority of Movers (76%) and Non-movers (74%) have households composed of 2-4 members.

Of households with 5 members, Movers claim 8%, whereas Non-movers claim up to 10%. But as the household membership increased from 5 to 6 and 7, it is Movers who claim the greater proportion. Looking at the household type also, the similarity in distribution is apparent; but Movers have a greater number of larger adult households (35%) compared with Non-movers with only 23%. These differences must have implications for both perceived and actual need for larger accommodation (i.e. housing need) and must have therefore determined the decision to move, especially for Movers: a decision which members of the household must have influenced either as a collectivity or as individuals.

TABLE 22(a)
Household size of Movers and Non-movers (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos. in household</th>
<th>Movers</th>
<th>Non-movers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perhaps of greater importance in influencing the household's migration decision is the fact that some members of the household were, in fact, workers in the migrant firm. There were instances where, apart from the Head of Household (who may also be the respondent) being an employee of the firm, a wife, a son or daughter, and other relatives also worked for the firm. In such cases, the migration decision was such that each member of the household had directly influenced it in relatively important senses.

In answer to the question: "Does anyone else from your household work at ................. (name of firm)?", the response revealed that: 10% of Movers and 4% of Non-movers had members of their household working in the same firm with them; and that these were made up of sisters (2%), mother-in-law (6%) and others (2%) from the Movers' household, 6% and 4% from the households of Non-movers. And in response to the question: "And how interested was your wife/husband when you first told her/him that the firm was going to ................. (name of new town), and you had a chance of moving too?";

**TABLE 22(b)**

*Household Type of Movers and Non-movers (Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Movers</th>
<th>Non-movers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual under 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small adult households</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small families</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large families</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Adult households</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other small households</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | 100   | 100    | 100        |

*Source: Survey of Migrant firms (New Towns Project) N = 152*
the reactions of the spouses of Movers were similar to those of theNon-movers. That is, spouses of Movers were more inclined to showinginterest than those of Non-movers. Thus, whereas 59% of the spousesof Movers were 'Very interested in moving' and only 7% were "Not veryinterested", 14% of the spouses of Non-movers said they were, 'Veryinterested' whilst as many as 43% were 'not very interested'. Itwas, therefore very likely that the attitudes of members of the house-hold working in the same firm and of those of the spouses of therespondents might have been taken into account in the ultimate decisionreached.

Responses of workers to Management Orientation Stimuli were nevermade without the knowledge and full participation of members of thehousehold. At the meetings, exhibitions/displays, film shows andconducted tours organised by management to condition attitudes andinduce workers to move, there were spouses, mothers, brothers and sisters,children, relatives and 'others' or 'someone' from the household inattendance with the respondent.

If all these people did not influence the decision to migrate orto stay behind, they were either consulted or the decision was madewith their interests fully taken into account. However, when respondentswere asked whether the whole household was moving, 82% of Movers said'Yes': and the remaining 18% had already arranged to leave behindbrothers and sisters, mothers and fathers-in-law, fathers and mothers,and 'others' who could manage very well on their own. The highproportion of Movers who were moving with most members of the household
suggests that the probability was high that those members of the household who will be moving might have influenced the decision for the household to move. And when respondents were asked to give the reasons why they took their decision, 4% of Non-movers said that one of the reasons for choosing to stay behind was because members of the household rejected the idea of moving.

In order, particularly to ascertain not only the process through which the household decision was made but also the specific contributions that Spouses made, provision was made, so that a spouse was present at the interview wherever possible. Interviewers were specifically requested to make a note of the views and remarks of the spouse. The following recorded remarks summarise the attitude of most spouses and the process through which the final decision was reached:

"We had argued long and hard about the decision. We didn't come to blows but we certainly argued for hours and days".

And

"I'll have to go if it means my husband losing his job; he has promised I'll have a new washing machine, etc, but I don't relish the idea unless the firm provides us with a nice house".

The consultations and arguments that went on in the household generally centred around family welfare and concern over the younger and older members of the household, about decent accommodation in
decent surroundings, the social status of the household, and about jobs and continuity in employment as the basic source of earning livelihood and maintaining existing standards and ties.

The household needed relevant and adequate information to enable it to take a balanced and responsible decision which was bound to affect the future of everyone in it. A recognition of the need for vital information explains why members of the household invariably participated in all the information-giving activities organised by management. But the quality and the adequacy of the information obtained were subjects of severe criticism by workers from both camps. Although this point has been raised earlier in the course of evaluating the way management prepared workers for the change implicit in relocation, yet the following remarks from respondents point to the 'difficulty that the household faced in influencing migration decision without the desired quality of information:

"Lack of information is causing a lot of confusion and disillusion among the entire staff. Some of them have built up a suspicion capable of putting the whole transfer in danger. I cannot even tell the wife what's going on."

and another said:

"This firm (named) tells us nothing, only asking us to see Personnel Officer .......... Even when we had a meeting with Personnel, they just wanted 'Yes' and 'No' answers. My family thought the firm is being really unhelpful."
It is clearly evident that the decision-making unit is not just the respondent (the worker), but indeed the entire household of which the respondent is only a member. The fact that the decision-maker is far from being a single individual person but the entire household, has implications for the commitment implicit in the decision and in the degree of responsibility with which that decision was made. In other words, the decision marks the point of 'no return' for the entire household: a fact which may have a decisive effect on the ease or difficulty with which the household adapts and adjusts into the new location if it moved, or if it did not, the stability and solidarity of the family may have been greatly strengthened.

The Propensity to Move

Are certain individuals, households of families, and groups more inclined to move than others? We should have to look at least at, two variables to ascertain the broad dimensions of the propensity to move. Merton's distinction between 'cosmopolitans' and 'locals' has been used to study residential mobility. Brown and Belcher who carried out the study concluded that the latest roles of cosmopolitanism or localism were more important in determining the propensity of physicians in Georgia to move. Cosmopolitans refer to those committed to professional skills, having little loyalty to the community in which they lived and having reference groups which were not specific

67. Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, quoted by Jackson, Ibid, p. 64.

to the community. Locals or Burgesses, on the other hand, refer to those who developed strong roots in an area and are predominant in the social and political lives of the area, especially after they have achieved their career progression within the same locality. Thus, based on residential characteristics, the propensity to move for cosmopolitans is positive, whereas for the locals/burgesses, it is negative. Another means of measuring the propensity to move has been based on personal characteristics: life-cycle and career. F. Musgrove,69 drew the conclusion that migrants tend to be of a higher social class than the rest of the population; and this was confirmed in the Bristol study carried out by Clifford Jansen in which he showed that when migrants were matched with residents by age, employments, status, etc., there were still highly significant differences in the social class (measured by occupation) of the two groups: 69.3% of migrants' compared to 44.1% of residents were in career-type occupations, while 27% more residents than migrants held manual jobs.70 Furthermore, the 1961 Census showed that the rates of migration was three times higher among professionals than among semi-skilled workers; and Friedlander and Roshier71 found that less professionals, managers and executives lived for a much shorter period in their locality than the unskilled and the semi-skilled: again pointing to the fact that people in occupations carrying higher


social status are much more mobile than others. There have also been indications of direct relationship between types of careers taken up by individuals at a certain stage in the life-cycle and migration. Dorothy Thomas\textsuperscript{72} reached the conclusion that the only differential that has held with some consistency in several contexts and over a long period of time is that persons in their late teens, twenties and early thirties were more migratory than other groups. Other variables like single persons and newly-weds which are related to the life-cycle also have an important influence on the propensity to move. Leslie and Richardson's study of residential mobility in Lafayette\textsuperscript{73} focussed attention on the combined effect of life-cycle and career-pattern on migratory intentions. They found a high correlation between career pattern variables and residential mobility, and thus demonstrated that career can be a determinant of the propensity to move. Taking all factors into consideration, it seems evident that life-cycle and career-pattern, the presence of higher social class, and residential/personal characteristics are associated with and do determine the inclination to move. It has also been shown that Motivation (as indicated by the Reasons to Move and Not to Move), forms another significant means of ascertaining the propensity to move.

Against the background of the above review, it is possible to identify the factors or influences which determine the propensity to move for the respondents which this research deals with. The

\textsuperscript{72} G.R. Leslie and A. Richardson, "Life Cycle, Career Pattern and decision to move," in \textit{American Sociological Review} 26 (December 1961), pp. 894-902.

\textsuperscript{73}
propensity to move will be measured by the expressed intentions of our sample; by any previous action taken by respondents to move before the employer's decision to relocate; and by past history of mobility. Respondents to be examined will be from both the migrant firms (migrant workers) and from the Islington survey (stress area sample). By focussing attention on the two samples, we are not only comparing them but also raising questions as to whether or not it is possible, and fruitful to classify our respondents in such a way as to promote an analysis of their characteristics which can be valuable to the employer, the policy-maker and the planner.

a) Survey of Migrant Firms Sample

Indications of the motivations for the migrant decisions of the respondents from the migrant firms have been summarised in Tables 16 and 17. The same respondents have further amplified their reasons and intentions in a number of ways.

Asked the question: "Apart from the possibility of moving to ............... (new town) with ............... (firm), have you ever thought about moving from here?, 75% of Movers said 'Yes', 24% said "No-never", with 1% giving other answers, compared with Non-movers: 41% of whom said 'Yes', 58% 'No' and 1% of whom thought they will eventually be moved by local council. When further asked: "When did you first think about moving?" 43% had thought of moving two years before the period of the survey, 30% had been thinking of moving since 2 to 5 years before the survey, 10% since the past 5 to 10 years and 14% have had the intention to move for over 10 years. And at the time of the survey, 79% were still considering moving before the opportunity offered by relocation compared with only 21% who were no longer thinking of moving.
TABLE 23

Intentions for recent contemplated changes of residential location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intention for the attempted move</th>
<th>Total number making the attempt</th>
<th>Percentage mentioning the intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preference for the country</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to get out of London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pace of life too fast; needed fresh air, etc, for health reasons; other answers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike for the particular area of London</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to get out of the house/flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'for health reasons; poor conditions - damp, roof leakage, overcrowding and lack of privacy (wanted self-contained flat)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present accommodation too small; (needed a house not flat); better place to live; getting married; lack of facilities in present accommodation - inadequate and lack of cooking facilities, bathroom, toilet.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Accommodation too large (need family house)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent too high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with landlord/Affected by Redevelopment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise in London, Needed garden for Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, pubs, neighbours and children - noisy; for the interest of spouse and children, better schooling needed, better atmosphere</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be near relatives, friends and neighbours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be nearer place of work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because firm was moving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking of the future: retirement, children growing up, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Not stated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)
It is questionable whether these expressed intentions are sufficient evidence of the propensity to move. If they are not, perhaps evidence of the desires for moving or not moving might lend some weight to propensity. Thus, when respondents were asked: "why were (are) you thinking of moving"?, the responses which are summarised in Table 23 show high correlation with the motivations of respondents as measured by the reasons for moving or staying already considered.

More than 70% (N=113) of the respondents have had expressed intentions to move away from their present residence before the opportunity arose for their employers to relocate. From Table 23, respondents who have previously considered moving did so mainly because they intended to satisfy their 'housing need'; because they wanted to get out of their unsatisfactory housing conditions; because they wished to get away from noisy London and from its fast pace of daily life etc. There were other desires of relatively less important nature, such as preference for countryside, dislike for a particular area in London in which respondent lived. Once again, the desire to satisfy respondents' housing need and a growing desire to be residentially located in a desirable and respectable environment have consistently emerged as the major determinants of the propensity to move.

Propensity to move, however, is associated with the exercise of the choice of area to which a migrant would, under normal circumstances, like to move. Table 24 shows, in broad terms, the various areas to which respondents would like to move. It should be assumed that the expressed choice of a particular area carries with it the implication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of choice</th>
<th>Total No. of respondents exercising the choice</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents choosing the choice (weighted%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any area within Greater London (GLC)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An area outside London:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 15 miles radius from London</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 15-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 31-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 51+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular place - just outside London:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere in the country</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular place: anywhere, any area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any nice, respectable street or quiet place; any place where we can get a nice flat or house.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia Standard Region:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex and Lincolnshire; including Westcliff, Canvey Island, etc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey, Sussex, Kent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Standard Region and Hampshire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in UIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/K, Not stated, Never thought of it, Never cared</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project) Q. 59
that such area provides what the respondents are looking for. Interestingly, 13% of those expressing the choice of area prefer to remain within the Greater London area; and although 18% did not specify any area, they of course indicated that they are looking for a nice, respectable place. Nevertheless, there was an obvious preference for East Anglia Standard Region (17%) and for Surrey, Sussex and Kent (10%). The areas immediately outside London were of less attraction, but East Anglia, Sussex/Surrey/Kent appear to be great favourites. In all, the tendency is that all areas of popular choice are approximately within the distance of 50 to 80 miles from London. By implication, they include the area in which most London new towns are located.

With the exception of a relatively significant preference for movement to the South-West Region (including Hampshire), the choice of movement within a given radius from London is indicated by 9% of the respondents who expressed the desire to move up to Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. Does this choice add to our knowledge of 'flight from cities' and the 'suburban retreat'? Does it indicate the direction in which planners should be looking to identify possible future population concentration? These questions must direct attention to an important area of future speculations in the overall population concentration growth in Britain, especially from the older cities.

Apart from expressed intentions, desires and inclinations to move, it is pertinent to examine what practical action that respondents took to realise their desires—whether they had any history of mobility and whether there were specific or general constraints on those desires to
change residential location. When respondents were requested to indicate what they did to find a place to move to, it was obvious (See Table 26) that they have, in fact, taken practical steps which would have, if successful, led to a move. Some of them had registered on the Industrial Selection Scheme (now the New and Expanding Town Scheme) for a job; others had made enquiries for council housing; others visited new towns and other places in search of a job and/or a home; and others have, for the same purpose, embarked upon house-purchase schemes. Of the 19 people who registered on the Industrial Selection Scheme (N.E.T. Scheme) slightly less than half (42%) had been on the scheme for up to 2 years; 16% had been on it for up to 4 years; indeed, 21% had been registered and waiting for the best for up to 6 years; and 11% had been registered for over 6 years. Registrants generally agreed that the scheme was not much helpful as a recruiting mechanism. In order to avoid the frustration of being on the scheme for years without finding a job and a home, those who were desperate to move used other means. Thus, about 5% of respondents joined the migrant firms about 6 months before their move in order that they could avoid recruitment through the scheme and yet ensure that they moved out of London.

Sufficient data are not available from which respondents' history of mobility can be deduced. However, at the time of the survey, over 60 respondents (41%) had lived in their (present) address for over 10 years; 18% (N=27) had lived there for between 5 and 10 years and 17% (N=26) for up to 5 years. Before coming to their present address, they had lived in other places which have been summarised in Table 26. Taking the longest period
TABLE 25
Respondents' practical steps toward moving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practical steps taken to move to a new area</th>
<th>Total number taking the step</th>
<th>Percentage that took a particular step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered on GLC Industrial Selection Scheme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for every job that came up on the list.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for jobs in a new town through Labour Exchange.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to see Council Housing Manager and registered for council housing.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also went to County Hall (GLC) and inquired about housing, Asked for GLC transfer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting New Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to new towns to see about job and housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited other places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to look at other places. Looked round and walked down many streets.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to buy a house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving money for deposit. Made enquiries through estate agents for houses in and out of London. Looked through papers and advertisements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO/Not really/Not yet/Nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No attempts so far made to move</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Answers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Not Stated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project):
that residents have stayed in their present address as the base (10 years), it seems that a significant number of respondents (35%) on average, may have changed residence once or twice within the past 10 years. Since this is a crude calculation, it cannot be a reliable index for measuring the propensity to move. But it best indicates some tendency towards geographical mobility.

**TABLE 26**

Residential Location of Respondents before present address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Residential Location</th>
<th>Total No. of Respondents who changed address</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents who made the change by moving (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East London Postal district</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East London Postal district</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West London Postal district</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North/N.W. London Postal district</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London Postal district</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in England</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland/Wales/Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Not Stated/Insufficient</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100 100

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project): Q.1(b)
If respondents failed to move before the opportunity to relocate with their employers occurred, it was not because they did not make the effort. This, of course, does not imply that all respondents took steps to move. Indeed, as Table 25 shows, of the 86 respondents who expressed the desire to change location, 45% (N=38) either took no practical steps to find a place, or they had not yet made any efforts to do so at the time of the survey. But of all those, who, in fact, took the necessary steps to look for suitable locations, there were obvious reasons which prevent them from eventually moving. Table 27 summarises the constraining influences which show significant correlation with those reasons previously identified earlier which worked against movement.

Once again, the outstanding constraining influence is connected with housing: failure to rent or buy the desired accommodation. Factors connected with employment appeared to be the second constraint: lack of jobs in the new town, lack of skill to get onto the new and expanding town scheme and unsuccessful application for jobs in new towns for other reasons. It is interesting to note that most of the constraining influences coincide with those reasons given by Non-movers for taking the decision to stay behind. It seems more likely that the majority of those respondents who tried and failed to change their residential location by moving may have been drawn from the group described in this study as Movers.
## TABLE 27

Constraints on previous attempts to change residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints on efforts to move</th>
<th>No. of respondents making efforts</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inability to find satisfactory Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't get a place; offers too far away; not in the area wanted. Unable to buy a house or to rent suitable house.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places too expensive - did not have the money; couldn't afford deposit for house to buy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons associated with Council Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for council housing: no success, Still waiting for council to move us. Council couldn't give us any other place.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons connected with Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of jobs in new towns: fear of loss of job and unemployment; failed to obtain jobs by application- couldn't get on the Scheme because of lack of skill.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons connected with continuity of Career with present employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to stay with same employer: firm wouldn't move us. Did not wish to commute from London</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of (particular) New Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Problems of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties of changing the children's schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content with living in London Settled completely in London</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just didn't follow up efforts Arrangements broke down</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/Not stated</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms (New Towns Project)
It seems also probable that before the opportunity occurred for our sample of migrant workers to consider relocation with their employers, some of the members of the group described as Non-movers may have made similar efforts to move from their present residence. For both Movers and Non-movers, therefore, relocation would appear as a unique opportunity to reconsider the desire to change residential location. It is suggested that at any time that respondent were confronted with migration decision, both current predisposition to move and past history of mobility will invariably significantly influence that decision.

(b) The Propensity of Inner City Residents to Move

In order to draw some valuable conclusions about the general propensity to move of residents of large cities and to ascertain their attitudes to moving to new towns, a comparison between the sample of workers of migrant firms just reviewed with a sample of the residents of an inner city area is necessary. Workers of migrant firms represent a group of city dwellers undergoing a change imposed by relocation in which, among other things, there is the danger of a loss of a source of livelihood and at the same time, a promise of a better future. On the other hand, the residents of an inner city area are undergoing a different kind of change: possibly a deteriorating environment and neighbourhood and an increasing shortage of housing accommodation. How far does the predisposition of the latter to move compare with that of the former already sketched?
The inner city area was Islington, parts of which are included in the GLC designated "stress areas". A survey (Islington Resident Survey) on the attitude of residents to movement to new and expanding towns was carried out as the second (major) aspect of the New Towns Project. The Survey was conducted in the north east of the borough in the area designated as Tollington, in the Community Plan. The area consists predominantly of late Victorian terraced housing, originally intended for occupation by single families: somewhat depressed - if less pretentious - cousins of the villas once inhabited by Mr. Pooter and his friends, a mile or so to the West.

These houses have mostly declined, over time, into multi-occupation, either in flats through token conversion or as straightforward lodging houses. However, they are supplemented in the important function that they still perform, of providing cheap accommodation, by a number of smaller artisan cottages, some of them still rented for single family occupation. More recently, numbers of both kinds of houses have been demolished to make way for local authority housing, of a straightforward - if rather depressingly unimaginative - kind - others await a similar fate, shrouded in corrugated iron. Occasional bright splashes of paint show where the odd dwelling has been handed over, as a 'short-life' property to a local group, or simply squatted in, without benefit of formal arrangements. But in general the environment is drab; exteriors mostly long unpainted, except where one of the new wave of owner-occupiers from overseas has painstakingly picked out the decorative stucco with fresh colour. Litter swirls along the pavement where the children play (Islington has less

recreational open space than any other Inner London borough).

But, despite its depressed outward appearance the area has enjoyed, in the past at least, two substantial assets: reasonable access to employment, and cheap and secure housing. Only comparatively recently have these two assets been threatened by the processes of change now taking place in the inner city. In this respect - as in others - the area seems sufficiently typical of the less privileged part of the Borough to enable us to draw valid conclusions about the situation in which the inner London working class lives, and the extent to which there are realistic alternatives open to them, in attempting to improve their situation.

The sample was drawn from a population of four polling districts in the Highbury and Parkway wards of Tollington. The sampling frame employed for selecting addresses was the Electoral Register. A sample of 704 addresses was drawn, after adjustments; 512 usable interviews (a 73% response rate) were obtained. There have been important changes recently in the area as a result of population mobility and urban renewal which make the Tollington district a significant area of social transition.

The most visible of these changes dominate the local landscape in the shape of new municipal tower blocks in north Highbury and in the Station ward adjoining. This is the location of over a third of new house-building by the borough and the G.L.C. since these new authorities came into existence in 1965 and it is forecast that 30% of the properties in the Tollington district will have been redeveloped
by them by 1981. One of the positive advantages of redevelopment here is the relatively low density of much of the older residential areas where there is a good deal of small terraced housing in single family occupation. Rebuilding can provide a significant gain in the density of dwelling units - a windfall which is increasingly rare in the inner city.

The other major process of change is through migration. As already noted, Islington has experienced a sharp fall in population due to outward migration, accelerating over the past decade. This high degree of mobility has also affected the Tollington district. Population of Islington has fallen from 261,232 in 1961 to 235,440 in 1966, to 201,875 in 1971.

The extent of the social changes that have resulted from the twin processes of urban renewal and selective migration were among the most graphic findings in our survey, and a brief summary of these provides a setting for more detailed analysis of groups within the sample which follows. First of all, the sample showed a pronounced bias towards working class households in social classes IV and V - the part-skilled and unskilled occupations. 42% of all heads of households were in these two social classes, compared with only 26% of all London households in 1966. Among the economically active the figure was slightly - but not appreciably - lower at 39%. Unlike some of the wards where gentrification has occurred, Parkway and North Highbury are very clearly areas of working class settlement with a marked under-representation not only of the professional and intermediate workers, but, to a lesser extent, of the skilled 'middle-mass' in the class structure.
The sample had been a very mobile one. Half of all households had moved into their present accommodation in the previous five years and two-third had moved at least once in the past decade.

The local working class now includes a very substantial element of ethnic minorities, as a result of post-war immigration to London. 36% of household heads were born outside the United Kingdom and, with their families, formed 46% of the total population recorded in the sample. The most important ethnic groups were migrants from Eire (11%); Greek Cypriots (6%) and West Indians (5%).

TABLE 28
Socio-economic group of stress area and Islington Residents
Migrant Firms Survey (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.L.C.</th>
<th>Islington</th>
<th>Stress Area Residents</th>
<th>Migrant Firm Workers</th>
<th>Movers</th>
<th>Non-movers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer/professional</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal service</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman, skilled manual</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces etc.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of Migrant Firms and Islington Survey (New Towns Project): and 1966 Census
The remainder included a large and miscellaneous population of European and African and Asian origin. The British born population could itself be split into two categories; natives born in the inner London Boroughs who formed 35% of the sample and the 'non-locals' from Outer London and the provinces who made up the remaining 29%.

**TABLE 29**

Birthplace of stress area sample and Islington residents
(Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Islington</th>
<th>Stress area Residents</th>
<th>Migrant Firm Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of U.K.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eire</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of New Commonwealth</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New Towns Project

The majority of last moves (66%) had been from within Islington and 90% originated within inner London. This extensive but localised mobility appears to be the result of upward filtering in the housing stock, stimulated by the exodus of the indigenous population to the suburbs and by redevelopment in Tollington.

What were the attitudes of the Islington residents towards movement to new and expanding towns? Table 30 summarises the response of respondents to whether or not they would personally move to a new town if they had the opportunity.
TABLE 30

Stress area residents' attitude to moving to a New Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, we would definitely move</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, we would probably move</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, we don't think we would move</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, we definitely would not move</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0 (253)

It is obvious from the table that many people simply do not like the idea of themselves living in a new town and that is a very good reason for not wishing to move to one. The undernoted is a list of the uncoded* reasons why residents did not wish to move to a new town taken from answers to the open-ended question "What are your reasons for saying that you are not moving"?

Reasons*:

Roots here/have lived here a long time/too old to move.
Friends are here/too difficult to make new friends/prefer to be with people I know.
Used to London/prefer it here/couldn't settle elsewhere/would be a stranger.
New Town soulless/lacks character/unfriendly.
Lack of amenities/poor shopping facilities/lack of entertainment/transport, etc.
Too far from work/don't want to change jobs/prospects and wages better in London/other difficulties connected with work.
Could not leave aged relative, prefer to live near family.
Other reasons connected with family.
Criticism of planning.

* Uncoded Reasons: Due to coding error, these reasons were not coded as in previous cases.
But it is also true that a substantial number of the residents (37.1%) would consider moving if the opportunity occurred. For this number, reasons connected, again, with housing need and an escape from a neighbourhood that was changing in a negative way - these two influences more than any others, were the push-factors. It is interesting that the stress area residents contained a substantial number of working class. The fact that the sample as a whole has been seen to be very mobile and the attitude of 37% confirms also a pre-disposition to moving, would suggest that there are obvious unfulfilled aspirations of these residents that can only be satisfied by moving to a new town. Compared with the respondents from migrant firms, the reasons given for moving and not moving are virtually similar: Housing, Environmental factors, and reasons connected with work, being the most important for movers; while familial and community connections, other social networks and the abundance of urban facilities and amenities constrain the movement of stayers. Thus, if the opportunity to move to a new town is presented to the residents of an inner city area what is the likely pattern of decision that will emerge? There will be Movers as well as Non-movers: but the typology is likely to be determined by the propensity of the various groups of residents to move.
4.4 Migration Decision as an adaptive response - The Socio-Spatial Model

1. Social Change by adaptation

Adaptation is response induced by changes and the means by which the change is accommodated and internalised. The first stage of an adaptive reaction takes the form of a homeostatic response. That is, as a change occurs in the environment to alter the organism-environment interaction, the organism makes a physiological adjustment in order to adapt into the change and to return to a state of equilibrium in its relationship with the environment. In a similar way, an individual adapts to a change by personally responding to that change in various ways: protesting, accepting, expressing anxiety, anger or opposition. When the imminent change of the relocation of the migrant firms was announced, workers reacted in the ways indicated. An organisation as a system adapts to changing situations by re-organising its internal and external structure, modifies its methods of production and distribution; or increases its efficiency so as to be more competitive. In the very case of the migrant firms under consideration, the adaptive responses open to them in the face of growing threat of financial losses and decreasing profit-margins, included the decision to relocate so as to re-organise their activities. Thus as a change becomes more persistent, the organism (as well as the individual and work organisation) moves beyond a homeostatic response to develop more permanent modifications in order to adjust into an enduring change. Workers of migrant firms modified their initial reactions by their orientation and rational responses until they settled down to the stable state of making the ultimate decision to move or to stay behind.
The adaptation process takes place in (three) stages. First, when a new set of stimuli hits us within our environment, the brain and the body respond to the change by reflex action based on the working of the nervous system. We have already noted a similar (emotional) reaction from workers on learning about relocation, (the stimuli input).

Fig. 7

Stages and Components of Adaptation Process

1: Neural/Homeostatic Response
2: Orientation/Homonal Response
3: Adaptive/Enduring Response

The stimulus, whether it is a sharp noise or a threatening piece of information, triggers off what experimental psychologists call "Orientation Response". This response which starts the mini-process of returning the body equilibrium (homeostasis) takes place because the stimulus is novel and does not match any existing neural model of
the body, the organism or the system. Orientation Responses sensitizes the affected into taking in or/and asking for more information, in exactly the same way that workers did after the official announcement about relocation and in the wake of management's orientation stimuli (see Chapter 3, para 3.5). Orientation Response therefore, prepares the object for change: by way of modifying attitudes, behaviour or reaction's it tunes the object to new ideas and provides the opportunity to accommodate and adjust with a changing situation. The point at which change causes stress is reached when Orientation Responses challenge the view or pattern of life in the pre-conceived world of the individual.

Second, the next major stage is the Adaptive Response. It provides a much more potent and sustained thrush of energy than the O.R. (Orientation Response). When individuals are forced to face a situation of change involving uncertainty and conflict (a comparable position in which the workers of migrant firms found themselves), hormonal changes in the body caused by anxiety and fear produce external (emotional) responses which enable the individual to begin to adapt into the new situation. A.R. (Adaptive Response) is a continuous reaction and modifications to meet changes in our physical and social environment. The very anticipation of a change can trigger the adaptive response. Fig. 7 is a diagramatic illustration of the process of adaptation. Between Orientation Responses and the Adaptive Response, there is an intermediate stage which is partly a continuation of the neural change necessary to promote adaptation and partly the beginning of the more enduring response epitomised by accommodation and adjustment. It is my view that relocation is a stimulus in-put of
change. Given this, migration decision itself must be an adaptive response to the change that relocation brings in its trail, namely: an alteration of the socio-spatial relationship of those involved in a shift of geographical and social space from one surrounding to another. When we migrate, we make and break relationships with things, places and people. As we move through the organisation geography of society, we learn new information and ideas in order to adapt and live again. The need to adapt arises because our relationship with the old environment was altered. That relationship developed and grew at two levels: physical and social; so that normal everyday life implies a constant interaction with both the physical and the social aspects of the total environment. This interaction, illustrated in Fig. 8 (Socio-spatial Interaction Model) demonstrates the nature of the attachment of human beings to their habitat. It is particularly essential to draw attention to the composition of a typical environment of an industrialised society and to the ways in which both the individual and his work-organisation are linked with the various aspects of the environment.
Fig. 8

The Socio-Spatial Interaction Model

A) The Physical Aspect of the Environment

The physical surroundings - space streets, fields, parks, trees, rivers;

Physical symbolic objects - houses, and historic buildings; statues; and

Man-made things - bridges, roads, street lights, communication, facilities, etc.

B) The Social Aspects of the Environment

1. The family - as an institution and as a socialising agent.
2. Institutions for education, training and socialisation.
3. Social, Religions and Cultural Institutions.
4. The Economy and Market - work Organisations, etc.
5. The Polity and State Agencies - Government, politics, legal institutions, etc.
6. Social and Welfare amenities - Street lights, libraries, hospital and health services, museums, galleries, concert halls, roads, market and shops.
7. Social investments and Recreation facilities - transport, Hospitals, cinemas, theatres, gold and roses.
The Physical Aspect of Environment

This refers to the physical surroundings within which human beings build homes. It refers to space around; to the community and the neighbourhood; the streets and roads; the fields and the parks; the woodlands and forests; and the rivers and the oceans. It includes the aero-space and what is generally called the "atmosphere". Human surroundings include physical symbolic objects - as aspects of human heritage: houses, historic buildings, churches, parliaments, statues, works of art. The environment refers to man-made things also: bridges, street lights, communication facilities. Human attachment to the components of physical environment is complete not only because they are mostly man-made or gifts of nature but also because humans have come to depend upon them for existence and survival.

The Social Aspect of the Environment

This is as important as the physical aspect. Indeed, its components are an expression of way of life, values, beliefs, and essential institutions. The social aspect of the environment is composed of inter-related parts on which the lives of humans within them also depend. The basic characteristics of a human environment (at least in a western society) is the presence of basic social institutions: the family, education and training institutions, Religious and Cultural institutions, the Economy and the market, the polity and state agents, welfare amenities and other social investments.

An individual (in this case, the working man) in a human environment is comparable with a lower organism existing in its own environment (the protoplasm). Survival of all human beings and the organisations
they create is possible through constant interaction with the components of the environment. In particular, the individual's interaction with the community and the physical space on one hand and with the various social institutions on the other hand must be seen as a complete and normal way of life.

The threat of detachment from this environment by migration induce from both the individual and his firm a set of responses. The responses were adaptive since they either accepted the change or rejected it. The mover was responding to a loss of interaction with an old environment and to the problems of moving into a new milieu where he will be facing the task of building up a new process of interaction. To make a success of the later, he needed to ensure that the environment into which he is moving is, for all intents and purposes, a replica of the old and familiar environment. It is for this reason, that the Mover was particularly anxious to ensure that the new environment contains all the basic institutions, facilities, and amenities which characterise the old habitat. On the other hand, part of the Non-mover's adaptive response was partly a rejection of the new location, because of its failure to provide those things that give character to the human surroundings he is used to, and partly because his response to moving was completely negative. In other words, he withdrew his positive adaptive response.
3. Maladaptation: Environmental Alienation and New Town Blues

Maladaptation is manifested in a set of conscious and unconscious behaviours which indicate that the subject is (a) overwhelmed by change (b) Unable to accommodate and adjust into change (c) Unable to realise the goals for which he initially wished to make a change and (d) Unable to relate adequately to factors in a new environment. A maladapted person is therefore, the victim of a complex disorientation. He is in a state of anomie and suffers, among other things, from environmental alienation and social disorganisation. His behaviour can be described, to some extent, as deviant in the one major sense that he might be reacting to his own adaptive response which failed.

Alvin Toffler produces a rich and valuable review of the root-causes of maladaptation based on environmental over-stimulation. The modern, (industrialised) society contains striking signs of confusional breakdowns which are clearly examples of maladaptation of the individual under conditions of environmental over-stimulation: the spreading use of drugs, the rise of mysticism, the recurrent outbreaks of vandalism and undirected violence, the politics of nihilism and nostalgia, the sick apathy of millions and many more. Psycho-physiologists have shown, in their studies of the impact of change on various organisms, that successful adaptation occurs only within the "adaptive range": a level of stimulation neither too low nor too high. Professor Berlyne of the University of Toronto once remarked that: "the central nervous system of a higher animal is designed to cope with environments that produce a certain rate of stimulation. It will naturally not perform at its best in an

74. Alvin Toffler, Future Shock, especially Chapter 16.
environment that over-stresses or overloads it. This remark and a similar one made about environmental under-stimulation stress the significance of maladaptation taking place as a result of over-stimulation. Above the adaptive range the individual easily becomes tense and irritable, violent or with-drawn, anxious and restless, etc. Studies of human behaviour when people are thrown into conditions of high and rapid change and novelty have been carried out in times of fire, flood, earthquake and crises. These studies cited by Toffler and including the outbreak of tornadoes, combat situations and other disasters have been used to demonstrate the inability to adapt into change brought about by too much novelty. For example, in disaster or combat situations the individual can be so psychologically overwhelmed by a high level of environmental stimulation that he suddenly finds familiar objects and relationships with the environment transformed beyond recognition. His response is marked by confusion, anxiety, irritability, distrust and bewilderment, and withdrawal into apathy.

All these behaviours disrupt or at least threaten the constitutive order of the on-going activity; therefore, they are themselves or at least they precipitate dis-organisation.

The underlying phenomenon in the whole problem of adaptation is that the change which precipitates the process of adjustment is "deviant from the norm". Thus, successful adaptation means fitting

75. Toffler, pp. 305-306.
squarely into the prescribed norms and maladaptation would refer to the opposite situation. To adapt into a new situation is to be requested to re-programme oneself in order to fit into novelty, to drop the old ways and to pick up new ones. Once more this involves decision-making; it involves some kind of rational behaviour which always includes an intricate combination of routinisation and creativity. In other words, newness disturbs the decision-mix; it tips the balance towards the most difficult and most costly form of decision-making. That decision, can be the right or the wrong decision; and if it is the later, it marks the end to the fight to adapt and to live again; and at the same time marks the beginning of maladaptation.

Can maladaptation be determined to any significant extent by the psychological state and personality trait of the individual? Are some people more likely to adapt than others? According to Brody adaptation in the psychological sense, is the process of establishing and maintaining a relatively stable reciprocal relationship with the environment.  

It has been shown in Fig. 7 that adaptation process is not an automatic process but in stages. Adaptation therefore, is certainly determined, at least in part, by talent, social context and the degree to which the immediate consequences, for example, of moving, fit the pre-migratory fantasies and motivations. The initial encounters with newness in a new environment are bound to be especially important. The interplay between our defensive and adaptive responses, is therefore, a function of our past history, experiences and present environmental circumstances. As Brody puts it: "a person's repertory of

defensive and adaptive devices stem from his early socialisation and experiences and their use is re-inforced or extinguished by current societal sanctions and prohibitions. So, a maladaptive behaviour although easily observable externally, eg. by withdrawal or violence, yet it is likely to have been hitherto masked by the various talents or strengths of the individual. Similarly, the person with anxiety attacks, phobic fears, depressive episodes or obsessive thoughts - qualities that relate to the individual's total personality - may not be identified in a new environment as a casualty of maladaptation unless he also exhibits a public behaviour which draws attention to himself, e.g. help-seeking. Thus, some migrants may simply be by nature risk-takers, people willing to go a step beyond the ordinary or the expected; and their vulnerability to maladaptation under stress remains moot. Others are merely geographical escapists - people who deal with personal and environmental disaster by physical flight. They carry their problems with them, anyway. A move over space for the escapist can be related to a pre-existing psychiatric illness. However, escapists have, in Wolpert's study been shown to have acted rationally in fleeing the city for reasons based on "environmental stress" comparable to the kind of environmental over-stimulation that Alvin Toffler himself has competently emphasized on. Brody's typology of the victims of maladaptation (risk-takers and escapists) based on personality traits compares interestingly with Toffler's: Deniers, Specialists, Reversionists and Super-simplifiers. The Denier

---

77. Brody, pp. 15-16.

78. Alvin Toffler, p. 319.
'blocks out' unwelcome reality to escape from change but forced to adopt it only after crisis. In the face of obvious tides of change, the Reversionist sticks to his old ways - previously programmed decisions and habits with dogmatic desperation. His social outlook is regressive and shocked by sweeping changes, the reversionist makes a last-minute desperate efforts by demanding for a return to past glories of yesterday. The specialist does not 'block out' novelty but enthusiastically keep pace with change though only in a limited area. While he sticks to novelty in a limited spectrum, he copes well. But he soon finds his speciality obsolete in the sense that he is caught by 'cultural lag'.

There is the super-simplifier who searches for a unitary solution via intellectual rationalisation. In a sense, he is an escapist; one who wishes to escape reality by providing "a global solution" to an overwhelming problem. Thus, the bewildered and anxious student or youth takes to drug-taking: the L.S.D. Methedrin, Dexedrine, Dextro-amphetamine tablets or the heroin. Or the teenage girl, unable to cope with the daily tangle of stresses, takes the dramatic way out by becoming pregnant. Or the youth who is over-stimulated but has no means of directing the energy takes to violence and vandalism. These typologies emphasize the validity of any suggestion that the psychological state of the victim of maladaptation is the determining factor for his maladaptive responses and behaviours. More than this, the typology also has implications for understanding the kind of migrants who are likely to return to their place of origin because of failure to adapt.
Perhaps the best index of maladaptation is the extent to which the victim failed to achieve the goal for which he moved into a new environment. The migrant, although excited by new stimuli - opportunities, etc., yet he was also fearful of new threats and the unknown when he set out to change his environment. Aspirations apart, he had his fantasies, expectations, dreams. But when eventually he settles down to confront the new situation to face the reality of his migratory decision, he may fail or succeed. Why? Some of the reasons have been discussed above and need not be repeated. We must examine the broader impact of anomie and the failure of motivation. Returning briefly to the New Towns Project, the Survey of Islington Migrants' contained an assessment of the experience of Movers, particularly their assessment as to whether or not they took the right decision to move out of Islington to new towns. Table 31 summarises the assessment of those who thought they took the right decision, and Table 32 summarises the assessment of those who thought otherwise. In effect, 91.7% made the right decision and 8.3% regretted their own decision. By implication, 8% of Movers were likely to return to Islington for having failed to realise their goals. Two of the migrant firms were also revisited 6 months after move: Samuel Jones & Co. Ltd, and Brown Brothers Ltd. In thirty interviews covering the two, migrants were asked to evaluate the decision they took to migrate. Majority of the migrants (82%; N = 25) thought that they took the right decision to move; 8% thought they took the wrong decision and 10% were uncertain at that time as to whether or not they took the right decision. In Brown Brothers, two migrants were reported to have returned to London compared with three from Samuel Jones Ltd: a returnee-rate of 10% and 4% respectively; and an average for both firms of 7%. In 1972, the national average of
### TABLE 31

Reasons given for making the right decision to move

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>% of respondents who mentioned this reason</th>
<th>Weighted Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better house here/own house</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom for children/good place to bring up children/children happier/ space to play</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happier in ourselves/peace of mind</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better environment/better place to live</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better for health/children's health</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools are better/children doing well/better prospects for children</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner/fresh air</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better jobs here/happy in job</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have made friends/people are very friendly/friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More open/near coast/out of London</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have spare room/visitors can stay here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Right decision-makers = 91.7%

### TABLE 32

Reasons given for making the wrong decision to move

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>% of respondents who mentioned this reason</th>
<th>Weighted Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A miserable place/has unhappy memories/has caused unhappiness</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answers</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low wages/poor pay</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarcity of jobs/restricted choice of work</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness/miss friends/relatives</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wrong decision-makers = 8.3%
returnees was given as 3%. But the success story of the relocation of Bassett and Findlay from Southwark to Wellingborough (an expanding town) recorded a returnee rate of 10% which compares favourably with the rate from the Migrant Firm Survey. The interviews on the experiences of migrant workers of the two firms mentioned above revealed that although the majority of workers thought that they made the right decision, yet almost all of them expressed dissatisfaction with the poverty of the new environment in providing such amenities that had formed part of the urban life of the place of origin: transport, shopping facilities, entertainment and leisure facilities, hospitals and doctors, and so on.

It is not possible to establish a direct correlation between the lack of these urban facilities and the propensity of some migrants to return to the place of origin: yet, as already indicated attachment to and interaction with the urban environment depend very much on the availability of these amenities and facilities. It is, therefore, likely that they were partly accountable for some potential migrants declining to take the plunge as well as in causing others who migrated to return to the place of origin.

It is probably adequate to explain maladaptation by reference to the migrants' disappointment with the inadequate provision of social facilities. They may have also failed to get what they expected in a new town. In Table 33, 31% were disappointed by the image of the new town, for example: and another 11% felt lonely. On the whole,

migrants found less in the new environment to relate to. The migrant found himself in a state of anomie and faced a possible failure to realise his motivations and expectations as he confronted an unfamiliar situation and the vagueness or ambiguity of a social and physical space that has little relevance to what the old one offered. It is this state that produces what the popular press refers to (in the new town context), as "New Town Blues". The concept of "new town blues" refers to the notion that in-migrants find it so difficult to make new friends, to settle and to adjust into their new environment; and that consequently, they become disappointed, bitter and lonely. "New Town Blues" is the distant observer's interpretation of the effect of the constructed (disappointing) image of the new town to the maladapted in-migrant; an image which views the new town as composed of "islands of estates" surrounded by mud, serviced by a bus once every blue moon, and of "cheerless community centres" that are regularly smashed up by teenage vandals who are 'environmentally understimulated'. These notions may be accurate descriptions of maladaptive behaviours even though they do not explain the causes of such behaviours. Basically, "new town blues" are maladaptive behaviours exemplified by apathy, withdrawal, loneliness, violence and vandalism, and other neurotic behaviours. Their explanations are based on disappointed expectations, dreams and fantasies; and the failure to realise more concrete aspirations.

They are also caused by alienation from a familiar environment and a consequent loss of socio-spatial interaction, the loss of "a sense of co-munity" and "a sense of place"; alienation from friends, relatives,
reference groups and associations, valuable associations and networks; alienation from the comfort of those urban amenities and facilities that make life in the cities unique. New Town Blues (or maladaptation) is caused by the in-migrant's state of anomie. Having lost the support of an old system, he confronts newness that he is unable to relate to adequately. Because he has not established any roots (having lost the old ones), he is neither here nor there. A combination of alienation and anomie contributes largely to the state of cultural shock of which 'new town blues' are only one manifestation.

As an adaptative breakdown, cultural shock is a profound disorientation suffered by an in-migrant who plunged into migration without adequate preparation into the culture of the place of destination. A move from London to Milton Keynes may not imply necessarily a journey into a distinctive 'alien' culture. Yet, in a significant way, it means an export of urban culture from London to Milton Keynes. The migrant from London is still left in a situation in which he has to make real efforts to find his feet, first, on the ground. In 30 interviews of the migrants of two of the firms that relocated, conducted six months after the move, to find out how migrants were settling in, 83% (N=25) confirmed that they were finding it difficult to become accepted by the 'natives' as part of the community. Asked how long they estimate it will take them, majority (67%: N=20) put it, at about 20 years time. One respondent summed it up by saying: "I suppose I am going to be just a countryside cockney". And the feelings of the natives themselves are summed up by the following remark: "We do not want Londoners with their problems here". There is a clear sense of apprehension of cultural conflict on both sides.
As demonstrated by the Banbury Study, as the influx of urban population grows, urban cultural ascendancy becomes a reality. Thus, the 'natives' who protest against the presence of in-migrants are adaptively responding to an imminent cultural invasion.

On the other hand, cultural shock, to the in-migrant, is a form of personality maladjustment which is a reaction to a temporarily unsuccessful attempt to adjust to new surroundings and people. To some, it is subjective feeling of loss, and a sense of isolation and loneliness. To others, it can be viewed as a response to stress by emotional and intellectual withdrawal. It is, therefore, most likely that both risk-takers and escapists can either fail or succeed in migration, in terms of adequately adapting or maladapting. Much will depend upon their personality, their motivation, their social experiences and perhaps the circumstances of the move. Similarly, for Deniers, Specialists, Reversionists and Super-simplifiers, some may be successful whilst others may not. These typologies are valuable only in putting migrants in categories for purposes of discussing the notion of maladaptation. It is still much of a problem to utilise the typology to draw the specific line between failure and success in migration without recourse to personal (psychological) traits.

The causal explanation of maladaptation is likely to give the misleading impression that all migrants automatically become exposed to maladaptive breakdowns at destination. On the contrary, what the preceding analysis has shown is the probability of a migrant either returning to the place of origin or manifesting some maladaptive
behaviours as a result of the failure to fit into the new environment. Between these two extreme probable situations, most migrants have invariably developed coping mechanisms that enabled them to settle and adapt successfully into the host environment. Clustering of immigrants to certain areas within the new environment is a universally acknowledged tendency especially during the earlier part of settlement. Partly because of resistance, rejection, prejudice and discrimination from the natives and partly because of the need for psychological, emotional and economic support from kith and kin already present in the new environment, clustering offers the best mechanism for coping with alienation and newness.

4.5 Objective Characteristics and Typology of Migrants

1. Objective Characteristics of Migrants

So far, a broad classification of respondents into Movers and Non-movers has been used in the foregoing analysis and discussions. It has all along been essential to distinguish between those who took the opportunity to move to a new town and those who preferred continued life in the older city. The classification has served the useful, even if limited purpose of facilitating the description, analysis and understanding of the attitudes of both categories. In order to further examine what kind of people are most likely to be Movers and Non-movers, it is relevant to take into account both the psychological and objective (statistical aggregation) of the migrants. In the preceding paragraph (see 4.4), some of the basic psychological characteristics of migrants were briefly described. It now remains to examine the more objective characteristics of respondents under the following headings: Age, Social Class (S.E.G.), Education, Ethnicity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Survey of Migrant Firms 1972</th>
<th>Islington stress Area Residents 1972</th>
<th>Greater London residents 1967</th>
<th>Married heads of household who moved to 6 London new towns in 1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movers</td>
<td>Non-movers</td>
<td>Movers</td>
<td>Non-movers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 (152)</td>
<td>100 (512)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Extracted from the 'Survey of Migrant Firms' based on case study of four firms that moved out from London for relocation in New and Expanding Towns. Age ranges of respondents were adjusted to fit into Columns 1, 3 and 4.

2. Figures from the Islington Stress area Survey of Residents.

3. These percentages are taken from the 1967 GLC survey of London's households: The characteristics of London households. Research Report No. 5, August 1970

4. Some statistics kindly lent by the Economics Directorate B. Dept. of the Environment. The six new towns are Basildon, Bracknell, Crawley, Harlow, Hemel Hempstead and Stevenage.
Age Structure of Migrants

Table 33 compares the age-structure of respondents (i.e. workers of migrant firms - Column 1) with those of Islington residents, GLC residents and migrants to six London new towns. It will be observed that 18% of the respondents falling within the 25-35 age bracket were Movers compared with 34% who moved to six London new towns in 1969 (cf. Ray Thomas's study). For those between 35 and 45 years old, 14% of the respondents moved compared with 17% of total movements in 1969. These figures indicate conformity with universal observation of greater mobility of people within the 25-40 years age bracket. It also confirms the current trend which shows that people of youthful age, i.e. those within this same age bracket, have been leaving London for new towns in disproportionate numbers leaving behind the older and the infirm. But the table also indicates very interesting trend for the older people. For those between the age 45-65, 58% moved from the migrant firms (63% did not) compared with 17% from the same age bracket who moved to new towns in 1969.

This represents a very significant difference in the proportion of people of this age group who moved in 1972 compared with the proportion in 1969 for two reasons. First, because this age group is generally accepted as less mobile than the younger age group. Second, because it raises the question as to whether or not overall mobility is increased with relocation of firms compared with when firms recruit directly from new towns. In other words, does it make any difference in the age structure of those who move if movement is the result of firms relocating in a new town? It is suggested here that it makes a great deal of difference. In recruitment, especially through the ISS
(New and Expanding Town Schemes), the employer usually goes for the young and the professional; the technicians and the skilled manual workers. In relocation, the employer is much more obliged to take those who decide to move regardless of their skill. That is not to say that relocation has not been shown to provide an opportunity to rid the migrant firm of its inefficient labour. Nevertheless, it is also true that the migrant firm invariably depends on some of its established workers (often referred to as "key workers") to make relocation a success. For this reason, in particular, the movers are invariably older, skilled and experienced workers who have been with their employers for a long time. Thus, if we compare in Table 35 the age structure of respondents with that of registrants on the ISS, the crucial difference underlined by these comments as far as recruitment is concerned, clearly emerges. The ISS registrants, for example, are drawn largely from the 25-34 and 15-24 age brackets. These two age groups account for 58% of recruitments by employers in new towns, which tallies almost with migrants to six London new towns in 1969 drawn from these age groups, and accounting for 58.8% of the total population of migrants.

The proportion of movers from the migrant firms drawn from the 45-65 age bracket is interesting for a different reason. Indeed, it suggests that one possible way to recruit to new towns the much needed older people to bring about a better (social) balance in the population is by attracting more firms to relocate in new towns. Thus, planned migration must provide an exception to the rule in migration which holds that much more younger people are more likely to migrate than the older ones.
### TABLE 34

Age of heads of household: Migrant firm workers, ISS registrants, Migrants to six London new Towns. G.L.C. residents (see Table 33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movers</td>
<td>Non-movers</td>
<td>Movers</td>
<td>Non-movers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social class of Migrants (S.E.G.)

Table 35 Column 1 gives a breakdown of the social class of respondents of migrant firms by socio-economic groupings. The column is compared with the S.E.G. of those registered on the selection scheme, migrants to six London new towns in 1969, and with the S.E.G. of GLC residents for 1966. It is important to note that (in Column 1) whereas 14% of foremen, skilled manual etc., decided to move with their employers, as many as 28% of this same group decided to remain in London. Yet, 43% of the ISS registrants wishing to move out of London in 1971 and 37% of migrants already resident in new towns in 1969 (see Columns (ii) and (iii) come from this social group.
TABLE 35

Social Class (by socio-economic grouping) of Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N-M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled manual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual and personal service workers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled and agricultural</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces and others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES TO TABLE


2. See note 4 to Table 33 for source and the six new towns. The gaps in column (iii) marked * arise because the data cannot be disaggregated into the same S.E.G. groupings as used for the other columns. The figures included refer to the same S.E.G. categories and are for employed heads of household.

3. Column (iv) (Greater London residents) refers to economically active or retired males aged 15 and over.
It was to be expected that, following the general trend, more workers from this group should have moved. Why then was the reverse the case? It has been indicated earlier that the more skilled and professional workers whilst attracted to new towns by the very generous incentives and financial assistance from their employers to relocate, were nevertheless, also fearful of the effects of lack of alternative jobs to go to in the event of a loss of the present job.

**TABLE 36**
Social Class of Migrants – Heads of Households  
(by socio-economic grouping) (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.E.G.</th>
<th>(i) Movers</th>
<th>(ii) Non-movers</th>
<th>(iii) Movers</th>
<th>(iv) Non-movers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Managerial, Own employers (3,4,12,13)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal service/semi-skilled (7,10,15)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foremen, skilled manual and own account (8,9,12,14)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual (11)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces/ inadequately described</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 (152)</td>
<td>100 (512)</td>
<td>100 (201)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new town was judged not to possess the potential of providing a big and flexible labour market in which skill can be sold at the highest bidder. It was this cautious approach which dampened the enthusiasm of many skilled manual workers, technicians and professionals who could have taken the opportunity to move. Thus, it was not only job and housing considerations but also the prospect of changing jobs at the new location which influenced the decision to move.

On the other hand, the difference in the proportion of Movers and Non-movers from the economic groups described as managers and Non-manual workers (4% of movers and 2% of Non-movers; and 17% of Movers and 12% of Non-movers), is not entirely surprising, following the general trend already noted. Almost the same percentage of semi-skilled workers moved as there was those that did not (38% compared with 37%). But the more surprising finding was that more unskilled moved (22%) compared with those that did not (16%). This is a second case in which the general pattern seems to be reversed. It has been noted elsewhere that evidence exists that the unskilled are generally less mobile than the skilled and the professional. In the new town context, the preference for the recruitment of the skilled, technicians, professionals and semi-skilled has been demonstrated by the Selection Scheme and the composition of migrants to six new towns in 1969. But in the case of the relocating firms in which workers were given the opportunity to indicate whether or not they wish to leave the city to move to a new town, the preference of the working class (the unskilled and the semi-skilled) is demonstrably one of enthusiasm to move. Although only 22% of the unskilled wished to move or actually moved, a still smaller percentage (16%) decided to stay. In fact, if the
traditional working class group represented, occupationally, by unskilled workers, are taken together, then 61% of the working class group was willing to move or actually moved, compared with only 53% who did not.

Let us check the validity of this conclusion by comparing the decisions of our respondents from the migrant firms with those of respondents in the Islington Stress Area where respondents were largely drawn from the working class group.

Table 37 summarises the socio-economic grouping of the Islington Stress Area Residents and the S.E.G. of Islington Migrants to new towns. Both groups (Columns ii and iii) are compared with the groupings of workers of migrant firms shown under Column i. The percentage of the working class group described as 'Personal Service/Semi-skilled' who left Islington for the new towns in 1972 was 59%; while those described as 'Unskilled Manual' was 4% a total of 63% from the working class. This total compares favourably with the total from migrant firms (61%). The differences in the characteristics of the working class migrants from Islington and the Migrant firms are not at all significant since they are limited to the proportions of them that were 'semi-skilled' and 'unskilled'. But the difference in the number of working class migrants that ultimately moved to a new town remains fundamentally a function of the method of recruitment, in this case either through the Selection Scheme or through a Migrant Firm. It is much more likely that a greater number of the working class wishing to move to a new town will do so if and when their employer is relocating in a new town.
The Ethnic Origin of Migrants

TABLE 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Migrant firm workers</th>
<th>Islington Migrants</th>
<th>Islington Stress Area Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in London</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in the U.K.</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eire</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece/Cyprus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies/Caribbean</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India/Pakistan/Africa</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere outside U.K.</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (152)</td>
<td>100.0 (201)</td>
<td>100 (512)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New Towns Project

N.B. Asterisks* indicates that corresponding figures are merged into "Elsewhere in the U.K." in order to adjust into the other columns.

Majority of the migrants from Islington and the migrant firms (88% and 76%, respectively) are natives of Great Britain. Approximately 5% in each case is of Irish descent; and whereas no migrant workers come from Greece/Cyprus, only 0.5% residents of Greek/Cypriot origin from Islington moved to new towns. On the other hand, 12% of those from the New Commonwealth (West Indies, India, Pakistan, Africa, etc) moved with their employers compared with 7% of those from this same group who moved from their place of residence (Islington) to the new towns. This finding again leads to a similar conclusion already drawn about the mobility of the working class. That is, that where a firm is relocating in a new town, the probability - that it will move with a
larger proportion of workers drawn from various ethnic groups than when these workers are directly recruited by employers, is relatively high.

It was, however, expected that a larger proportion of black and brown workers within the migrant firms would have taken the opportunity to move to a new town. This expectation was based partly on the fact that one of the migrant firms employed a large proportion of West Indians (more than 25% of the total work-force was composed of West Indians) and the firm itself had hoped that many of its black workers will move; and partly because the assumption that black/brown workers are unable to move out of London because of lack of skill has been demolished. The 1966 census figures, for example, show that 45% of West Indians in London are skilled manual workers. Similarly, most Indians are craftsmen and professionals, just as a good deal of Africans are highly (professionally) qualified. Given this picture, a much higher proportion of black/brown movers was expected. But the figure achieved was much lower. Why? This is a question that has not been easy to answer for years as it becomes increasingly noticeable that as the population of new towns grow, less black and brown faces are seen. The survey of migrant firms found only that black/brown workers were discouraged from moving because of "perceived fear of hostility". Although perceived fear of hostility could be both unreal and exaggerated, yet it does point to obvious obstacles rooted in ethnicity which are additional to the general constraints already noted. These specific obstacles whatever their nature, were, unfortunately, not spelt out. Moreover, the number of blacks/browns involved in the process of planned migration was so small that any
further analysis was likely to lead to no valuable conclusions.

Further research was necessary in order to identify any such obstacles. It is in order to increase knowledge in the mobility to new towns of ethnic minorities in Britain that the study on "Opportunities for ethnic minorities in new and expanding towns" is being currently undertaken by the Commission for Racial Equality for and on behalf of the Department of the Environment.

Educational Attainment of Migrants

Table 38 shows the educational qualifications of the respondents from the migrant firms. Majority of both Movers and Non-movers (78% and 82% respectively) have no formal qualifications obtained from further education after leaving primary school. The proportion of those with Diplomas and other qualifications that made the move was higher than that of Non-movers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training or qualification</th>
<th>Total No. of Migrants obtaining the qualification</th>
<th>Movers (Percentage)</th>
<th>Non-movers (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degrees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualifications (Unspecified)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications from further education</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/refusals, etc</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 (152)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But it is interesting to note at the same time that those with higher qualifications or longer training e.g. Apprenticeship, University degrees and professional qualifications seem to have exercised preference to stay behind instead of moving. This would seem to correlate with the finding that those in the S.E.G. described as Professionals, Managers, Skilled Manuals, Foremen and Technicians cautiously opted (significantly) to stay in London, where the prospects of changing for alternative jobs at will were greater.

2. A Typology of City Migrants

The question that must be examined is "who are most likely to choose to move out of the older city at the earliest opportunity and who would most likely prefer to stay behind"? In this paragraph, an attempt will be made to produce a typology of migrants, primarily based on the attitudes, the psychological traits and the residential location of city dwellers most likely to move to a new town as well as those that would (likely) prefer to stay behind.

a) The Working Class Aspirants

Some "Movers" are likely to be found among the working class residents of the inner city who are aspiring to a higher social status by a change of their present residential location. Often referred to as the "downwardly mobile" or the "impatient risers", this group, by occupation semi-skilled and unskilled, seeks for environments in which a reference group of a higher social status is located and which match their own aspirations. Such environments of their choice are usually associated withm for example, the middle class and therefore enhance the social status of whoever moves in to live there.
Thus, an in-migrant to Hampstead is easily associated with middle-class intellectualism. In addition to this, the mover is expected to own a car, to be an owner-occupier and to adopt the middle-class style of life that is a norm in this area. In other words, a movement into a middle-class environment is for the working class a status enhancing act: a significant process of working class embourgeoisement. To the working class residents of the inner city, life in a new town improves their social status; and the new town provides the melting pot effect that enhances the social standing of a working class in-migrant. Osborn and Whittick were, apparently, referring to the melting-pot effect and the embourgeoisement of the working class when they described new towns as "answer to megalopolis".

It is therefore, understandable why some working class movers saw the move to a new town as "of far greater moment than future career or pension rights, or immediate cash in hand".80 This conclusion summarises the meaning that the working class respondents attached to relocation: an opportunity to realise aspirations outside work; by far the most significant motivation for the decision to move.

Not all the working class residents of the inner city can be said to be enthusiastic to move out to a new town just to improve their social status. There are still the poor and the trapped, the old and the infirm and there are still the urban villagers and natives epitomised by Bethnal Greeners.

b) **Middle Class Escapists**

Other movers may be found predominantly among the middle class inner city residents who anticipate or experience disharmony and dissonance from the implied status of their present residents. As they perceive the social respectability of their neighbourhood and the social status of the residents correspondingly diminishing, they too seek for life in environments within which they will resume and maintain the status quo. In occupational terms, this group of middle-class movers are Managers, Professional people, Foremen and Supervisors and the upper segments of non-manual workers. Well educated and middle class in their style of life: home owners, car owners, possession of domestic gadgets and affluent in the pattern of bringing up children, etc., these mobile inner city dwellers are usually residentially located in pockets of classy environmental enclaves in which they live side by side with their own kind. So, just as there are urban villagers of Bethnal Greeners; so there are urban villagers of intellectuals, stockbrokers, legal practitioners, property dealers, export and import financial magnets, entertainers and film-stars. In their search for respectable, quiet, clean and healthy environs with their semi-detached family and country homes, they first search for homes in or seek to move from the urban villages to the city suburbs or/and then direct to the healthy environs beyond the green belts in new towns. They dislike the deterioration of familiar environment.

Thus, whenever the environment is seen to be losing its qualities of healthiness, cleanliness, respectability, etc, these middle-class groups escape. It is this phenomenon which fundamentally explains
the trend referred to as the "suburban retreat" or the "flight from
the city" by which the "migratory elites" escape from the congested
older cities to the suburbs and the country.

However, leaving the city is by no means automatic for all the
middle class people. There are those whom Merton refers to as "cosmopolites" who include students, artists, writers, musicians and entertainers, as well as the intellectuals and professionals. They live in the city so as to be near the special cultural facilities usually located in the city. There are those politically referred to as "Locals or Burgesses": those who developed strong roots in an area and are predominantly in the social, cultural and political activities of the area after they have achieved their career progression usually within the same locality. There are also "returnees" to the city who are affected by what is currently known as "gentrification". For these Non-movers group of the middle class, the suburb or the new town can only at best be possible alternatives but not substitutes for the urban environment of the city which more than provides for basic and traditional needs and facilities on which their existence depends.

c) The Home Seekers

Majority of movers must remain, inevitably, the inner city residents in continuing need of housing. In these days of rising expectations in living standard and level of decency, the concept of housing need extends beyond mere 'living space' into the realm of 'beautiful gardens', 'clean surroundings' and 'good neighbourhood'. Only the new towns have the potentials of satisfying this fundamental need of city residents; a fact which underlines the contributions that
new towns will continue to make for a long time. In particular, the retiring workman aspiring to spend the rest of his life in a peaceful country cottage, as well as the young couples (perhaps with young kids) in the early stage of family building, will continue to find the new town attractive. For such persons, relocation is an opportunity that must be seized.

d) The Spiralists/Organisation men

A reasonable proportion (17%) of the respondents of migrant firms moved for job reasons. On average, majority of the workers of migrant firms had put in, at the time of relocation, ten years of service. Others were simply young technicians and skilled manual workers who can be described as affluent workers mobile enough to move with their job in order to keep or maintain a career progression. These are the Spiralists, i.e. those who move geographically in order to move up socially. Except that they are much younger, they are as well 'migratory elites' and in terms of career-orientation typically 'organisation-men'. They move with their jobs; but they are also likely to return to the inner city if it offers greater prospects for career advancement and increased social status.

4.6 Summary of main findings and Conclusions

Main Findings

1. To the migrant firms relocation was interpreted as a means to ensure the survival of the firm as an on-going social system. To the migrant workers, migration was an opportunity to leave the city in order to satisfy, mostly, non-work aspirations.

Only 17% moved for reasons connected with work and career; 83% moved for non-work reasons. For those who preferred to stay
behind, attachment to London: familial and community connections, availability of alternative jobs, and the poverty of new towns in urban facilities and amenities, were in the main constraints.

2. The drop-out rate was 59%; which means that the firms achieved on average, the transfer of only 41% of their existing staff.

3. More older people moved than did the younger ones; and more of the working class employees moved compared with those of them who preferred to remain in London. Except in the case of the semi-skilled where the proportion of movers and non-movers was similar, and in the case of Non-manual workers who had a slightly higher proportion of movers than non-movers, more professionals, foremen and supervisors and the skilled manual workers tended to prefer to stay behind.

4. Contrary to the general assumption, the decision-making unit is the family and not just the respondent/head of household.

5. Migration decision itself is the product of cost-benefit analysis.

6. Migration decision-making is an adaptive response to a change of environment.

7. The inner city residents most likely to move to a new town are: members of the working class aspiring to middle-class status by moving into a typically middle-class environment; members of the middle-class who move away from a deteriorating environment to retreat into the suburbs in order to maintain the status quo; the young couples in the early stages of family-building and the retiring 'organisation-man' who wishes to
enjoy his old age in a country cottage; and the spiralists who move with his job to enhance his social position and maintain a career progression. And those who stay behind are most likely to be cosmopolites, the locals and the burgesses of the urban villages, the trapped natives and the ethnic villagers. By occupation, they could be anything from the Manager and business owner, to foremen and supervisors, the professionals, the technicians and the skilled manual workers, artists and entertainers, the semi-skilled and the unskilled.

Conclusions

Human beings, like lower biological organisms, depend upon and interact with their surroundings in order to survive. As a result of this attachment to the environment, the human being shows reluctance to change that environment by a shift to a new one. If he has to move, it is usually as a result of strong motivation. This situation explains the nature of migration decision both as a process and as an adaptive response to change of environment. Thus, any decision to move over physical and social space must be based (inevitably) on a rough calculus of costs and benefits. Migration decision is often compared with the decision to get married although there are important differences. Nonetheless, in both cases, the decision can be reversed: by divorce or by returning to place of origin if maladaptation is experienced. The rational deliberations which ensured the avoidance of wrong decisions by our migrant workers are demonstrated by the exhaustive preparations described in Chapter 3. Here, it is necessary to observe that the migration decision of our migrant workers were based on considerations associated with
environmental factors, housing need, work and career, the future of the family, social and community network, and personal circumstances. These considerations seem to suggest that migrant workers were responding in the first place, to the change implicit in abandoning a familiar environment to adapt into a new one. For the inner city residents offered the opportunity to move to a new town, the strongest motive for moving was the chance of satisfying some socially generated, yet non-work, aspirations.
CHAPTER 5

ACTION FRAME OF REFERENCE IN MIGRATION DECISION-MAKING

5.1 Migration Decision-making: a unit of social action

Men construct a social world to which they attach meanings: meanings which they derive from shared expectations and values, and from knowledge and experiences that developed out of interactions with others. In human societies, symbols, expectations, values and experiences provide individuals with frames of reference which shape their actions and with which they make sense of other people's actions. Within this context, every unit of social action must include all human behaviour when and in so far as the acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to it. Action in this sense may be either overt or purely inward or subjective, it may consist of positive intervention in a situation, or of deliberately reframing from such intervention or passively acquiescing in the situation. As Weber said, action is social in so far as, by virtue of the subjective meaning attached to it, the acting individual (or individuals) takes account of the behaviour of others and is thereby oriented in its course.

Men, therefore, define their situation and act in certain ways in order to attain certain ends. In other words, the action of men stems from a network of meanings which they themselves construct from given situations; the ends that they are concerned to attain, the

range of alternative actions that they perceive to be available to them; and the choice of means most likely to be effective in attaining the given ends, bearing in mind the likely reactions of others to their actions.

It follows that social action has an internal logic by virtue of the fact that people assign meanings to situations and to the actions of others and then react in terms of the interpretations suggested by those meanings. It is therefore, clearly conceivable that a group of people (e.g. our migrant workers) could respond differently to the same situation or the same objectively defined stimulus, e.g. the cash assistance and incentives to move. The different responses given to the same situation by the same people explains the function of variations in interpretations and meanings attached to the same situation. It is the subjective understanding of the actions of men which Weber regards as the fundamental distinguishing feature of sociology compared with the natural sciences. He declares that: "we can accomplish something which is never attainable in the natural sciences, namely: the subjective understanding of the action of the component individuals", and argued that sociology must be concerned with the interpretation of action in terms of its subjective meaning. 83

Migration decision-making is, for all intents and purposes, an instance of social action. Earlier (Chapter 3) it was demonstrated that workers were acting in a particular situation. That situation was an opportunity to choose between leaving the city or staying behind,

83. Max Weber, pp. 94 and 103.
following the decision of their employers to relocate in a new town. To be able to decide one way or the other, workers first defined their situation in terms, not only of what meaning they attach to moving or staying behind, but also what alternative means existed for the realisation of the interpretations suggested by the situation.

As soon as they entered the stage of exercising a choice, involving the weighing of the pros and cons of staying or moving their actions approximated to the expressions of motivated men. This demonstrated that workers attached meanings to relocation. For some movers, it was an opportunity to enhance their social status by better housing and through residential location in an environment that is associated with higher social standing; and for some non-movers, staying behind confirmed the extent of their attachment to the familiar urban environment.

The meanings attached to relocation were different for different groups of our sample of workers. It was different, for e.g. between the older and younger workers; between the working class and middle class workers; between ethnic minorities and natives, and in occupational terms between the unskilled and the professionals. It was also different for the single and married, males and females and so on. Migration decision is as much a function of the meanings that migrants attached to the situation, as it is the ends that migrants wished to attain: their needs, their aspirations, their hopes and expectations. Such meanings are social facts which are socially given, e.g. better housing in a better environment wins social approval from respectable people in society. And meanings are also socially sustained by the
institutionalisation and internalisation of roles and expectations, and by taking the actions of others into account through the process of interactions.

The motivations of our migrant workers are demonstrably essential to their interpretation of the situation as well as in actually making their decision. However, as we observed the workers in a process of transition, it was difficult to say whether they were 'behaving' or 'acting'. The distinction between 'behaviour' and 'action' whilst it may appear unimportant, does underline the problem of situational interpretation and rationality in the actions of men at one point in time. Behaviour usually refers to response to a stimulus whose objective characteristics are perceived by the observer; so that the reaction of the observer to the stimulus can be analysed and conclusions drawn from the reactions.

Observable patterns of behaviour can be deduced from reactions to stimuli, which then provide the social scientist with his most reliable source of data. Following from this, it was demonstrated that Management, in order to orientate and condition workers to accept and respond favourably to relocation, offered them cash assistance and incentives and made serious efforts to familiarise workers with the new location. The measures constituted stimulus input to which workers reacted, but of course, differently. These reactions are a clear example of 'behaviour'. But they show that behaviour is an expression of motive or intention; suggesting that 'action' and 'behaviour' are both generated by motive. In the above example on the reactions of workers to cash assistance, incentives
and familiarisation, the behaviours of workers were partly reflecting the expectations of management and partly rejecting them; and partly demonstrating that the motives of workers were something superior to cash assistance and incentives. Nevertheless, it is also true to say that by concentrating on behaviour itself without interpreting the meaning of that behaviour, it is possible to miss its significance (in this case, its meaning) to the people involved and to the people to whom the behaviour is directed. 'Action' and 'Behaviour' can, therefore, be used interchangeably with no inconsistency because although 'action' itself occurs not as a response to an observable stimulus but as a product of a system of expectations yet it is generated by the desire to attain given ends. That is probably what Weber means when he defined social action as all human behaviour when and in so far as the acting individual attaches subjective meaning to it.

The understanding of the migration decisions of workers and the frame of reference on which those decisions were made must begin with the observation and the interpretation of the subjective state of mind of the workers (as actors), as well as with the demonstration of the way they defined the situation. This approach has meant a close examination of meanings that workers attached to the opportunity to leave the inner city: in turn, this means looking for typical motives of our typical migrant workers which would explain their migration decisions in that given situation within which they acted. It has been shown that our sample of migrant workers were highly motivated people whose divergent aspirations led them to define and interpret the occasion of relocating in a new town differently.
They showed that the action they took (i.e. decision to move or to stay behind) was related closely to the meaning they attached to the opportunity of leaving the city. The way they defined the situation, the meanings they attached to it and the ends they hoped to attain - all this provided the vehicle for action. That action, represented, in this context by the decision-making process, has been shown to be characteristically rational; that is, workers were not only expressing what the situation meant to them, what they could get out of it and what the consequences of acting or remaining passive or acquiescing will be, but also weighing the relative effectiveness of alternative means of achieving the ends defined. Indeed, as it was shown in Chapter 4, decision-making is the product of cost-benefit analysis. This deliberate and calculating kind of social action Weber calls 'Rational' ('Zweckrational'). Where an action has been shown to be goal-orientated as in the case of the migrant workers, it is hardly necessary any more to demonstrate rationality. The rational action of migrant workers is explained when the meanings they attach to their migration decision are apparent and manifest. That is to say, as soon as it clearly demonstrated that the actor acted in a particular way, either in order to or because of, then such action is sufficiently rational being backed by concrete motive and supplying adequate information about the situation within which the actor acted.

Not all workers were, however, purely rational in their behaviour. There were migrant workers whose actions were guided by their emotional feelings towards the 'governor' or the employing firm. Some workers have come to be emotionally attached to the migrant firm after so
many years of unbroken service. Others have such personal relationships with the proprietor, or head of department as to regard themselves as members of the family. Thus, some movers may have decided to move purely for sentimental reasons - what Pareto calls 'derivations' or what Weber calls 'affectual orientation of action'. It has been shown that part of the decision not to move was the result of emotional attachment to London. It is likely that some of our Movers motivated by long service and attachment to the employer might be heavily drawn from the typical organisation men or spiralists more inclined to make progress, maintain their career and improve their social status by sticking to one employer. For this group of migrant workers, their action approximates to what Weber calls 'Traditional (Social) Action'. A fourth type of (ideal) social action which probably defines some of the behaviours of our sample of migrant workers is what Weber refers to as 'Wertrational': that is, a rational action guided by a conscious belief in the absolute value of some ethical, aesthetic or religious behaviour entirely for its own sake and independent of any prospects of external success. It is perhaps difficult to separate Zweckrational from Wertrational action in the one sense that the later can be an amplification of the former action. For example, where the actor's goal turns out to be a desire for a thing that is valued for its own sake. This was the case with our migrant workers (especially Movers) part of whose goals for moving was the satisfaction of an aspiration to live in a 'modern house; in the beautiful, fresh and quiet environment of the new town'. 
The implication of this aspiration is that movement to a new town for some migrant workers was construed as a social value to which they were aspiring to achieve.

5.2 The Action frame of reference of migrant workers

So far it has been demonstrated that men's motives, emotions or sentiments, their desire to conform to rules and expectations of others and occasional pursuits of value and belief, provide them with a frame of reference for their social action, including (in the present context) the unit act of deciding whether to migrate from the inner city to a new town or to stay behind. Goldthorpe, and his associates have shown how the action frame of reference can be usefully applied to the sociological analysis of the behaviour of workers within work organisations. In explaining the social behaviour and relationships of affluent workers of the car industry, they took as the initial basis of that explanation, the way workers defined their situations and demonstrated that the orientations that the workers brought into work determined their attitude to work, their behaviour and relationships which they formed with the firm and their colleagues.

In examining the situations of our sample of migrant workers, it may now be asked: what considerations (or action frame of reference) provided the basis on which their migration decisions were made? The considerations implicit in those decisions can be summarised as follows:-
1. Environmental Quality
2. Housing and Neighbourhood
3. Community, Social Ties and Association
4. Family and Private Life
5. Work and Career

The Social and Physical Environment

Respondents have demonstrated, in their migration decisions, the subjective meaning that they attach to environmental factors. They have made continuous and direct comparisons between the new town environment and the urban environment of the inner city areas. They have made continuous assessment of the quality of social relationships that prevailed in the inner city environment and speculated on what life could be in a new environment in which all the developed and valued ties, associations and connections would be lacking. Respondents have also considered the extent to which they can live in a new environment which is different from the natural habitat for urbanites. In other words, their frame of reference in their migration decisions were mainly based on relating the contents of the familiar environments of the inner city to those of the new town and asking themselves questions about moving or staying whose answers at best emphasize what aspirations they would wish to satisfy.

Against this background, some respondents, in their reasons for moving expressed an unambiguous preference for the cleaner, healthier and desirable physical surroundings of the new town whilst deploring the deterioration of the London (urban) environment which was perceived as having lost its respectability and glamour. But at the
same time, the lack of basic amenities of an urban environment in new towns severely constrained the desires of many to move away from the older city. And the kind of social relationships that respondents expected to develop at destination (including the ease of difficulty for adapting and adjusting, making friends and generally resocialising once more), also featured prominently in the underlying considerations in their migration decisions. Thus, the new town environment, for example, its cleaner, healthier and modern outlook; its suburban and respectable surroundings; its quiet, peaceful and serene appeal; and its conduciveness to bringing up children or for retirement formed a significant frame of reference for 48% of Movers who mentioned this factor as a determinant of the decision to move.

The concept of the 'environment' discussed in Chapter 6, poses its own problems. The general and more narrow meaning given to the environment is its association with the physical space around, whereas, in its wider context, it refers to the physical and social space to which, through daily interactions, men in society relate to and attach meaning. Viewed in this wider context, the significance of the concept of the environment to the present discussion, must be the value that men attach to 'environment'.

The comparisons between the new town and inner city environments are meaningful only in terms of the subjective values that respondents attach to each of both kinds of environment: their contents, their qualities, and their useful and social grading. The environment would, therefore, include the physical surroundings, the social heritage of a community, the richness and quality of social interaction,
the amount of social investments for welfare and comfort; hospitals, transport, cinema, sporting and social club facilities, shopping and so on. It is, therefore, not surprising that the evaluation which Non-movers attach to their environment was a frame of reference for 23% who decided not to move because they were unable to abandon the London environment; and the significance that 29% attached to community ties, social connections and professional associations.

The comparisons that respondents made between 'the old' and 'the new' environments reflected on both the differences between the two and the likely choices that different city residents could make given the opportunity to move out. But it does not mean that, in absolute terms, the inner city environment is inferior to the new town environment or vice versa. What it means is that both environments are alternatives available to different categories of city residents within which they can pursue their different and preferred life styles. 84

For example, appropriate environments within the city have created ghettos - ethnic ghettos, class segregation, or professional separatism. These environmental enclaves promote the pursuit of preferred style of life which either conforms with the shared expectations and norms of a particular social group, or enables a particular individual to identify with an ethnic, social or professional grouping; or the style of life picked up which enables the individual to satisfy the aspiration of belonging to the group. Our sample of migrant workers have demonstrated in the analyses of preceding chapters that moving out to a new town or staying in London was an expression of conformity and identification with, or aspiration to pursuing a way of life which,

84. According to William Michelson, life style is a composite of those aspects of the roles that a person strongly emphasizes. It refers not to styles of dress or furnishing but rather to styles of living. A style of life can be picked up, imitated, acquired or ascribed. However, it is basically rooted in 'image' and 'role' and 'role emphasis'. See W. Michelson, p. 63.
only the choice of moving to a new environment in a new town or staying in the old but familiar environment of the inner city, could help to achieve.

**Housing and Neighbourhood**

The concept of housing in the present day means more than a building with a number of rooms and spaces for different purposes whether we are referring to the single person, the married couple or a family with children and grown-ups. Housing need has extended beyond 'shelter' and 'accommodation', to include central heating, low-density accommodation, gardens at the rear and front of the house, and a desirable, respectable environment that wins the approval of decent and civilised people. The definition of housing (and housing need) moves in direct proportion with the growth of decency, standard of living and environmental health. Therefore, any form of overcrowding, any kind of congestion and any perception of the deterioration of the surroundings would have increased the perception for bad housing. This fact explains why 48% of Movers mentioned housing need as a determinant of their decision to move; and it also explains why some Non-Movers were content to stay in London where they appear to be satisfactorily housed.

Where the emphasis in housing choice revolves around modernity, quality and residential location, the potentials of the inner city area satisfying such growing demand will be obviously limited. On the other hand, the new town stands out capable of meeting that need. It is for this specific reason that historically the creation of new towns have been and will continue to be functionally justified.
This function is more likely to be extended in view of the fact that the demand for single family houses (low-density and purpose built) has continued to rise and cannot be met by any possible increases in the provision of housing stock in the older cities. Respondents, therefore, demonstrated their sensitivity not only to the growing trend in the extension of the concept of housing from simple 'shelter' to the 'wider neighbourhood', but also in the potentialities of the new town in fulfilling their aspirations in terms of housing need. A significant aspect of their frame of reference in migration decision-making was the desire to satisfy housing need however widely the concept has currently been interpreted.

The Family, Life Cycle and Personal Circumstances

A great deal of serious considerations for the future of the family: welfare and comfort, children's education and upbringing etc., and for personal problems, e.g. health, formed a substantial part of the frame of reference for the migration decisions of our respondents. In the case of Movers, 30% (equivalence of 14% of all Movers) mentioned concern for the family and children as a determinant of the decision to move; and 32% (15% of Movers) mentioned Personal Circumstances (health reasons, conditions of other dependents, etc.) as important consideration for moving. Similarly, Non-movers were constrained from moving for the same reason that they were motivated by considerations related to concern for 'Family and Personal Problems'. Because, particularly, other members of the family had their jobs in London while other members rejected moving outright, 28% of Non-movers decided to stay.
On the positive side, there were respondents who were less protective in their thinking as in being rather adventurous in their outlook in order to provide greater security for the family. For different people in different stages of life cycle: the young and childless, the young child-raisers, the elderly and the retiring working man. The family and personal future of each of these must be affected by the environment in which they are located at a crucial point in time in their life-cycle. As William Michelson has observed direct access, for example to the outside, maximises control in child raising under conventional parent-child relationships. This control can be effectively achieved only if child-rearing takes place in a much more open-spaced environment. Similarly, self-contained single family housing units, the type that will be more likely to be available in new towns, also promote child raising by minimising parent fostering of children's inhibitions. On the other hand, only adults before and after the child-raising stage of life (as well as the childless) frequently rate access to consumer goods and services more highly than do families with growing children.

By implication, any planning policy for the provision of amenities in a new town based on "neighbourhood accessibility" is likely to encourage those in the child-raising stage of life more than others. In the same way that ownership and use of private motor-cars promote family centred life so will accessibility based on neighbourhood concept. Nevertheless, the aged and the retiring workman

will find great satisfaction in leading a much more secluded and less rushed life. For all these people, the new town is demonstrably a source of attraction. And the awareness of what the new town can offer in the realisation of their dreams, provided a frame of reference on which their decision to move out of London depended.

Community, Association and Social Ties

Community is not just a geographical area; it is people, it is attitude, a network of relationships, ties, associations. Community means interactions at various levels; it means the quality of developed values and contacts that bind people together. Community means "a sense of place" and "a sense of belonging". Community is a form of attachment. The strength of the binding bonds that make one a member of a community has been illustrated by social life and relationships in the typical communities of Bethnal Green in East End of London, Boston's West End in the United States, Ethnic Ghettos in America and the professional film-star enclaves in Hollywood, or the 'Eko' villages of downtown Lagos in Nigeria. The inner city area stands in the same position as these various communities, especially to city residents.

Moving away from such communities must be a painful experience and a challenge to an established tradition. It implies giving away so much of parts of one's heritage; and it must take a great deal of compensation to be able to make the break-away. The rough calculus, which respondents made in order to decide on whether or not the

86. Michelson, p. 63-75.
break-away was worthwhile has been described and discussed in Chapter 4. Although for various reasons, many Movers decided to leave the inner city, yet they did so by acknowledging the significance of their attachment to their community (12%) and the obvious amount of valued contacts they would be losing by moving (15%). On the other hand, it was obvious that a substantial number of Non-movers could not make the move mainly because they were unable to uproot from their community/home (15%); they did not want to break up valued contacts, associations and ties (16%); or did not want to separate from other members of the family who would be left behind if the move was made (28%). In other words, as a result of the subjective meaning that 59% of Non-movers attribute to community bond (including related social ties and valued associations), they decided against moving.

Work and Career

Only 17% of the Movers confirmed that their decision to move was motivated by the desire to keep their jobs and to maintain their career progression with the employer. As indicated above, the remaining 83% decided to move for reasons connected with environmental quality of the new town, housing need, the future of the family and so on. For the Non-movers, their job and the pursuit of career with the migrant firm occupied an inferior position in their scale of preferences. At least most Non-movers were content to stay behind in London confident that another job will be found much more easily. It is strange that only such a comparatively small proportion of the migrant workers could interpret the opportunity to move to a new town as a means of promoting their future career. Why this should be so
will remain a matter for speculation in view of the fact that evidence is available which indicates that most people who were recruited to work in new towns in the past seven years or so were motivated by the twin motive of getting a job and a house. So that in a situation in which a job and a house are secured (a situation represented by planned migration), it should be expected that the proportion of workers that will rush to pick up the opportunity would have been significant. Perhaps part of the answer may lie in the age and aspirations of our sample of migrant workers, as well as in the method of recruitment. Fig 9 indicates the various dimensions of respondents' frame of reference.

Fig. 9

Components of workers frame of reference

Frame of Reference in Migration Decision-making
5.3 Social Status, Life Style and Residential Location

Data on the reasons for moving or not moving and on the determinants for the decision made suggest that clear motive for improving the social positions of our sample of workers existed. More so, an examination of the components of the frame of reference on which their migration decision-making was based (see Fig. 9), would further suggest that there was a tacit belief by our sample of migrant workers in maintaining or achieving social respectability by choosing their residential location in an environment that fits the social image to which they aspire. Tied to residential/environmental respectability is the complimentary imperative of adopting a fitting style of life.

This section is, therefore, devoted to discussing the phenomenon of social status, its determinants and the particular route through which our migrant workers sought to maintain an already achieved social status or aspired to achieve it, namely: by residential location in a suburban house within a socially desirable environment.

Social status means a man's 'general' standing vis-a-vis the other members of the society or some section of it; and like social satisfaction comes with it the notion of superiority or/and inferiority. In addition, it deals with the way in which two people in the society will regard each other; that is, reciprocal attitudes expressed in reciprocal behaviour. In other words, social status derives from an assessment of one's relative position in the society; it deals with

the way others assess your social worth: one's rights, power and influence, one's wealth or education, and the amount of respect that a person commands among others. Social status or position can either be 'accorded' or 'subjectively derived'. In each case, a social position carries with it certain attitudes and role and behaviour expectations from others. Thus, we can distinguish between 'actual social position' as accorded by the attitudes and behaviour of those among whom the individual lives and moves, i.e. personal social status, e.g. the respectability and gentility of a good doctor; the social position accorded by the conventional values current in the society to the group of which the individual is a representative, i.e. positional social status, e.g. the general worth of a member of parliament; and one's position in the society derived from the social stratification system prevalent, e.g. a working class or a middle class person; or in occupational terms, a teacher, a factory worker, a bank clerk. So, birth and culture, wealth and material possessions, education, occupation or profession, as well as subjective assessment of status, participation in certain social activities and relationships, and status derived from the judgement of others are basic determinants of social status.

Certainly, what determines the social position of a person in the society, varies from society to society, particularly according to differences in emphasis in the underlying system of evaluation. In India, for example, for all intents and purposes, social status generally reflects current caste membership; even though there could be further distinctions of personal social status within a local caste group. In parts of Iboland (Nigeria), the hierarchical ordering of
persons in the society begins with Chieftaincy (Ndi Eze), and ends with subject persons. But within the second category (the subjects) there are distinctions of 'amala' (real natives) and 'mbiarabia' (non-natives; foreigners, including slaves). And even within the 'amalas' who pride themselves with being both the 'real natives' and 'noblemen', there are further distinctions of inferiority and superiority based on wealth, material possessions and relationship with the ruling class, etc. In Britain and Continental Europe where the estate system has influenced or survived into the age of (social) class, rights and privileges from birth, prestige from wealth and culture of mobility, gentility and respectability, education and profession determine social status. In each of these examples, it is important to note that it is the underlying system of assessment that determines the ultimate social grading. In India, and Africa, it is certainly birth; in Britain and Continental Europe, it is birth and culture of mobility; whereas in, say, America, it is the idealized picture of a world open to talent and enterprise - a belief in fundamental social equality as the climate within which individual talents can determine social positions. Nevertheless, inspite of the basic differences in the underlying system of evaluation, it is impossible to identify a person's social status within the society by looking at him in the street unless there are common features by which we can easily identify the Brahmin, the African chief, the middle class person in Britain or in America, and so on. It may be the way such persons dress or speak; the way they

live: special houses, special possessions, the use of some equipment; and above all, perhaps the way they regard themselves and as others react to them. In short, the attitudes and behaviours of people are very important indices by which the distant observer can recognise other people's social grading. In recent years, people's attitudes: especially derived from the way they grade themselves (i.e. subjective grading), and their behaviours: what they do in order to be identified with certain social status have been used as the basis for (social) theorising about status identification, status maintenance and status enhancement. Debates on these related issues have led to significant academic contributions to social mobility and the embourgeoisement of the working class.

Research and the debates have focussed on whether or not one's social status - whether accorded, ascribed or subjectively determined, can be improved, maintained or worsened by means other than the advantage of birth or the inheritance of wealth. Marshall's answer is 'yes', although he points out that the means and routes through which it can be achieved have been varied on one hand, and have been the subjects of protracted controversy, on the other hand. Social mobility is a term which has been used to refer to the movement of individuals from one social position to another, such movement being linked with and therefore only meaningful by reference to the prevailing system of social satisfaction. Mobility can be horizontal where an individual moves within his own social class, or vertical where he has moved from

90. Thompsson and Tunstall, Sociological Perspectives, p. 292-293.
a working class to a middle class position. So, while social mobility may be inter-group and intra-group, it can also be inter-generational and intra-generational; as it can be upwards, downwards or static (maintained). It is usually assessed in relation to occupational categories, partly because occupation tends to be closely correlated with income, consumption patterns, educational achievement and styles of life which are important determinants of social ranking; or partly because occupation provides a good means of social ranking (in terms of socio-economic groupings) and an objective index for research into social stratification. In some societies too, intra and inter social class marriage provide one valuable means of climbing the social ladder, although in the present day, for most societies, wealth and material possessions and education remain significant routes to enhancing one's social status. Education has been recognised as having increased its importance in social mobility such that Turner, in his comparison between the American and British societies, has distinguished between 'contest' mobility and 'sponsored' mobility to reflect on the effect that different emphasis in the education system can have on mobility in each of the two societies. American education reflects the norms of 'contest' mobility: a system in which elite status in the prize in an open contest based on the aspirants' own talents and efforts; whereas British education reflects the norms of 'sponsored' mobility: in which elites are recruited by other established elites or their agents who accord elite position on the basis of some educational criterion, e.g. certification after prescribed examinations.

---

91. Ralph Turner, Sociological Perspectives, p. 316.
While many have moved from one social position to another by better education, wealth and material possessions, or by better occupation, others have moved in a different direction, namely adopting styles of life, behaviour patterns and other identifications and imagery which put them into a social circle within which they can by subjective assessment and by the evaluation of others, be identified as people of higher social standing. To take this route is to recognise that enhanced social status comes by the improvement of one's general respectability. Correct attitude, behaviour, manners, right accent and adoption of the prevailing ethos must be the aspirant's stocks-in-trade. In other words, adopting the appropriate style of life might win the respect of others already in the circle. This thinking, fundamental as it is, does not always consider whether adopting the appropriate style of life washes one clean of his dirt from the group lower down; nor does it consider that the new style of life does not necessarily automatically change the attitude of the reference group into one of absolute acceptance of the self-recruit into the fold. However, the strength of the tendency towards enhancing social status by way of adopting the appropriate style of life has been persuasively argued by Goldthorpe and his associates in their thesis on the "embourgeoisement of the working class", and demonstrated by both the study of the affluent worker's industrial attitude and behaviour; and in the study on the changing voting behaviour of the working class (e.g. working class conservatism). 92

The study on the sociology of the affluent worker by Goldthorpe and his associates was directed at testing empirically the widely accepted thesis of 'working class embourgeoisement': the thesis that, as manual workers and their families achieve relatively high incomes and living standards, they assume a way of life which is more characteristically 'middle class' and become in fact progressively assimilated into middle class society. 93

This thesis is the product of a debate on the working class which has its origins in the work of Karl Marx and Engels. Given Marx's prediction of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism as a result of working class evolution; and given Engel's recognition of the British worker's craving for 'respectability' and 'enhanced social status' which lead (him) to "a willingness, indeed eagerness, to accept burgeoise social values, life styles and political ideas", 94 the authors of the study directed their attention to demonstrating (empirically) the versions of working class embourgeoisement thesis in the several contexts of work, sociability, social aspirations and imagery and so on, by examining their industrial attitudes and behaviours as reflected specifically in adopted styles of life. The significant conclusion reached by this study is the confirmation that the desire for respectability - an aspiration outside work, determined the social, economic and political attitudes to work to their mates and their employers; in terms of their social relationships and family life, and in terms of their voting behaviour. Particularly on the last point (voting

behaviour) at the inquest on the 1959 election, many academic commentators including David Butler, Richard Rose, Mark Abrams and S.M. Lipset, saw a connection between working class affluence, the spread of a middle class outlook and the drift of support from the Labour Party. Additionally, there have been studies which, indeed, confirm the fact that a large section of the working class in Britain are moving towards new middle class values and middle class existence. 95 They do so by adopting middle class values, middle class styles of life: house ownership, car ownership, pattern of consumption, the use of leisure and holidays, child-rearing patterns, and educational/occupational choice, and so on.

In this study, on migration to new towns, I have tried to show that there is, at present, another route by which the working class people seek to improve their social grading: this is by residential location in a desirable environment usually associated with the middle class. I have also tried to indicate that those middle class people who change residential location ensure that they move into a similar environment which fits into their already acquired social status. That this choice of residential location is a social value to which our respondents were aspiring to attain or maintain has been demonstrated by the reasons given for moving or staying behind, by the frame of reference for the decision taken and by the cost-benefit analysis which preceded those decisions.

5.4 Conclusions

This study originally set out to test (empirically) the hypothesis that: "the decision to move or to stay behind is fundamentally an instrument for the achievement of non-work aspirations of migrant workers". Those aspirations have been shown to be the concern for the family, environmental quality, housing, community association and ties and occupational progression. Except for the last, the other major aspirations are certainly needs that were totally unconnected with work environment. It can therefore, be claimed that the hypothesis has been reasonably (successfully) tested. It seems clearly apparent from this study that the craving for the quality of the environment is increasingly becoming a social value to which many working class people aspire as a means of improving their social status. On the other hand, the social investments of the new town and the expected quality of social relationships that migrants can develop, must, for a long time remain major constraining influences on the decision of inner city residents to move to live there. It follows that planners and sociologists must of necessity find out and take into account what men want, learn about how they respond to different kinds of housing, neighbourhood and total environment, the values they attach to the contents and quality of their community - physical and social: and then reflect these needs and aspirations when building new communities. No doubt, as sociologists and planners ponder about how to build new and meaningful human habitats (call it 'community' or 'new town'), the question they must direct attention to is whether (given the nature of the particular society's system of social grading) the final product ought to be "a melting-pot community" or "a human habitat which provides for different kinds of persons" within the society.
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Chapter 6

THEORETICAL ISSUES RAISED BY PLANNED MIGRATION

6.1 The Environment: a Sociological Concept

To the physical Scientist, the environment is purely an objective reality separate from human beings: a kind of physical world of its own which we cannot experience. But to the Social Scientist, especially one who is primarily concerned with human society, social interactions and the web of inter-relationships, the environment must refer to the social space and the entire surroundings: the totality of the physical and the social habitat within which man lives and works, and to which he reacts and attaches meaning. Within this space, a complexity of social processes take place. In it, man constructs his world and its social realities; he locates his entire heritage and all the properties of his life coloured and interpreted by his experiences. The environment can, therefore, be said to be an integral part of the social structure. It is kept alive by networks of human relations, social conventions and institutions; and it generates in its occupants a structural sense of 'place', 'belonging' and 'community': a sense of attachment that can only be a function of his socio-spatial interaction.
In the experiences of the social being, the environment must be a complex totality of many aspects, sometimes physically defined; and at other times only viewed in terms of on-going social relationships. In this regard, aspects of the environment must include the streets and the houses in which we live, the churches and the schools as social institutions, the shops and the hospitals. It will also include the farms and the fields, the hills, the rivers and the bridges, the social and recreational facilities, the cinemas and the theatres, the museums and the parliament. Within the community and the neighbourhood, the corner shop and the local market, the parks and the jubilees, the pubs and the libraries: each of this gives character and meaning to the total surroundings. They generate both physical and emotional attachments in residents, in the same way that the London Palladium and the Royal Albert Hall, Westminster Abbey and the Winchester Cathedral give Britons a sense of national pride and represent aspects of their social heritage symbolically expressed. It is therefore, not possible to separate the physical from the social aspects of the environment. Both are blended in every concrete reality. The Church, for example, is revealed in an edifice; the Parliament and the Town Hall are both symbols of government and power politics; social relations and networks are expressed in social groups involved in all sorts of social activities and processes; literature and arts are expressed in a variety of ways displayed in galleries, libraries and museums; beliefs, value and life styles find expression in social and cultural habits, in the choice of housing and residential neighbourhood, and in patterns of consumption. Thus, the physical is at the same time
the symbol of the social and the environment is characteristically charged with human memories, human traditions, and human values, often expressed in concrete and symbolic forms.

The basic concept of the environment just outlined has been adequately reflected in two most recent publications. Peter Cowan and his associates emphasize that: "the environment means more than hedgerows, road or bricks and mortar; (that) it means more than pollution ..... (and that) it means a whole nexus in which life is lived ........ It must included people's expectations, their hopes and their aspirations". 96 Professor Thomas Blair, in his specific reference to the urban environment describes it as: "a total area, its peoples and life styles, its social and spatial systems, land uses, activities and linkages". 97 Indeed, the growing concern over the quality of the environment, especially in the more technologically advanced parts of the world, is both recognition of the influence of the environment on life expectancy and a demonstration that the contents of our physical surroundings are a vital component of the human habitat. In America, for example, environmentalists have become one of the main lobbies in national politics. They now exercise the combined functions of a number of earlier movements which operated as separate bodies. One of these was the conservation movement, originally a 19th century protest movement against the degradation of natural environments; and the other was the public health movement.

originally concerned with the philosophy of nuisance abatement in industrial cities, which later widened its concepts of health to include concern with the complex relationship between physical and mental well-being and the environment. In Britain, the Countryside Commission is similarly functionally concerned with preservation and conservation of the natural environment.

All over the industrialised parts of the world, there are growing and sustained protests against air, water and land pollution; against noise from factories, motor vehicles and from supersonic aircrafts. There is a growing anxiety to preserve the green belts and historic buildings. These protests simply confirm that our surroundings are not only parts of our heritage, but they are also vital aspects of the total environment to which we attach meaning and react. In terms of content, any classification that is sufficiently balanced to reflect the broader concept outlined above, must first demonstrate the inter-dependence between the social and the physical aspects of the environment. Bernard's classification (See Fig. 10, p. 249) partially satisfied this basic characteristic. He was, however, much more interested to demonstrate the physical aspect of the environment, and whilst showing that there is also a social aspect, nevertheless, he said very little about it. Although it is important to emphasize that the environment is composed of the physical and the social aspects, it is relatively much more important to demonstrate that the environment is something that men attach meaning

**Fig. 10**

**QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE**

**THE TOTAL ENVIRONMENT**

**Physical Aspects**
- Unmodified by man
- Climatic and cosmic conditions
- Uncultivated land as a complex of physico-chemical and biological elements: the sea

**Modified by man**
- Physico-chemical
- Organic
  - Domesticated animals and plants.
  - The equilibrium of life as changed by man.

**Social Aspects**
- Structural
- Communal
  - All standardized forms of social relationship.
  - Folkways, institutions.
  - Groups, communities
  - Inherited lores.
  - (The social heritage)

**Impressed on original environment**
- Cultivated land.
- Routes of communication and transportation

**Detached from original environment**
- Concrete instruments
  - Tools and mechanisms,
  - buildings, etc.

**Symbolic or representative forms, speech symbols, records, art forms**

---

**SOURCE:** 'A Classification of Environments' by L.L. Bernard, in "American Journal of Sociology XXXI" (1925) pp. 318-332.
and react to. It is only in this way that the sociological concept of the environment becomes relevant to the analyses of this study. Apart from the classification of the environment based on content, at an entirely different level, other classifications have been made based on stages of industrial development, prevalent life styles, and the degree of sophistication of existing social investments. Based on this second level of classification, 'urban environment' and 'suburban environment' have been distinguished for purposes of comparison between the inner city area and the new town surrounding.

A sociological concept of the environment must look beyond the relatively simplistic and emotive concern for the quality of the physical surroundings. It should probe into the realm of the philosophy of space, to examine how space takes on meaning for its occupants. This meaning should be established in terms of the significant relationship between the individual and 'things' around on one hand; and the relationship between himself and his connections with people, on the other hand. Approached in this way, social space becomes a combination of physical things, the complexity of individual feelings and images developed in the normal courses of social processes and of reactions towards spatial symbolisms which surround people in society. Thus, the meaning attached to social

99. Social Investments - I have used this expression to describe the supply of social amenities and facilities in an urban environment, such as: Hospitals, Transport, Shops, Social and Welfare amenities, Entertainment (Cinemas, Theatres, etc.) Recreation and Sports, and Libraries, Arts, Museums and Social Clubs, etc.

100. David Harvey, Social Justice and the City (London: Edward Arnold, 1973), p. 34.
space reflect the value placed on its physical contents, its culture, the existing social order, and the aspirations, need and fears of its occupants. Although it could be said that man creates his own environment, it is also true that over time he becomes biologically parasitic on and less fitted to live without his own environment. This interdependence between man and his environment indicates that any behaviour environmentally determined can be explained by reference to stimulus-response process. The relationship is also fundamental to the development of that sense of place and spatial attachment which constrain the individual's capacity to uproot from one environment and to adapt into another. The nature of that inter-dependence of the individual with his environment and of the work organisation with its own environment was explained in Chapter 4 when the individual and the firm were both likened to an organism. In this analogy the protoplasm on which the organism depends for survival is likened to the physical and social environment within which the individual lives (See. Fig. 11). Both the individual person and (say) the factory in which he works have the need for survival as an ultimate goal. Consequently, they share the common problem of effective interaction with and adaptation into their environment, without which the fundamental need will be unattainable. Suppose, for example, the protoplasm of the Amoeba is removed, the organism soon dies from lack of support from its environment. And, if fish is pulled out from water (its natural environment), it also dies unless it is quickly put back. Similarly, under a change in the climatic temperature of the environment, trees shed their leaves to avoid loss of heat and moisture; and birds migrate to other environments more conducive to continued existence. In each case, a change of the
FIG. 11

THE NATURE OF HUMAN (TOTAL) ENVIRONMENT BASED ON ORGANIC CONCEPT

Fig. 11(a)
The Amoeba:

A living Organism surrounded by its protoplasm - the organismic environment.

The Nucleus
The nucleus of Organism
The Protoplasm (The Organism's Environment)

Fig. 11(b)
The Individual as Organism surrounded by his human environment

The Individual as Organism
The Individual's total Environment (i.e., the Organism's protoplasm)
environment invariably generates an adaptive response from the organism manifested by sudden death in the case of the lower organism less adaptive to changes; or the adaptation into a new environment of certain organisms through structural specialisation, modification and evolution. Extending the analogy to human beings, I have demonstrated through the Socio-Spatial Interaction Model, that migration decision-making is a form of adaptive response to a change of environment. Human beings are distinguished from other types of organisms by the fact of their capacity to adapt to environmental changes through the exercise of choice between known alternatives. Therefore, when human beings are forced or induced to abandon their familiar environment, they respond to this change in two major ways: they resist homeostatically the threat to their stability and survival posed by the disturbance of the interaction with their environment; and, in order to survive, they respond to the change by trying to adapt into a new (but similar) environment.

An outstanding weakness in the study of the environment is the problem of a lack of rigorous definition based on which its dynamics can be subjected to critical analysis. There is hardly any one study, which seriously attempted to provide a definition of the environment based on a clear concept. There are, of course, obvious problems in trying to do this. First, the all-inclusive nature of the notion of the environment is a problem in itself. The environment may be compared to what Americans call the "motherhood issue": something everybody claims to know; something nobody is against; and yet something nobody could neither define nor could properly actually
understand. Too often, the environments are said to refer to the immediate physical space; at times, it is synonymous with influence or a situation conducive to achieving a given goal. For example, a strategist often refers to creating an environment in which to achieve an objective. In many cases, the environment is used very loosely to mean anything around us: the temperature and the air we breath; the natural scenery around; or the wild life. In this confusion, the invaluable analytical concept is totally missing. Second, many, if not all, organisation theorists write and comment on the environment with a great deal of assumption. In particular, protagonists of the open system theory, whilst emphasizing that organisations, like organisms, have needs of stability, survival and adaptation into their environment, they tend to leave the environment to be defined by the reader. A.K. Rice, for example in his invaluable study of the enterprise and its environment came very close to providing a working definition. Based on the hypothesis that the enterprise must be related to its physical and social environment if it must survive, Rice developed the 'Import-Conversion-Export' model to illustrate organisational dependence on its environment. 101 However, in explaining the components of that environment he said: "For an enterprise the environment consists of its total political, social and economic surroundings; for a part of an enterprise the environment includes the other parts and the whole". In this statement, the physical aspect of the environment is clearly not considered an essential component. Instead, the emphasis seems to be actually placed on factor influences. The basic concept of the

environment on which the definition should be based, does not seem to have been reflected in the statement. It is my view that any definition of the environment must essentially derive from the hypothesis that the environment is the social and physical space within which life is lived and to which man reacts and attaches meaning. To understand its components and to explore its dynamics, especially in so far as they determine human behaviour, the functional interaction of man with his entire surroundings (social and physical) should provide the necessary guide.

6.2 Environmental Determinism

Can the environment determine human behaviour in the comparable sense that our motives (and goals) can direct us to behave in some ways? In order to give a balanced answer to this question, we must:

a) examine the stimulus properties of the environment and determine how man responds to them (stimulus-response action).

b) examine the various ways by which man makes and changes his own environment and how these changes affect his behaviour.

c) examine evidence from studies on the environment to see if there is a case for and against environmental determinism.

Human response to the stimulus properties of the environment, has been adequately described by Rene Dubos. He observed that in obscure ways, human life converts the physio-chemical processes of
biological existence into actions, representations and aspirations which pose to the science of \$A\$ problems not found in the same degree in the study of other living organisms. Mechanical stresses, irritating materials, radiations and temperature act directly on human fabric; just as the daily, lunar and seasonal periods transmit to humans the distant effects of the cosmic and solar forces. Other direct physical stimuli that affect the physico-chemical nature of man derive from geographical hazards of the earthquake, hurricane, tornado, lightning, fire, floods. Add to this list, the artificial stimuli - the irritants in the air and water; the rising noise levels and the congestions of the urban environment - all this, lead to stressful over-stimulation. Yet, where they are absent, there is a duldrum, monotony and under-stimulation. Each situation has its effects on human beings in terms of the possible induced response. It may be an avoidance behaviour or a sensory deprivation which leads to maladaptive behaviour. An example of avoidance behaviour is provided by Wolpert's study of migration decision which he described as an adjustment to environmental stress. That is to say, as urban residents experience a great deal of stressful elements in their environment, they avoid the situation by escaping (migrating) to a more favourable environment. I have argued earlier, on the other hand, that maladaptive behaviours such as vandalism, withdrawal (new town blues), are partly responses to environmental under-stimulation. Environmental under-stimulation also provides an example of the way in which factors in the environment indirectly affect human behaviour. I have demonstrated earlier that migration decision itself is an adaptive response to a change of the environment. This proposition is itself demonstrated empirically by the migration decisions of
Movers and Non-movers alike. While Non-movers feared that lack of facilities and amenities in new towns may under-stimulate them, Movers were actually (partly) motivated by the clean, fresh and respectable features of the new town environment.

The chain of indirect responses indicated shows the importance of man's propensity to symbolize everything that happens to him and then to react to the symbols as if they were actual environmental stimuli. As Dubos remarked .... "all the perceptions and interpretations of the mind become translated into organic processes. For this reason, the actual effects that the environment exerts on man commonly bear little if any resemblance to the direct effects that could have been expected from the physico-chemical nature of the stimulus. The body machine reacts not only to the stimulus itself but also to all the symbols associated with the experiences of the past and the expectations of the future, symbols which are converted into effective stimuli by particular events". 103 Every day we witness man's ability to create a physical environment and to develop communities within which he can express his needs of association and ordinary living. In this creative action, we also watch the natural environment defaced and often destroyed; and interactions and social relationships often grow complex, impersonal and meaningless. As these things happen, we congratulate ourselves for the social progress we attain and protest at the speed with which our environment is changing. We admire the architectural and aesthetic beauty of the surroundings and debate the issue of how our behaviour is changed by

103. Dubos, Man Adapting, p. 5-7.
the designs. There is no doubt that town planners, architects and
designers have tended to be social idealists who, led by utopian
thinking and the zeal to transform society, have envisaged the
creation of ideal communities in which people can live the good life.
They believe that such desirable social aims can be secured by the
effective design of the physical environment. This orientation
developed into strong sense of architectural determinism — the
simplest idea that a good physical environment will necessarily
produce the good life. In other words, the beautification of the
physical environment by application of the most up-to-date archi-
tectural and design techniques will generate the good life, including
the most desirable behaviour.

The essential feature of the philosophy that underlines archi-
tectural determinism is the implicit belief in the use of design in
the achievement of rather generalised and multiple social goals.
Nonetheless, the pursuit of such aim has achieved its own success
especially the unique knowledge of cultural preservation and enrich-
ment. Indeed, the designer has been challenged to create a design
that fulfills specific functions, whilst at the same time using his
talents to represent symbolically some deeper (e.g. social and
cultural) meanings in building and other spatial arrangements. The
studies considered below contain evidence that demonstrate the power
of architectural design to influence behaviour. The conclusions that
the studies reach pose more questions than they have answered. It
is, for example, now doubtful whether the purpose of a building still
remains that of giving us shelter against the weather, protecting us
against enemies and dangers, and shielding us from the terrors that dwell in the anonymous darkness and distance beyond. Parly because as a professional, the architect designer is increasingly concerning himself with functionalism (based on the belief that 'form follows function') and with expressionism (a demonstration of aesthetism, controlled and sanctioned by politicians and administrators), the power to shape the physical surroundings has continued to be concentrated in the hands of small (professional) minority - the architect-designers. The way they alter the environment and affect the behaviour of men within it can be compared with the way the professional advertiser introduces a new product, sells it, popularises it and induces consumers to want to buy more of it. This analogy is reflected by A.E. Parr when he said that: "to calm our fears and make us feel secure in our surroundings is no longer the purpose of architecture. The proper aim (now) is to glorify and thereby reinforce our anxieties, instead of trying to ease our tension by the design of our millieu." 104

However, the designer has a problem. Having traditionally functioned in an artistic framework, the environmental designer finds himself generally operating outside the social and behavioural scientific community; and consequently, his knowledge of the techniques of objective analysis and the organisation of human systems is understandably minimal. Yet, he has to make design decisions involving people and their behaviour; he needs to communicate with people to

understand their needs and requirements. In most cases he relies on his professionalism as a designer to make decisions that turn out to be inappropriate, clumsy and irrelevant but which are accepted, nonetheless. A simple example of the consequences of this kind of imposed design solution comes from the attitude of migrant workers to some of the houses allocated to them in a new town. There was a general criticism of the way the houses are clustered and arranged like 'barracks' (in their description); in the shape of the houses which make them look like 'square boxes'; and in their general 'monotonous look'. There were other general criticisms about the size of the kitchens and the apparent lack of privacy that the positioning of doors and staircases brought in their trail. It is true that to accommodate all and relevant human needs in the designing of houses for various people from various social backgrounds would be a most difficult task. But the crucial point here remains that the designer's expertise and aesthetism took precedence over the needs of householders; a point which underlines the seriousness of the critical comments about the shape, size and arrangement of the houses. Does the response of householders indicate that architectural designs determine and generate behaviour? Does the existing arrangement of buildings and spaces make some forms of human activity and movement more difficult or even impossible while encouraging others? Can we conclude from the response of householders that on a large scale and if so desired, design can be an instrument of change in a particular direction which produces profound effects on human behaviour?
"We shape our buildings, and afterwards our buildings shape us." 105. This statement, made by Winston Churchill on the occasion of the re-opening of Parliament (House of Commons) after its wartime damage, sums up the conclusions of many studies on architectural determinism. A study of army barracks by Robert Blake and his associates, 106 showed that the installation of partitions at regular intervals within barracks influenced the formation of strong friendship groups within the areas bound by the partitions whilst at the same time it lessened the formation of social relationships over a wider area. Robert Sommer 107 has reported similar studies on school libraries, cafeterias and residences with similar results. Apparently, the most significant of the studies carried out by Massachusetts Institute of Technology dealt with the extent to which environmental factors (in this case, prefabricated homes for veterans of the Second World War) influenced the friendship patterns and opinions of the residents of these homes located in two areas - Westgate and Westgate West. Physical distance was clearly a factor that influenced friendship formation; and friendship patterns influenced the way opinions were moulded in the Westgate community. Further, it was later discovered that spatially determined friendship networks affected the consumer behaviour of those within the clique, especially in the installation of air conditioners in their apartments and in the purchase of major domestic appliances. Results of the M.I.T. study enabled the researchers to

---

105. William Michelson, Man and his urban environment, p. 168.
distinguish between physical and functional distance which determined friendship patterns and opinion-formation, respectively.

A more detailed illustration of the significance of functional distance to behaviour was pursued by a study of the friendship patterns of university students living in dormitories (University of Princeton)\(^{109}\). In four separate storey buildings in which students lived, the crucial element that contributed to functional distance was the positioning of the toilet facilities which were not decentralised throughout the building. The study concluded that in one dormitory, 70% of the friendship relationships were determined by architectural factors while the proportion rose to 76% in the second dormitory. Leo Kuper's survey of postwar housing outside Coventry gives yet another dimension to the M.I.T. studies. Kuper found that more intensive interaction between neighbours took place in cul-de-sacs than in long terraces of houses. In another study of post-war university community, Caplow and Forman\(^{110}\) (University of Minnesota), found that friendship formation was a function of the positioning of doors in a University village housing. Robert Merton's study in Craftown\(^{111}\) directs attention to intensive contact growing from proximity (between residents living across the street); and a review by Beshers\(^{112}\) confirms


\(^{111}\) Robert Merton, Crafton Study: Friendship Across the Street, see Michelson, p. 177.

the tendency for marriages to result from residential proximity. Indeed, studies about commuting patterns (cf. Ray Thomas), industrial movement from large conurbations (cf. Keeble and others), and topical issues about neighbourhood units and the provision of amenities, transport and accessibility, are partly but fundamentally based on the notion of functional distance.

There is, therefore, little doubt that both the physical stimulus of the (physical) environment and the architectural designs of the physical planner can and do influence human behaviour within the environment. The city planner does have the power to determine the nature and intensity of social interactions and lives. He can and does shape the length and shape of streets, city blocks, the size and arrangement of estates and can decide the distribution and location pattern of people's residence. But what he cannot do is also to determine the nature and the quality of those interactions - a matter which belongs to attitudes, values, emotions and the perceptions of people of different social and cultural backgrounds.

A case for environmental determinism exists, but only if a number of conditions are observed. Under what conditions does environmental determinism become apparent? Considering friendship patterns which have been the subject of many studies; it is immediately recognised that the people studied were homogenous groups: Veterans in barracks, students of Westgate and University Village (Minnesota), the working class people badly in need of housing in Kuper's study. Those who developed intensive contacts or finally got married as a result of their residential proximity are more likely to be people who have certain
things in common: may be social class, life style, life cycle etc. Particularly, in the case of veterans, there was the added extraneous circumstances of having returned after years of absence in combat. More than any other social group, they needed the association of others. Further, whether it is the university community, the tenants of council estates, or veterans of the second world war in fabricated homes, homogeneity was an important element by their circumstance, as residents and in terms of the results intended to be achieved for them as groups. It is also important to take into account the element of personal contact from personality and the intensity of such contact. Where people are naturally friendly, personal contacts are likely to grow deeper, more intensive and enduring. The intensive personal relationships of Bethnal Greeners in the East End of London underlines both the influence of homogeneity and the relatively more important factor of the quality of interaction than the effect of architectural designs. Homogeneity is not only limited to common social grading; it extends into common style of life, common belief and value and common perception and attitudes. I have demonstrated earlier that attachment to a familiar environment is, for Non-movers, the product of their bio-psychological perception; and that for Movers the choice of residential location within an environment that raised their social status, was vital.

Towards a theory of the environment

People relate to an environment both mentally (the mental map) and experientially. The mental perception of the environment exists if an individual thinks that a particular environment fits into his personal characteristics, values, styles of life and aspirations.
Thus, if by moving into an area generally regarded as socially desirable (by physical appearance of the area and by the quality and type of social interaction) one is seen to have been socially upgraded, then such a perception is by itself an example of the enabling power of that environment. This will be the direct effect of an experiential congruence between the location and a social status. Similarly, if people believe that families can best be raised in a suburban environment, the state of mental congruence between 'familism' and 'suburbanism' transforms the environment into a social fact.113

Research in the United States of America based on 'Social Area Analysis 114 has been utilised to illuminate the theory of mental perception of a neighbourhood. By isolating social rank, segregation and urbanisation, and relating them analytically to census data, Social Area Analysis has promoted a greater understanding of what and why different social variables cluster in space. For example, it explains substantially those processes in the city that lead to residential and social segregations and to the development of ghettos - ethnic, religious, social class, and the professions, etc. Following this, Johassen115, in his study of migration from one part of New York City to another by Norwegian Americans, showed that the original choice of Brooklyn by these people was consistent with their nautical background. The choice of an environment tells its own story and conveys its meaning - stories and meanings which confirm


that the environment is a social fact. Evidence from environmental
determinism; evidence from the general social concern about human
environment and the growing number of pressure groups that lobby for
the preservation, conservation and beautification of our environ-
ment; and the evidence of the increasing tendency for many people
"fleeing the cities and retreating into the suburbs": these are
indications that the concept of environment is likely to attract
the attention of planners & sociologist in the future and that
concern for environmental quality will tend to increasingly
become a social value to which many will aspire. Within the context of this broad concept, any theory of the environ-
ment must both bridge the gap between the notions of the social and
behavioural scientists, architects and designers and planners, and reflect a broad generalisation. Geography has long dealt with
the stimulus properties of the environment, producing a generality
vision perhaps at the expense of precision and insight. Psychology
has tended to ignore the physical environment, although it has studied
intensively the perception and symbolisation of discrete stimulus
often with precision of insight obtained at the expense of general-
isability of results from controlled laboratory experiments. Yet
it seems that a successful study relating men's behaviour to their
environment can, indeed, emerge. However, the influence on behaviour
pattern from architecture and design cannot be denied even if we make
allowances for certain caveats. The process of bridge-building,
therefore, calls for an amalgamation of the contributions made by
these various elements, and especially injecting some intellectual
content into making the behavioural sciences and the architect planner
relate adequately to human needs in the process of creating the ideal
human environment.
The central task of the social and behavioural sciences in the study of the environment is, therefore, to relate the stimulus properties of the (physical) environment to their symbolic human manifestations, and in turn to define the stimulus properties of the symbolic environment that men create. In other words, the study of the environment must take into account elements in the two aspects of the environment: the physical and the social. It must examine the various instances in which the physical environment is both a dependent and an independent variable, as well as the cases in which man in his environment can be both a dependent and an independent variable. In explaining the way the environment determines human behaviour and vice versa, there must be a two-way causation. Michelson 116 has reflected this view by using what he calls the Intersystem Congruence Model drawing on the analysis made by Raymond Studer. 117 I have myself used a model which demonstrates the contributions of the two sides of the environment to explain the point that human interaction with and interdependence on his environment explains environmental determinism. That model is the Socio-spatial Interaction Model. Essentially, the environment must be seen as human habitat to which human beings react and attach meaning.


6.3 Organisational Analysis: Systems Theory applied to Industrial Relocation

1. Managerial Behaviour in Relocation

An important advantage in the study of industrial relocation is the opportunity it offers to the industrial sociologist to monitor organisational behaviour. It enables him not only to record the processes, the reactions and responses of those who work and act on behalf of the organisation, but also to offer more empirically-based explanation to observed reactions. It has been possible to contribute to the study of organisational behaviour by applying theories of organisational analysis to industrial relocation.

A more recent approach in the study of organisation behaviour adopts the systems model which looks at the organisation as a social system. The assumption is that the organisation is composed of a set of inter-dependent parts; that it has needs for survival; and that it behaves and takes actions through its management. A systems approach therefore, emphasizes two things. First, functionalism, which stresses the similarity between a biological and a social structure; and second, a general systems theory which emphasize the similarities of processes occurring within the various parts of the whole. Functionalism implies that social system are in much the same way as organisms because they have needs of survival and adaptation to their environment which they satisfy by means of a particular pattern of inter-dependence between their parts.
A system approach therefore regards the object of study in organisational behaviour and analysis as that of analysing how an on-going system of parts functions in order to persist and to maintain its stability. As Talcott Parsons points out, for an organisation to survive, it must cope with four functional problems of adaptation, goal-attainment, integration and tension-management (pattern maintenance).118 This implies attributing actions to the organisation. It is logical to infer that since such organisations have needs to satisfy, they must take the necessary actions to realise the needs. Management personifies the organisation and therefore acts on its behalf especially in taking strategic decisions.

The decision to relocate a firm is a perfect example of the kind of strategic decisions taken by an organisation through its management. When, therefore, Lawrence Haworth119 discusses whether organisations do act, he was not doubting that organisations can act; he was, rather concerned with explaining the mechanics by which organisational behaviour takes place. In Chapter 3, the actions of the migrant firms, in making relocation happen, have been described as aspects of managerial behaviour. In all migrant firms, managerial behaviour, for all intents and purposes, followed the same pattern. Having taken the strategic decision to move the firm, management was in each case committed to managing the transition until the firm settles into its new environment. Management planned, controlled

118. Chandler Morse, "Functional Imperatives" in The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons, ed. Max Black, especially p. 113-52.
and directed all activities and operations that were necessary. They contained all tensions, anxieties and the disorganisation that were inevitably generated by the processes of change. They kept the various parts of the organisation together and maintained the necessary patterns of relationships within the organisation. The main concern was to maintain the quasi-equilibrium position of the organisation as it passed through a state of temporary inertia and instability until it returned to a state of complete stability. Each of the Parsonian imperatives was a challenge to the management's overall responsibility to ensure the persistence of the organisation at the end of relocation. On the basis of the general management ideology about the nature and the needs of the working man, each firm took steps to prepare and condition its workers to accommodate the change and to make the move. And through the familiarisation processes, the firms also prepared their workers for adaptation, adjustment and assimilation into the new environment. The validity of management ideology and the effectiveness of the management orientation stimuli are judged by the extent to which they succeeded in shaping and changing attitudes to moving. Managerial behaviour in relocation can be seen to have been directed towards the overall goal of the organisation's persistence through the specific routes of coping with Parson's four functional problems.
6.4 Workers' Motivation and Frame of Reference in Migration Decisions

Except when we act under emotion, it is believed that our behaviour is generally determined by motive. Maslow's theory of motivation directs attention to four dimensions of human needs: psychological and safety needs, social and ego needs. But organisational behaviour can also be either the result of promoting efficiency (cf. Weber's study of bureaucracy); or as the means of protecting one's or group interest (cf. Sayles and his study of wild cat strikes).

A particular relevant source from which the behaviour of the migrant workers can be explained derives from the thesis of March and Simon. In their explanation of organisational behaviour, they put out three grouped propositions as follows:

1. That organisation members, particularly employees, are primarily passive instruments, capable of performing work and accepting directions, but not initiating action or exerting influence in any significant way.

2. That members bring to their organisations, attitudes, values and goals; that they have to be motivated or induced to participate in the system of organisation behaviour; that there is incomplete parallelism between their personal goals and the organisation goals; and that the actual or potential goal conflicts make power phenomena, attitudes, and morale centrally important in the explanation of organisational behaviour.
3. That organisation members are decision-makers and problem solvers, and that the perception and thought processes are central to the explanation of behaviour in organisations.¹²⁰

They were taking the viewpoint of social psychologists (which they are) and directing their attention to the assessment of "the influences that impinge upon the individual human being from his environment and how he responds to these influences", in an organisation. The significance of the propositions can now be evaluated by the development in industrial sociological studies to which they have given rise in the present days. It is particularly important to refer to the work of Goldthorpe and his associates which is fundamentally an empirical verification of proposition 2 and through which the foundation of non-work Sociology has been firmly established. The theoretical value of Goldthorpe's study lies in its specific application of the unit action theory; i.e. a demonstration that the action frame of reference can be the basis for the explanation of behaviour and social relationships within a work organisation. Based on the action frame of reference which, in particular, directs attention to the variety of meanings which work may have for industrial employees, Goldthorpe and his associates sought to establish (and indeed, established) empirically that:

¹²⁰. March and Simon, Organisations, p. 6.
a) the wants and expectations which men bring to their employment and the interpretation which they thus give to their work, shape the attitudinal and behavioural patterns of their working lives as a whole.

b) the values and motivations that lead workers to the view of work they have adopted must be traced back, so far as this is possible, to typical life situations and experiences.

c) that in modern 'mass' society, the enterprise is often not an organisation of any normative influence in the lives of its manual labour force; and consequently, that the attitudes and behaviour of industrial workers can better be understood when related to the roles they occupy and the goals they pursue in the wider society than when related to their tasks and roles as employees.

These conclusions mean more than a simple empirical verification of social psychological-based proposition. The authors, among other things, maintain that the assumption of the Human Relations School (influenced very much by Elton Mayo) of the social man is less fundamental (though important) to the notion of the orientation that the worker brings to work, because it is the later that actually determines attitude, behaviour and patterns of relationship inside and outside the work organisation. Relationships in the enterprise refer to those with mates, supervisors and managers; relationships based on their image of the enterprise and relationships arising from their trade union involvement and activities and the way they plan their future family and community lives. In other words, an understanding and explanation of behaviour, attitudes and social relation-
ships of workers in an organisation does require an ultimate reference to the structure and processes as well as the social values of the wider society within which the enterprise operates. Putting it yet in simpler terms, behaviour and attitudes within an organisation must be socially generated and so socially sustained. In one more important respect, the study of the attitudes and behaviour of affluent workers, highlights the validity and empirically establishes the proposition that the goals of the individuals and those of the organisation in the final analysis must necessarily diverge. As a parallel, the attitudes and behaviour of our sample of migrant workers have been shown to be a function of the needs and aspirations which they pursue but which, nevertheless, are not directly related to the roles they occupy and the tasks they perform in the migrant firm. Instead, they are needs and aspirations, the satisfaction of which would have conferred on them improved social respect and regard, i.e. the satisfaction of the social need for self-esteem.

6.5 Community and Urban Theory - The Relevance to planned migration

By moving to a new town the migrant certainly carries with him much of the old habits, style of life, attitudes, traditions and values. But how much of these will depend upon his age, sex, ethnic and social background, occupation, experience and personality, and, perhaps, the special circumstances of the move. How much of the city culture does the (city) migrant take with him as an invisible export to the new town? Can we rightly talk about "the new town culture"? If we can, what exactly is it and where does it come from? Can it be the urban culture of the city; or could the new town culture have developed rather from the interactions and social
relations of the residents of a new town over a period of time? These questions can only assume their right meaning when they are discussed against the background of a clear understanding of the concept of 'community' and 'urbanism'; when migration decision is related to community attachment and urban networks and associations; and when the pattern of social interactions and relationships in the new town can be traced back to a similar pattern in the city from where migrants moved. In short, cultural and other connections between the (inner) city and the new town ought to be established.

1. The Concepts of 'community' and 'urbanism'

Colin Bell and Howard Newby have given a very stimulating review of the literature on both the concept of community and community study as a research method.¹²¹

In this review, Bell and Newby provide a valuable summary of the protracted debate by sociologists on what makes a community, the various types of community, theories of the community and how best a community could and should be studied. From the very many contributions to the debate, community appears to consist of a number of 'common' elements among which are: a territorial area, a complexity of institutions within an area, a sense of belonging, an organisation of human aggregates with shared perspectives and culture, a set of social identifications and interactions, a place, a geographical entity of the local living and working people, and so on. What

then is the community: is it all these named elements; is it a combin-

ation of them; or is it just one all-embracing element?

George Hillery's ninety-four definitions of the community, though inconclusive, have provided a considerable amount of elements which other writers have mentioned as basic in the understanding of the concept of community. Hillery's definitions contain four elements, namely: Social Interaction in an area (mentioned in 55 definitions); presence of some common characteristics (mentioned in 21 definitions); Ecological: physical and place relationships (contained in 3 definitions) and Type of Community - e.g. Rural (Contained in 15 definitions). In other words the presence of a group of people interacting within an area, and having some common ties or bonds are necessary elements in community. Marvin Sussman, in his own definition has emphasized on these elements when he said: 'A community is said to exist when interaction between individuals has the purpose of meeting individual needs and obtaining group goals ... a limited geographical area is another feature of the community. The feature of social interactions, structures for the gratification of physical, social and psychological needs and limited geographical area are basic to the definition of community". Sussman's introduction of the achievement of individual and group goals as the source of interaction is not only difficult to establish but also suggests that community is comparable to an organisation deliberately brought into existence to satisfy certain needs such as organisation and individual goals. Unless one refers to the

new town as a purposely-built complete community pursuing the definite goal of developing into a balanced and self-contained community for work and living, other traditional and long-standing communities did not develop with given ends in view. However, Harold Kaufman's definition of the community\textsuperscript{124}, takes Sussman's emphasis further as he emphasized that community is a place, that it indicates a configuration as to way of life, both as to how people do things and what they want - that is, their institutions and their collective goals. Kaufman's interaction model of the community directs attention to three elements: community participant, community groups and associations and the phases and processes of community action. He argued that the processes were moving towards centralisation, specialisation and to increased impersonal relationships - developments which are hastening the decline of community.

The relative importance that sociologists attach to the element of interaction and social relations in the definition of the community has been consistently reflected in Hillery's definition; and in the work of Sutton and Kolaja and Talcott Parsons. Sutton and Kolaja refer to the community as: "a number of families residing in a relatively small area within which they have developed amore or less complete socio-cultural definition imbued with collective identification and by means which they solve problems arising from sharing an area";\textsuperscript{125} and Parsons calls the community: "a collectivity of actors sharing a limited territorial area as the base for carrying

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{124} Harold Kaufman, "Towards an Interactional Conception of Community", in \textit{Social Forces} 38 (1959).
\item \textsuperscript{125} W. Sutton and J. Kolaja, "The Concept of Community", in \textit{Rural Sociology}, 25 (1960).
\end{itemize}
out the greatest share of their daily activities". In both definitions, the interaction of people pursuing some ends within a given locality, appears to have received relatively more emphasis. Yet, there are many who would argue that interaction without a sense of belonging and a sense of place cannot constitute a sufficient element that creates a community. It seems, therefore, essential to bring into focus the contributions of ecologists.

Ecologists emphasize two main elements of community: the physical nature of the neighbourhoods in which the residents live; and the spatial consequences of social organisation. Using the biological analogy, the ecological approach relies on one of its major premises that there is continuity in the life patterns of all organic forms. As Hawley wrote: "the community has often been likened to an individual organism. So intimate and so necessary and the inter-relations of its parts e.g. families, associated corporate units; territorial corporate units, categoric units - age, sex, class; cliques, clubs, neighbourhood associations, etc ... that any influence felt at one point is almost immediately transmitted throughout. If not an organism, it is at least a super-organism". It would appear that Hawley was not only providing a sharp and accurate description of the spatial aspects of the community but also discussing the consequences of spatial structure on social processes and behaviour: when he remarked that: "the question of how men relate themselves to another in order to live in their habitat yields a description of community structure in terms of its overt and measurable features". Thus, ecologists

128. Ibid, p. 73.
have shown less interest in attitudes, sentiments and aspirations within the community because they regard any solidarity and shared interests of community members as a function of their common residence. In other words, they tend to regard spatial structure as the independent variable that determines human relations. Ecologists, therefore, disregard and deny that it is the interactions of community members that determine social processes and relations within the community.

There is certainly no end to the attempt to define the community. But a review of the continuing debate of what the community is and what it cannot be indicates that to study a community can be a fruitful exercise. What seems to have emerged is that theories of the community must reflect structure, form, organisation and type, as well as those processes inside the community which make it both tick and change. When we particularly refer to types of community, there are again a variety and different classifications. There is Tonnies's classification of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft which distinguishes a traditional community from the modern urbanised and rational community. There is the classification into Rural, Urban and Suburban communities. The distinguishing factors between urban and suburban communities, for example, are both geographical and functional. Thus, even though ways of life may be influenced by settlement patterns as ecologists believe, yet ways of life can also be a function of the nature of interactions and social reactions. Louis Wirth is therefore still right in emphasizing the influence of interaction from density.

130. Louise Wirth, "Urbanism as a way of life", in American Journal of Sociology 44 (1938).
even though, Gans, has argued that class distinctions and family-cycle are rather the valuable determinants of ways of life. Gans's argument suggests that the concept of 'urbanism' is a substitute for a settlement pattern called 'urban'\textsuperscript{131}. This in fact, should not be so. Urbanism must refer to a particular kind of process, mode of interaction, method of conducting social life, ways by which people relate to each other as the larger process of industrialisation compel people to cluster together in cities. That is to say, that urbanism is a concept that describes the social life: those interactions and relationships, which exist within an urban community. In this way, settlement pattern is almost irrelevant except that it draws attention to the fact that the social life being described takes place in a given geographically defined area.

The question then is: what makes a way of life, urban? Louis Wirth's theory of city life appears to give the clearest indication of 'urbanness'. To him urbanism should be understood as a set of social institutions, attitudes and behaviour which would tend to be found whenever people settled permanently in large, dense and heterogeneous groupings. Although many people, including Gans, Pahl, R. Morris and Peter Mann\textsuperscript{132} have challenged Wirth's theory on different grounds, yet, urbanism as a concept that described a way of life seems to have survived. When a migrant from the rural area moves into the city, he may not absolutely rid himself of his rural life; but certainly he modifies his attitude, associates with others and he picks up behaviour patterns that will enable him to fit into city life.


Similarly, when the city resident moves into the country (rural, suburban etc.), what does he do? Does he carry with him city life or does he drop it, modify it or go into seclusion? The fact that he needs some re-adjusting to do suggests that after the process of adapting into a new environment, normal life is likely to continue within urban ethos. Given this; it seems plausible to conclude that urbanism is a culture and not a territorial symbol.

2. Urbanism - The Culture of New Towns?

As the sample of city residents were deciding whether to move from the city to the new town, two influences were at work: the advantages from attachment to the city had to be weighed against the relative advantage of moving to a new town. Migration decisions of the city residents were made difficult by the 'pulls' to and the 'pushes' from the city. As it was demonstrated by the decision-making process and the frame of reference on which the decisions were made, the constraints imposed by city life - associations, social connections and networks, family considerations and other attachments, were sufficient influences that made migration unattractive. But on the other hand, the aspiration to get away from a deteriorating city environment, the prospect of having a house and a garden (perhaps for the first time) in the clean, healthy and desirable environment of a new town, and the improvement in social status that the move would bring to the entire family - these were compelling reasons to leave the city. Those who finally moved to the new town were drawn from different social groups - working class and middle class, and from different occupational groupings - managers, professionals, skilled and semi-skilled, and the unskilled. Based
on their different social backgrounds, and experiences, migrants may have come from the different communities and sub-communities of the city - but all, heading for the new town, where, as a result of deliberate public policy, there will be one community. This would suggest that the new town is likely and could, in due course, develop into a social melting pot: a community with no class distinction; with no cultural variations; and without any ecological groupings into sub-communities based on, for example, differences in styles of life - indeed, a homogenous community. And yet, the general character of the new town population shows that the professionals and skilled manual workers form the greater proportion of migrants. What implications for cultural development of the new town has the apparently professional and skilled 'bias' of the social structure?

Unfortunately, there is no available data from the 'Survey of Migrant Firms' which can be used to make any predictions on cultural development. Nevertheless, it is possible to infer that in general, the urban culture seems to have taken strong grip on the new towns. As in the larger cities, so it is becoming increasingly the pattern of social life and interaction for migrants to belong to social clubs, to be members of professional associations, political parties and so on. The general, low level of social investments in new towns (cinemas, hospitals, shopping facilities, libraries, museums, transport facilities etc.) has increased the need for dependence on the use of private motorcars. To be sufficiently mobile, it will require each family to provide their own private car. Since the cost of even a small car is now fairly expensive, only a limited number of families can, therefore, afford to buy one. The effect of
this can be far-reaching. Many potential migrants have apparently decided to stay behind in the city because they could not afford to buy and maintain a private motorcar. One possible effect of this situation in a new town is the possible development of privatised, rather family-centred life. If the process becomes a pattern, then the new town undoubtedly becomes more suburban than urban.

6.6 Summary and Conclusions

The theoretical issues that emerge from the descriptive analysis of a typical planned migration process and the frame of reference on which migration decision of a sample of (migrant) workers were based, have to be seen in the broad context of social change. The planned Migration Model: Before-During-After, facilitates understanding of the various processes involved in the transition as well as the different kinds of phenomena which are at work at the same time. On the other hand, the Socio-spatial Interaction Model, directs attention to the nature of the relationship between the migrant and the environment or community in which he lives, and from which he was compelled to migrate so as to re-adjust into a new one. The change of location from the city to a new town is, therefore, seen as a crucial social change for the migrant firm and for the worker: the later being, at the same time, a family man, a city resident, an organisation man and a social animal with silent aspirations that can only become manifest at an opportune moment. The opportunity was the choice between leaving the city or staying behind: and the worker's choice is better understood when he is regarded as an actor in a given situation.
In explaining the worker's migration decision, the meaning he attached to the situation and the ends that he hoped to achieve, provided the vehicle for action. The details of his motivations are demonstrated by the multi-dimensional nature of the action frame of reference on which the ultimate decision was made. It is, therefore, a fallacy to think that only one single theory can explain adequately the planned migration decision of the city worker. Yet, in broad terms, what this study has demonstrated is that a sociological study and explanation of 'planned' migration decision-making can be fruitfully undertaken through the application of the social action theory: in particular, the action frame of reference.
Chapter 7

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF PLANNED MIGRATION TO NEW TOWNS

This chapter discusses the policy implications of planned movement of urban population to new towns. It will specifically examine the various ways in which planned migration policy impinges on, promotes or hinders the realisation of those needs and aspirations of city residents already identified. Attention will be focussed on the achievement of new town development as an instrument of social policy, the effect of planning policy on the selection of the population of new towns and, by implication, the bias in favour of some social categories and the exclusion of others. It will include speculations on size and structure of the new towns population by the year 2000 and the implications for future social and economic planning. What they have failed to do and what have contributed to the poverty of new towns and whether they can be regarded as substitutes or alternatives to the (parent) older cities, will also be examined. Finally, I have briefly reflected in this discussion the current debate on the future of new and expanding town developments in terms of whether or not resources should be directed to the revitalisation of the cities, and in terms of whether or not the policy of dispersal and decentralisation should be reversed.

7.1 Successes and Failures of New Towns

The success of new town development as an instrument of social policy can be measured in different ways. Looking at the new town's original function as conveyed by Edenezar Howard, it seems reasonable —
to infer that new towns have functionally combined the relief of congestion in the older cities with the maintenance of a balance between the town and the country. They have also utilised the facilities of modern technology without necessarily sacrificing the social advantages of the historic older cities. While new towns are deliberately limited in size and population, they have nevertheless achieved some balance and self-containment to be able to sustain some of the well-known specialized functions of a city such as variety of occupations, diversity of human interests and an accumulation of capital resources which smaller units of settlement cannot encompass. In addition, new towns seem to have successfully demonstrated the possibility of combining urban with rural facilities, social and economic balance, as the rational equivalence of the sprawl and cluster of the metropolitan areas and conurbations. The link between the older city and the new town has been so reasonably established that it is correct to say that new towns are, in fact, the alternative and corrective to city overgrowth and congestion and to unduly scattered human settlements. As Lewis Mumford puts it, the wider success of new towns is in their serving: "as an alternative to functionless congestion and formless sprawl". 133

Between 1946 and 1974, twenty-nine new towns have been designated and developed. They have not only created new centres of growth, they have also developed new communities and new areas of population concentration. This is an innovation in social evolution affecting redistribution of settlement pattern and acting as an instrument of redistribution of settlement pattern and acting as an instrument of

regional development. Table 44 indicates that at the end of 1975, the population of London New Towns grew from 300,000 at time of destination to 700,000. This figure does not include population transferred from London to expanding towns. Table 45, similarly shows the population of other new towns in England, Scotland and Wales having increased from a total of 600,000 at destination to slightly over a million at the end of 1975. These figures do not also take into account population of the cities in those other areas that moved to expanding towns. Purely from the point of view of relieving congestion in the large cities, particularly London, the loss of population to new and expanding towns confirms that new towns are certainly performing one of the major functions of their creation, namely: the relief of congestion. In Chapter 1, paragraph 1.2, it was shown that new towns up to 1972, had significantly contributed to the relief of housing need of London. Table 49 shows that between 1970 and 1974, the contributions to London's housing by new and expanding towns were maintained. The estimates of housing need in London which it is hoped should be satisfied also by new and expanding towns are indicated in Table 50. The findings of this research point to a trend by which industries, aspiring city residents and home-seekers are likely to continue to move from the city to new towns. Industries will continue to move out from the cities as a pre-requisite to planning for expansion and competitiveness which are essential for their survival. New towns provide them with low-cost land and facilities for expansion; and the inner city areas, still congested and lacking in space for efficient operation, do not only impose high rents on organisations but also increase costs for commuters and house buyers. Environmental quality seem to have
increasingly become a factor of consideration in modern living standard. Thus, as the environmental quality of the inner city declines, movement from the cities to new towns and adjoining suburbs is likely to increase. It is, therefore, to be expected that city residents who wish to improve their social status through association with a high class residential location, and others who wish to maintain their status by moving into an environment socially accepted as respectable, are most likely in the future to move to new towns. Given this likely trend and given the fact that the housing problems of cities will, for a long time, continue to be met by new towns, they (new towns) are likely to provide an invaluable instrument of social and planning policy.

Viewed as an instrument of planning, new town developments have served more than the original purpose of helping to de-congest the inner cities. Many have consistently advocated that new towns should take on other functions that would also help to revive the cities and generate in them better quality of life. John Barr, for example, writing in the New Society of April 1, 1965, argued persuasively that new towns should add on the specific function of acting as anti-ghettos by absorbing increasing proportion of ethnic minority population of the larger cities. Osborn and Whittick in their book, as noted earlier, were also putting the functions of new towns in a broad planning perspective. However, John Barr's suggestion underlines an area of social problem which has hardly appealed to the imagination of the planner, namely: racial integration.
The belief that the integration of ethnic minorities into the British society is fundamental to good race relations and therefore a socially desirable objective, has dominated community relations thinking for a long time. Yet opinions are deeply divided as to what ought to be the most appropriate and effective mechanic for the achievement of such a goal. Within the last decade, voluntary dispersal of ethnic minorities from their concentrated patterns of settlement has been the most passionately discussed and, in fact, currently recommended. 134 Without any doubt, however, the word dispersal has stirred up ill-feelings and generated a great deal of fear and suspicion from both the ethnic minorities themselves and the indigenous population. To most ethnic minorities, dispersal is a deliberate policy of forcibly uprooting them from their own established communities; and to the indigenous population it generates a fear that an ethnic minority spread into the hitherto predominantly white areas amounts not only to a calculated invasion of the majority's environment but also to forcing them to share residential neighbourhoods with strangers. In this context, a policy of dispersal in racial terms, is bedevilled by obvious and formidable contradictions.

Nevertheless, new towns have been looked upon, as alternative environments within which both ethnic minorities, the poor and the trapped city residents could live decent lives, but only if they so prefer. A policy of voluntary dispersal must, therefore, provide

for choice between life in an enriched, revitalised and renewed inner city and the suburban new town. It has always been assumed that poor city residents, working class city residents and ethnic minorities from the cities are unable and unwilling to move to new towns. Both the New Towns Project and the present research have confirmed that these assumptions are unfounded. On the contrary, city residents of all categories are willing and often enthusiastic to move but are blocked by a number of obstacles, including the official selection mechanism discussed in this chapter. In the special case of ethnic minorities, there are the additional handicap of discrimination and the fear of the unknown which together tend to explain their insignificant presence in new towns. To be able to discover the nature of the barriers to their movement, to remove them or to encourage ethnic minorities to move to new towns, a special study commissioned by the Department of the Environment is currently being undertaken. Encouragement to move to new towns from the cities, viewed as an alternative choice to living in the inner city, and pursued concurrently with the renewal of the city, would seem to me, the most effective way for dealing with anti-ghetto development and the revival of our cities.

The Poverty of New Towns

It seems also necessary to briefly examine what the new towns have failed to do. The failures, I have chosen to describe as the Poverty of New Towns. For a long time now, critical comments about new towns

135. This study, entitled: Movement of Ethnic Minorities to New and Expanding Towns, was initiated and launched by the author for the Community Relations Commission on behalf of the D.O.E. The fieldwork is undertaken by the Social and Community Planning Research. The study has been taken over by the Commission for Racial Equality and will be completed in the early part of 1978.
have been concentrated on the achievement of balance and self-containment, on the issue of the provision of social facilities and amenities, the recruitment of new town population through the selection scheme, the absolute powers of the development corporations in the recruitment of new town population, and the bias in favour of the professional and the skilled manuals in the recruitment process, to the exclusion of the unskilled, the aged, and other social groups at risk. However, in this thesis, comments on these issues will be only as consistent as they are with the empirical findings.

It is important to critically evaluate the procedure and the criteria for selecting the new town population since this machine actually determines who moved to a new town. As the selection procedure itself has been described (Appendix 4), it is only necessary here to indicate the inherent deficiencies and limitations of the selection process and its effects on the characteristics of migrants and the volume of movement. In terms of the primary objectives of the scheme, it can be said to have operated satisfactorily within its constraints, especially in the relief of the housing needs of Londoners. For the purpose of the scheme, housing need appears to have been defined in a rather much more simplistic and straightforward way in order, particularly to establish a scheme of priorities for the selection of suitable applicants for employment vacancies in new and expanding towns. Since suitability is determined by the need of the industry and the employer, housing need appears to be defined not necessarily by the actual need for a roof over the head but rather, by the requirements of a job namely: skill, experience, industrial expertise. Table 39 confirms this point. From the analysis of more than 2,500 people
### TABLE 39
SOCIO-ECONOMIC GROUP COMPOSITION OF REGISTRANT SAMPLE (N=2557)
GREATER LONDON, INNER LONDON, OUTER LONDON, AND GREAT BRITAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic groups</th>
<th>I.S.S. registrant sample %</th>
<th>Greater London %</th>
<th>Inner London (Group 'A' Boroughs) %</th>
<th>Outer London (Group 'B' Boroughs) %</th>
<th>Great Britain %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 4 (Professional)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 13 (Managerial)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,9,12,14 (Skilled manual)</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6 (non-manual and clerical)</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,10,15 (semi-skilled and agricultural)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (unskilled manual)</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17 (Armed Forces and others)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. The information from the 1966 Census relates solely to economically active and retired males over the age of 15. Since the proportion of females in the I.S.S. registrant sample is only 5.6%, this should not affect the basis of the comparison made here very materially.

who registered for jobs in new and expanding towns through the scheme in 1972, the table shows that the registrants are relatively deficient in the professional and employing classes, as compared with Greater London and Great Britain as a whole. The proportions of non-manual, service, and semi-skilled workers are roughly the same in all categories, with the exception of a greater proportion of non-manual workers in Greater London. However, it is the highly skilled and unskilled groups that show the most marked differences. It can be seen that registrants on the scheme show some over-representation in the skilled manual category, as compared with Greater London and Great Britain as a whole, but this over-representation is even more marked in the migration population to Expanding Towns. This is due to the high proportion of technologically advanced "growth" industries in N.E.T.s which employ a high proportion of skilled workers than the national average. Conversely, the registrants contain a higher proportion of unskilled workers (presumably those in housing need, looking for better housing conditions) than N.E.T.s, Greater London, and Great Britain as a whole. But this occupational category is the least successful in moving to new and expanding towns since they are less needed by employers.

Turning to the age structure in Table 41, it can be seen that the scheme's registrants show a much greater proportion in the 20-29 age group than average, and that this is also a feature of the migrant population to N.E.T.s, which also contains a higher proportion of children, and a lower proportion of teenagers and over-45's than Greater London and Great Britain as a whole. This tallies with the figures in Tables 42 and 40(b) showing a much higher proportion of married
persons among the registrants, and also among migrants to Expanding Towns, than the national average. These facts confirm the general impression of N.E.T. migrants as mainly young couples with young children, looking for better career opportunities and a better environment in which to bring up their children. Furthermore, records held by the Department of Employment show that only a small proportion (15%) of those nominated by the G.L.C. to the Department as suitable for employment in N.E.T.s are in fact submitted to employers for consideration and also that only a small proportion (again 15%) of those submitted are in fact placed in employment in N.E.T.s.

This, together with the fact that only a small proportion of vacancies for Londoners in N.E.T.s are for unskilled men, highlights the general picture of the scheme as a procedure whose successful operation is primarily dependent on the structure of the labour market in N.E.T.s. Moreover, its significance in relation to the total flow of migrants from metropolitan areas is much less than is commonly supposed for obvious reasons. First, in none of the metropolitan areas of Britain for which the scheme is also in operation does the average proportion of out-migrants per annum accounted for by planned migration exceed 10%, with the exception of Glasgow, where the proportion is nearer 20%. Second, the scheme cannot make any very material difference to the effects of out-migration on the socio-economic composition of metropolitan areas, bearing in mind that London

136. These figures are extracted from an analysis of the New and Expanding Town Scheme (then known as the Industrial Selection Scheme) by Charles Thomson for the Centre for Environmental Studies, 1972.
where stricter control is maintained than anywhere else, not more than 75% of migrants to Expanding Towns move through the N.E.T.s., and not more than 30-40% in the case of the New Towns which are not formally tied to the exporting authorities as are the Expanding Towns. Third, since many more Londoners move through the scheme to Expanding than to New Towns, the result is that the scheme accounts for about half of the total planned movement of Londoners (i.e. about 25,000 persons per annum which is less than 10% of the total movement (about 300,000 persons per annum). Its contribution to the total volume of out-migration from London can therefore only be marginal, as it is in the contribution it makes in the satisfaction of the needs of the job market in New and Expanding Towns.

Another important criterion for determining the suitability of potential migrants is derived from the elements of social selection built into the selection procedure. For the employer, the reliability of the prospective employee is regarded as a significant contribution to the overall profitability of the work-organisation. And to the Housing Manager of the new and expanding towns, cleanliness and financial stability are both conditions for the determination of the suitability of potential tenants. Reliability, cleanliness and financial stability are qualities that are rather broadly socially determined, and less directly related to the requirements of the job. Yet as important determinants of suitability they underline the influence of the employer and the housing manager as "gatekeepers". 137-138. These figures are extracted from an analysis of the New and Expanding Town Scheme (then known as the Industrial Selection Scheme) by Charles Thomson for the Centre for Environmental Studies, 1972.
### Table 40(a) and (b)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>I.S.S. Registrant Sample (N = 2689) %</th>
<th>Immigrants to New Growth Areas 1961%</th>
<th>Greater London %</th>
<th>Inner London %</th>
<th>Outer London %</th>
<th>Great Britain %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest Proportion</td>
<td>Highest Proportion</td>
<td>Lowest Proportion</td>
<td>Highest Proportion</td>
<td>Lowest Proportion</td>
<td>Highest Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (b) Compounded age structure of N.E.T.s registrant sample, initial migrants to 8 N.E.T.s, Greater London, and Great Britain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>34.0 (-)</td>
<td>36.2 (-)</td>
<td>36.9 (-)</td>
<td>37.8 (-)</td>
<td>29.2 (-)</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.0 (9.1)</td>
<td>5.3 (8.3)</td>
<td>4.6 (7.3)</td>
<td>3.3 (5.3)</td>
<td>5.6 (7.9)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>13.8 (20.9)</td>
<td>13.8 (21.6)</td>
<td>15.5 (24.6)</td>
<td>14.2 (22.8)</td>
<td>17.4 (24.6)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.2 (26.0)</td>
<td>14.1 (22.1)</td>
<td>13.7 (21.7)</td>
<td>15.8 (25.4)</td>
<td>13.3 (18.8)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>19.3 (29.3)</td>
<td>17.6 (27.6)</td>
<td>14.9 (23.6)</td>
<td>11.0 (17.7)</td>
<td>19.1 (27.0)</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>6.8 (10.3)</td>
<td>7.0 (11.0)</td>
<td>9.4 (14.9)</td>
<td>4.8 (7.7)</td>
<td>8.8 (12.4)</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9 (4.4)</td>
<td>5.3 (8.3)</td>
<td>5.0 (7.9)</td>
<td>4.1 (6.6)</td>
<td>6.6 (9.3)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N.B. Figures in brackets refer to population 15 years and over, to allow better comparison with the N.E.T.s sample.

N.E.T.s = New and Expanding Town Scheme (formerly I.S.S.)
### TABLE 41

**Sex and Marital status composition of N.E.T.s registrant sample, Greater London, and Great Britain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>I.S.S. Sample (N = 2709)</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>Great Britain</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>I.S.S. Sample (N = 2676)</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>Great Britain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W/D/Sep.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 42

**Number of children at home (N.E.T.s registrant sample), and household size (five E.T.s, Greater London, and England & Wales)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Children at Home</th>
<th>I.S.S. Registrant Sample (N= 2316)</th>
<th>Household size (1959-70)</th>
<th>Five E.T.s</th>
<th>Greater London</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the recruitment of the population for new and expanding towns. The professionals, the managers, the non-manual workers, the skilled and the technician, and the "respectable working class" (i.e. the skilled manual for example), are preferred. For those who are status-conscious, those that are more likely to take seriously the dichotomy between the 'roughs' and 'the respectables', and for those who might look on immigrants from London as strangers with strange ways; social selection can be another significant determinant of who moves to new and expanding towns. Although this element of social selection is based not on explicit rules but on the ideology of social acceptability, it has become an acceptable criterion of selection.

As an administrative machinery for selecting new and expanding town population as well as the mechanism for monitoring planned movement out of the cities, the scheme is generally inadequate. This point re-emphasizes the need for more information on the contributions of unplanned movement. It is, however, administratively convenient and reasonably effective in the attainment of the objective of giving relief to London's housing need by distributing the housing stocks available in new and expanding towns. As a means of recruiting the labour needs of employers moving to new and expanding towns, the scheme is also inadequate, contributing only about 15-20% of those needs. Yet, without doubt, it promotes the satisfaction of industrial needs by serving as the process of selecting suitable (potential) employees. A number of studies have, nevertheless, pointed out that part of the
ineffectiveness of the scheme is the result of tying up job with housing, and especially the insistence that to secure housing, a job must be obtained first. The ineffectiveness is also partly because the selecting process itself is cumbersome, time-consuming and frustrating to both potential migrants and employers. It was to remedy the last weakness that the London Dispersal Liaison Group commissioned a study designed to make recommendations on how to improve the operation of the scheme. The result of the study is contained in Frances Gee's book. The report concentrated more in demonstrating the various ways in which the scheme has been, indeed, ineffective, cumbersome, frustrating and time-consuming, and less in indicating how it can achieve more. The general limitations of the scheme have led to many potential migrants and employers using other alternative (unofficial) means of moving to new and expanding towns. Employers recruit directly from the cities and other areas by advertisement; and potential migrants get on to jobs through private recommendations and introductions from friends and relatives already living in new/expanding towns. Some London Boroughs (e.g. Lambeth or Brent) have entered into "Special arrangements" with some new or expanding towns in order to ensure a continuous flow of migrants. Shelter Housing Association (SHAC) in London are known to be working with some new and expanding towns under special arrangement, probably.

141. London Dispersal Liaison Group: This is a Committee of Officers representing the GLC, the Dept. of Employment and the Dept. of the Environment, established to reconcile various conflicting interests in London in the dispersal of population to new and expanding towns. It was found in 1966 under the inspiration of Bob Mellish, then Minister of Housing and Local Government. The group sponsored the survey on which the Frances Gee report was based.
142. Frances Gee, Jobs and Homes for Londoners, see p. 16, fn.
on a much smaller scale. These various ways by which the official machinery (N.E.T. Scheme) is by-passed, indicate that the scheme is widely regarded as unsatisfactory in very important ways.

By far the most serious indictment against the scheme in the recruitment of population to new and expanding towns is its exclusion of the very social groups, who, by their own preferences, and due to their relative poverty and pressing housing needs would have benefitted most by moving. They include the following categories of socially disadvantaged: the poor and the infirm, old people, the unskilled, pensioners, ethnic minorities, people with large families, one-parent families (especially women), potentially mobile working class people and those who are nearing retiring age. One of the findings of this research is that there is a demonstrated enthusiasm among aspiring working class people, the unskilled, and some old people to leave the city for new towns. Recently, the Graeme Shakland report, based on forty studies, confirmed that many unskilled and low-paid workers are trapped in the cities (London, Liverpool, Birmingham, etc) because of the acute shortage of housing and unskilled jobs. The report urged for a major shift in the balance of the population (of both London and new towns) by helping to move the socially disadvantaged to better jobs and housing (Reported: Evening Standard 12.1.77). Most reports attribute the pool of the unskilled, poor, elderly and ethnic minorities increasingly left behind in London, to the large-scale exodus of manufacturing industries that migrated to new and expanding towns with, for example, London's most economically active skilled manual workers, technicians and professionals. These reports hardly mention also that this exodus is encouraged by the
selection process of the New and Expanding Town Scheme. As already noted, the stream of migrants to new and expanding towns shows a marked degree of self-selectivity which re-inforces the dictates of the labour markets. Over 80% of vacancies for Londoners in N.E.T.s are for skilled men, coupled with a preference on the part of employers for younger men. As many studies have shown migrants are, in general, better educated, of a higher social class, and have higher status occupation than non-migrants. They are also more likely to be at the family-building stage of the life-cycle. These characteristics are confirmed by both successful migrants to new and expanding towns and by registrants on the scheme. They show a greater than average proportion in the 20-29 age group and in the skilled manual occupational categories, which are predominantly composed of married heads of household, with 2-3 children.

It seems apparent, therefore, that, on balance, the more relatively successful method of recruiting new and expanding town population both in absolute number and by social mix, is obviously by means of transferring workers during the course of relocation. In relocation, it requires only an indication of how many workers are transferring to either a new town or an expanding town, to enable housing allocation to be made to the migrant workers. It is more straightforward and less cumbersome compared with the processes involved in recruiting through the scheme; although it is still based on the principle of a 'job before housing allocation'. If, therefore, migrant firms ideally have on their staff, a good proportion of unskilled workers, elderly workers nearing retiring age, one-parent families, black and brown workers - all of whom are prepared to move to a new town, a much more balanced
population is likely to be achieved at destination. Unfortunately, it does not happen like this in practice.

The migrant firm may have to force an earlier retirement and may generally decide who moves and who does not. But as a rule, it is the development corporation that decided which firm moves in the first place. The determination of which firms move to a new town is itself the product of somewhat curious arrangements in planned movement which generally control the movement of people and industry. It has to do with the legal arrangements between the 'exporting' authority (e.g. the GLC) and the 'receiving' authority (e.g. the new or expanding town). These arrangements allow for movement of people and industry to new and expanding towns to be conducted on a purely voluntary basis that allows the new or expanding town to take the people and industries it wants. Thus, new and expanding towns are known to have refused the relocation of factories with high risk of air or river pollution in their area; or refused the relocation of a firm employing large proportion of unskilled workers.

And yet, since public funds are provided by way of subsidies for setting up housing and industrial estates in new and expanding towns, it would have seemed right that a greater control by central government should be exerted over the determination of what industries move to these towns. If this were done, it would have been possible to direct the kind of firms that will provide, for example, unskilled jobs for city residents to relocate in new and expanding towns. However, this freedom, given to the receiving authorities have apparently induced in them a sense of responsibility towards creating a successful community
that can provide for the needs of local unemployed men first, such as teachers, firemen, local government officers and other "key" workers that are unavailable from London. The general lack of willingness to accept 'London's problems' is also compensated for by their acceptance of the operation of "Special Housing Allocation Schemes" by which houses are allocated to unskilled people in housing need, and for pensioners who normally have relatives living in those towns etc. The extended purpose of such a scheme is to enable a further balance to be achieved in the demographic and socio-economic structure of migrants to new and expanding towns. These schemes have not been (relatively) successful (being limited to about 15% of total housing stock), particularly because of the desire of the new and expanding town authorities not to strain their welfare services. Even if the scheme had been successful, the scale of operation would have been rather inadequate to make an impact.

7.2 New Towns Population by the year 2000

From Tables 44 and 45, it will be noted that London's New Towns population rose from a total of 324,000 at designation to a total of above 850,000 in 1975 and will be increased to more than one million by the year 2000. Other New Towns in England increased their total population of 550,900 at designation, to 783,500 in 1975, and will rise to above 1,200,000 by the year 2000. Scottish New Towns population rose from a total of 47,100 at designation, to 231,000 in 1975, and will rise to 498,300 by the year 2000; whilst the population of new towns in Wales would have risen from a total of 17,500 at designation, to 52,500 in 1975, reaching 91,100 in the year, 2000. Thus, London's new towns would have absorbed from London not less than one million of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Town</th>
<th>Date of Designation</th>
<th>Population at Designation</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Population in 1975</th>
<th>Average Rise per year</th>
<th>Population by the year 2000*</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>84,800</td>
<td>Capacity to take in more development and in-migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>37,450</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>+68,650</td>
<td>Would have achieved target population by 1995 (61,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>+111,605</td>
<td>By 1980, the population target of 70,000 would have been slightly exceeded (73,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>Unfixed</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>145,500</td>
<td>Population by the year 2000 will approach 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>23,260</td>
<td>Could take in more development and up to 5 to 6,000 in-migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemel</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>By the year 2000 population target will just be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hempstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>69,300</td>
<td>2148</td>
<td>+123,000</td>
<td>By 1992, target population (105,800) will be achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/cont'd ........
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Town</th>
<th>Date of Designation</th>
<th>Population at designation</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Population in 1975</th>
<th>Average Rise per year</th>
<th>Population by the year 2000*</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn Garden City</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>Much more elbow-room for development and in-migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>80,500</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>121,625</td>
<td>Great capacity for more development and receiving more migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>Greater capacity for development and migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>Great capacity for more development and migrants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Population for the year 2000 is estimated by simple inference and (crude) computation based on the average population in-take per year (Column 6). This intake is itself, based only on figures from the official machinery for monitoring planned population movement and does not, therefore, take into account other forms of 'unplanned' movement.

+ Bracknell, Crawley and Stevenage would have achieved their target population before the year 2000.

Source: The figures in this table are obtained from three main sources: GLC, Development Corporation and the Commission for New Towns estimates, and Simon Booths article on New Towns published in New Society, October 14, 1976. The computed estimates are mine. They are not necessarily accurate but represent the most likely working estimate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Town</th>
<th>Date of Designation</th>
<th>Population at Designation</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Population 1975</th>
<th>Average rise per year</th>
<th>Population by the year 2000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In other parts of England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aycliffe</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>25,960</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>23,125</td>
<td>Target population reached 1995 (44,490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lancs</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>259,400</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>305,650</td>
<td>Can take in more development by year 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>53,500</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>91,300</td>
<td>Target population to be reached by 1994 (82,740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterlee</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>52,200</td>
<td>Would have achieved target population by year 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>97,450</td>
<td>Target population achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runcorn</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>51,500</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>103,750</td>
<td>Target population achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelmersdale</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>96,350</td>
<td>Target population achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telford</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>3,857</td>
<td>193,425</td>
<td>Great capacity for further development and population in-take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>124,700</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>174,275</td>
<td>Capacity for more development and population in-take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>Target population reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(550,960)</td>
<td>(1,379,000)</td>
<td>(783,560)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,253,525)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/cont'd ............
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Town</th>
<th>Date of Designation</th>
<th>Population at Designation</th>
<th>Population Target</th>
<th>Population 1975</th>
<th>Average rise per year</th>
<th>Population by the year 2000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>Target population reached before the year 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kilbride</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>72,400</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>Target population reached before the year 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenrothes</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>32,100</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>60,800</td>
<td>Some capacity for more development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>38,650</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>58,650</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>114,200</td>
<td>More capacity for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>46,300</td>
<td>Great capacity for further development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehouse</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(47,150)</td>
<td>(550,000)</td>
<td>(231,050)</td>
<td>(498,300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbrian</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>76,725</td>
<td>Target population achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>Target population achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17,500)</td>
<td>(68,000)</td>
<td>(52,500)</td>
<td>(91,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,842,925</td>
<td>Total population for all new towns will be below the total target population by year 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes on Table

* Figures for Stonehouse new town relating to population at designation were unable at the time of this study. Consequently figures for 'Average rise per year' and 'Population by the year 2000' were not computed. Method of computation for the 5th and 6th columns is the same for Table 4.

SOURCE: Figures on the 2nd and 3rd columns of this table were obtained from Department of Environment's "Report by an Inter-departmental Study Group, H.M.S.O. 1971; and those from the 4th column are extracted from Simon Booth's article in the New Society (op.cit).
its population; other parts of English large cities (Midland North, North-East, Merseyside, etc) would have lost another one million of their population to new towns; and large cities in Wales and Scotland would have lost a total of 283,550 of their populations to new towns there. Approximately, 3 million of the population of the large cities in England, Scotland and Wales would have moved to resettle in new towns in these areas by the year 2000: that is one million more than the number that was originally planned (which is 1,850,000, the total of target population). The total figure for expanding towns which must be much higher than that of the new towns has not been included in arriving at these estimated losses of population from the large cities.

Although the losses in absolute number have been felt in London, Manchester, Birmingham and Glasgow etc, yet the impact has been partly reflected in the number of jobs that the migrants take with them. The combined effects of a reduction in the size of the population and in the total number of certain categories of jobs available to those who did not move, have attracted a great deal of critical comments on the justification of the current functions of new towns. Table 46, shows that as industry and people move out to new towns, jobs are lost to the exporting authorities and jobs are correspondingly created in new towns for the migrants. The Inner City areas of the large cities have been relatively much more affected by the loss of jobs although they were meant to benefit more from planned outward movement in terms of relieving congestion and rehousing their residents in new towns. From the tables, London New Towns, by the end of 1975 created in new towns a total of 442,700 jobs; New Towns in other parts of England
created 340,700 jobs; and New Towns in Wales and Scotland created 110,300 jobs. By the time when new towns in Britain have achieved their target population (probably around 2000) more than three million people would have moved out of the large conurbations, for whom not less than two million jobs would have been created in the new towns. Taking into account the fact that the cities also loose population and jobs to expanding towns in much higher proportion than new towns (the ratio, is approximately 4 to 5), it is reasonable to infer that if the present trend continues, at least five million people would have left the cities to hold not less than four million jobs in new and expanding towns by the year, 2000. Limiting this speculations to the consequences for new towns, it seems probable that new towns would have been well established as growth centres; and the aim of redistributing the working population of the large conurbations through a policy of decentralisation, would have made a significant achievement. As the new towns assume full active life as mature towns at that time they would have become a living example of an innovation in social evolution. Their value as instruments of economic and regional planning would, also have become, if not fully realised, at least, apparent. What, however, is difficult to foresee is the scale of social planning required in order to provide the kind of social investments usually associated with urban cities from where the majority of the new town residents moved.
The large exodus of industries and people from the cities to new (and expanding) towns seem to have had, perhaps, unintended consequences for the cities themselves. New Towns are blamed for having caused the exodus and for having impoverished, especially the inner cities. They are said to have creamed the cities of their economically active (both by occupation and age), leaving behind the unskilled, the elderly, racial minorities, and generally the sick and the infirm, who are described as trapped and unable to move out. New Towns, as noted above, are also said to have caused the loss of the more skilled and semi-skilled jobs from the cities; and that, especially they have hastened the further decline of the manufacturing industries as they attract such industries away. It is true that these things have been happening to the cities; indeed, as many more reports are published a gloomy picture is often painted about the future of British cities. It is perhaps true that these effects are partly the direct result of the policy of dispersal and decentralisation of population and industries to new towns; and partly as the result of economic and social influences. A feature of the public debates on the value of new towns is that they reach their peak during periods of economic recession, creating the impression that new town developments have been such woeful failures that any more planned developments must be withdrawn. As many argue, resources should now rather be diverted away from new town development to the renewal of the cities. Are these critical comments actually justified?
As a vital mechanism for social reconstruction and development, new towns were not originally intended to provide all the answers to the problems of the inner city. Their success in giving continuing relief to the housing needs of city residents has often been under-valued; so have their contributions to economic and regional planning, and their providing an alternative habitat for those who have lost the zeal to live in cities. All this apart, the very new town idea, significantly British as it is, has become a national pride. It does not seem true to say that new towns have failed, nor can the deterioration of the (inner) cities be wholly blamed on new towns. Movement from the cities to new (and expanding) towns will continued whether or not the policy of dispersal and decentralisation is reversed, modified or scrapped. What might happen if a change in policy occurs is not necessarily a sudden end of the movement to new towns but at best rather a reduction in the volume of movement. Apart from the fact that employers will continue to make decisions about relocation outside the cities for economic reasons, the flight from the cities and the suburban retreat will continue to account for the loss of population from the cities for a long time. Some of the findings of this research already indicate that a continuing flow of migrants to new towns is inevitable in the future. Given the new towns population forecast for the year 2000, based on current trend in movement from the cities, the question that needs asking is what the implications will be for the social structure of new town population at that time. Will new towns become established suburban communities for the middle class: Managers, Professionals, Technicians, Supervisors, Skilled and semi-skilled 'affluent manual' workers, possibly adopting middle class style of life and behaviour patterns? Will new towns have become socially balanced
### TABLE 45

**Jobs Created in British New Towns up to 1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Town</th>
<th>Year of Designation</th>
<th>Jobs created or taken away from cities up to 1975</th>
<th>*Total cost of development up to 1975 (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>London New Towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>£102.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>*67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>*67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemel Hempstead</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>*67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn Garden City</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>*67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>58,700 - 442,700</td>
<td>59.0 - £742.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Towns in England</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aycliffe</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lancs</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterlee</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runcorn</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelmersdale</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telford</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warington</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>16,500 - 340,700</td>
<td>48.8 - £486.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Towns in Scotland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kilbride</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>*48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenrothes</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehouse</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,800 - 88,800</td>
<td>*48.2 - £287.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/cont'd ........
New Towns in Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Town</th>
<th>Year of Designation</th>
<th>Jobs created or taken away from cities up to 1975</th>
<th>*Total cost of development up to 1975 (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cwmbran</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>5,000 - 21,500</td>
<td>7.6 - £ 44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>904,700</td>
<td>£1,561.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NB For purposes of easy reference, Table 45(a) will refer to Column 4 of this table (i.e. total cost of new town development up to 1975).

Notes on Table

*Figures marked with asterisks, have been obtained by estimates based on average cost for new towns in each of the four regions (London, Rest of England, Scotland and Wales). Under 'total' the figure marked with asterisks is the total without the estimated figures. None of the totals is, therefore, statistically accurate, but each is relatively accurate in indicating a reasonable picture in general costs of developing the new towns from designation to the year, 1975, i.e. approximately over a quarter of a century.

through a good mix of the social classes, sexes, age and racial groups, so as to have come nearer to becoming Ebenezer Howard's 'social city'? In the preceding paragraphs it has become apparent that by virtue of the demands of industry and commerce, by the manner by which employers satisfy the labour demands through the official machinery for the recruitment of new town population and by the very nature of the elements of social selection built into the recruitment processes, the social structure of the new towns has tended to become characteristically young, male-orientated, professional and skill-orientated. Studies...
and statistical analyses of the new town recruits such as those of Ray Thomas,143 Brian Herand,144 the GLC, the Department of the Environment and Development Corporations, demonstrate this fact. As long as the elements of selectivity in the recruitment of the population of new towns continue to receive the blessings of official policy, the present social structure is likely to be perpetuated. If such a situation prevails, then it is probable that by the year 2000, new towns might be dominated by technologists, affluent skilled manual workers, and professionals, in occupational terms. In terms of age, new town population while remaining fundamentally young and economically active, might also have its first or second generation of urban migrants from the cities and perhaps a slowly rising population of retired organisation men. If the process of self-selection continues, and new towns have become increasingly exclusive, the probability that people with the population characteristics identified might be attracted to new towns, will increase. They will come possibly from the cities, the outer metropolis and from other areas too. As a type of community, new towns could then be likened to the American suburbia in which family life is relatively self-centred; mobility and transport are based on private motoring and the quality of social relationships is built on interest-based associations. In addition, the clean, healthy physical surroundings of the new town may give it the social respectability that is usually associated with middle class environment. Thus, in all probability, the social structure of British new towns in the twenty-first century is likely to be over-

represented by homogenous socio-economic groups most likely to adopt middle class style of life and behaviour patterns. This would have left the new town aim of 'social balance' further away from realisation. The foregoing speculations and forecasts have to be evaluated against the background of an implicit assumption that new towns by the 21st century would have become mature "melting pots". That is, communities in which different social classes and occupational groupings would have been so mixed as to have produced a homogenous, one-class community. Yet, the concept of social balance must be seen to have expressly referred, at least, to the attainment of a mixture of different social classes as reflected in the Reith Committee Report which states that: "If a socially homogenous community is to be created, a conscious and sustained policy to that end will be needed on the part of the agency itself, and of the leaders of local industry and commerce and of social activity."¹⁴⁵

Development Corporations have, apparently, been given the freedom to adopt a policy that can result in attracting socially mixed population by the choice of industries that come to new towns; by encouraging different social groups to move to new towns; and by developing and encouraging participation in those social activities that develop social relations. If these measures were adopted, the logical expectation is a creation of a community, in which a social balance would be achieved. Nevertheless, the over-representation of the skilled manual, the technicians and the professionals would suggest the emergence of a dominant group of technologists, middle class orientated, able to adopt a style of life and pattern of
behaviour that will become typically middle class. In this way, the chances are that new towns would have become a melting-pot where, for example, child-rearing pattern is the same; conspicuous consumption becomes a way of life; sports and leisure concentrate on golf, cricket and the like; and the use of private motoring as well as a tendency towards family centred-life become part of the style of life for new town residents. It appears, therefore, that whilst policy measures in new towns can, in the future, achieve some social balance, it also seems more likely that continuing influences will tend to develop new towns into middle class suburban communities. The needs of industry and the existing recruitment mechanism provide reliable evidence for such development. There is also a possibility that a change in political attitude through voting behaviour of new town residents may provide a further evidence, following the suggestion in 1955 that the fall in Labour votes from 48% to 46% in the General Elections was most marked in those areas of the country most prosperous and economically progressive, including new towns. The apparent change in voting behaviour is said to be correlated with rising income, rising social status from improved occupational grouping of the skilled manual working class people; and from people rating themselves as middle class because of the area in which they live, because they now own cars and are owner-occupiers; or because they can afford to send their children to Universities and go on holiday abroad every summer. Specifically, a shift in voting behaviour - from voting for the Labour Party to voting for the Conservatives is construed as a means of assessing oneself in class terms. Since the working class

traditionally vote Labour, a shift to voting for Conservatives implies that the working class voter now regards himself as a middle class person. An increase in the number of the new town voters that give their votes to the Conservative could, therefore, provide an indication of the extent to which people from working class backgrounds are increasingly becoming (at least as they subjectively think) middle-class, and conservative in their political outlook. To the extent that this speculation is valid, the fortunes of the two major political parties in the new towns might probably undergo very significant changes by the 21st century. In other words a political balance in the House of Parliament is a possibility; and could be one that might result from the social composition of new towns in the next quarter of a century. The implications for social, economic and political planning imposed by population movement to new towns will be far too complex for the planner to begin now to measure. It is the nature of this complexity that these speculations are drawing attention to.

7.3 Re-appraisal of the Decentralisation Policy: The Case of London

As a long-established industrial city, London has been affected by the structural changes which have been taking place within industry generally such as nationalisation, automation and changing distribution patterns. Firms which set up in the heyday of London’s industrial expansion have reached the point where their plant and buildings have become obsolescent, with the need to modernise and expand. About 25% of the loss of manufacturing employment to London has been due to firms moving out. It is estimated that most of it has arisen from closures or from reductions in activity, partly associated with the
transfer of work to plants outside London. In the eight years to 1974, a total of 809 firms moved to London-related New and Expanding Towns; 652 (81%) of these originated in London, 414 of them in Inner London. One hundred and fifty-seven firms came either from other areas or were new firms setting up. In 1974, 98 firms relocated in New and Expanding Towns. Of these, 78 originated in London and 20 elsewhere. Currently, about 70% of the firms moving from London are engaged in manufacturing industry. This movement of manufacturing firms to New and Expanding Towns represents about 8% (10% in Inner London) of London's total loss of industrial employment, including loss by closure as well as migration.*

Among the main effects of the rapid changes which have resulted from the high levels of net migration is the unbalanced employment situation noted above. The more people that continue to leave London for growth areas; elsewhere, the greater will be the labour supply in those areas to attract firms. In turn the more firms that move to such areas, the larger will be the range of jobs available and the greater the attraction to people to leave London, thus re-inforcing the decline and the lack of balance between labour supply and demand. Firms leaving London tend to be the more technically advanced, with other firms often depending on them, and often with the potential for growth which is needed to sustain industrial employment in London. The scale and rapidity of migration and of the decline in industrial employment leave groups of workers in London who no longer have a skill

* Note: Figures quoted in this paragraph and in most parts of this section (7.3) are extracted from GLC Report (SPB44) on "Planned Growth Outside London" of 22.12.75.
which is in demand and who find difficulty in obtaining employment, particularly employment as satisfying and well paid as before. Those left behind will often require additional support from the social services. The decline in population does not produce equivalent savings in these services. Furthermore, the costs of urban renewal remain as high or even rise, while the decline in private sector investment increases the burden on the public sector.

The new effect of these changes in London was a total employment loss of 396,000. This is not reflected in unemployment rates for Greater London as a whole since it was paralleled by the overall drop in the Greater London population. Even so, the total number of registered male unemployed (aged 16 and over) in London by July 1975 was 87,072. This compares with figures of 96,774 in Scotland and of 49,789 in Wales. Overall Greater London rates do not reflect the unbalanced internal situation that has resulted from such large and rapid changes in population and in the structure of employment. The decline in manufacturing employment has borne particularly heavily on the older, industrial areas of London where the workers have traditionally looked to this type of employment for their livelihood. Male unemployment (aged 18 and over), expressed as a percentage of the resident labour force, has been consistently and significantly above the regional average in 20 of the 60 employment office areas in London, mainly in Inner London. It is particularly high in four areas: Stepney, Poplar, Brixton and Canning Town, where it has consistently been more than double the regional rate. Since this is generally true of skilled and unskilled workers alike, it cannot be entirely due to the concentration of unskilled workers.
living in Inner London.

London's population, as a result of these movements and changes, dropped by over half a million between 1961 and 1971 to 7.45 million, with the decline accelerating over the period and continuing to do so since. By 1974 the figure was 7.17 million (an average loss for the three years since 1971 of nearly 100,000 a year): the latest projections based on past trends would give a figure between 6.54 and 6.34 million by 1981. Between 1961 and 1971 the proportion of the population of working age dropped from 65% to 62%; two-thirds of this fall was due to an increase in the proportion of retired people. Activity rates of those of working age also changed - downwards for men, from 88% to 83%, and upwards for women, from 46% to 50%. The number of the economically active (those employed or seeking employment) dropped by about 325,000. While there was a slight increase (about 10,000 in the number of women), the fall between 1961 and 1971 in the number of economically active men was about 335,000 (13%). This fall was heaviest among manual workers (skilled; semi-skilled; unskilled). The drop in the number of skilled manual workers was almost 200,000 with their proportion of the total male workforce falling from 31% to 27%. There were some off-setting rises in the numbers of non-manual workers. The net decline in London's population results from a complex pattern of movement and changes. In 1970-71, the gross out-migration from London was 355,050. (This was made up of 166,040 to the rest of the South-East region; 81,010 to the rest of Great Britain outside the South-East region; and 108,000 to areas outside Great Britain). Movement into London in that year was 245,000. (This comprised 73,000 from the rest of the South-East region;
68,000 from the rest of Great Britain outside the South-East region; and 104,000 from outside Great Britain). The net population loss to London was of the order of 110,000. Less than 5% of the total out-migration from London consists of those moving under the officially sponsored New and Expanding Towns Scheme (NETS) - formerly Industrial Selection Scheme - operated jointly with the Department of Employment. 80% of those moving to New Towns and about 30% of those moving to Expanding Towns do not move under the aegis of the NETS, their own employment needs having been met by other means (e.g. transfer with firm, or securing their own employment) or because, as with pensioners, they do not require employment.

The total flow of migrants from London to local authority dwellings in London-related and Expanding Towns (whether or not moving under the NETS) is less than 10% of the total (gross) out-migration. This flow contrasts sharply, in terms of composition, as well as numbers, with the unplanned movement from London (Table 8). As the Table shows, the great majority of those leaving London, mostly under their own arrangements and mainly to private housing, have consisted predominantly of non-manual workers who are likely to have higher incomes and less housing need. The unplanned migration stream is larger in absolute terms and therefore has more far reaching effects on London. Its bias in favour of high-skill/high-income is more serious in its effects than planned migration, even though this also has so far shown some degree of bias in the same direction, with a high proportion of skilled and semi-skilled manual workers in the outflow. The way in which London's employment structure has changed compared with that of the rest of the South-East region and the country
as a whole is shown in Table 47. In particular, manufacturing as a proportion of total employment has been falling much faster in London, and slower in the Rest of the South-East Region (ROSE), than in England and Wales. This trend carries a threat that London's working population and economy will become over-dependent on a narrow range in the service sector. With the changing industrial structure is associated an equally marked change in the occupation structure, away from operative towards office employment.

Between 1961 and 1974, London's manufacturing employment fell by 489,000 - a decline of 34%, with the rate accelerating throughout the period. Between 1961 and 1966 the average rate of loss each year was 1.7%; it increased to 3.3% from 1966 to 1971 and, in the three years from 1971 to 1974, it rose to an annual rate of loss of as much as 4.7%. This rapid decline in London has not been part of a general pattern. Over the same period from 1961 to 1974, the drop in manufacturing employment in England and Wales as a whole was only 5% (compared with London's 34%), while in the rest of the South-East region outside London there was in fact a 21% increase during the period. The fall of 489,000 in manufacturing between 1961 and 1974 was partially offset by an increase of 338,000 (28%) in certain "growth services" (insurance, banking and finance; professional and scientific services, including teaching; public administration and defence; air transport and communications). At the same time the fall was further accentuated by a drop of 245,000 (14%) in other industries and services. The increase of 28% in "growth services" in London is compared with larger increases of 50% for the rest of the South-East region and of 42% for England and Wales; while the decrease of 14% in "other industries and
"services" is compared with a much smaller national decrease of less than 2% and a large increase in the rest of the South-East Region. (See also Table 46).

**TABLE 46**

PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYMENT IN THREE INDUSTRY GROUPS -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greater London</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Growth' Services</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Industries and Services</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rest of SE Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Growth' Services</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Industries and Services</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England and Wales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Growth' Services</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Industries and Services</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1961 Census of Population, corrected for bias.

NOTES: "Growth" Services comprise: Insurance, banking and finance, professional and scientific service, including teaching; public administration and defence; and transport and communications.
## TABLE 47

**EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY GROUPS, GREATER LONDON 1961-74**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Groups</th>
<th>Number (thousands)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office workers</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>1,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;Growth&quot; Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office workers</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other industries and Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office workers</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All industries and Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office workers</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>1,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>4,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1961 Census of Population, corrected for bias
1971 Census of Population

* "Growth" Services - Insurance, banking and finance; professional and scientific services, including teaching; public administration and defence; air transport and communications.
More than thirty years from the designation in 1946 of the first new towns, the policy of planned dispersal of population and industry from London has been vigorously pursued with firm public support. But the above review of the exodus of population and employment to new (and expanding) towns during this period gives cause for concern. The fear that unless planning strategies are modified or reversed to stop out-migration, London and other cities will decline faster than experienced in America, sparked off a public debate which was intensified from 1975 when the effects of the present economic recession became more apparent. As it has already been noted, many have argued that the gradual decline of the cities is the result of the growth of new towns. Others point out that because there are many influences which jointly affect the decline of the cities, it is much more rational to examine possible change in policy direction or some alternative measures. Whilst movement from the cities to new towns has been encouraged by dispersal policy, it is wrong to regard out-migration as the absolute consequence of that policy. As it has been shown, industries normally move to where adequate and cheap premises enable them to expand, to modernise and re-organise in order to persist and to compete effectively. New towns rather than congested cities provide the best opportunity for expansion. Therefore, whether or not dispersal policy is reversal or modified, firms will most likely continue to move out of the cities purely for economic reasons. I have earlier demonstrated also that it is a world trend that people tend to move out of the city centres into the suburbs and beyond the green-belts. In particular, a large proportion of our sample of potential migrants from London expressed the desire to move out of London when they had an opportunity to make a choice between staying or moving out. This finding
was re-affirmed in cabinet by John Silkin, Minister of Planning and Local Government when he expressed the view that London with its present population, is still overcrowded, and that because of the growth of small households, housing shortages will continue to grow. He thought that different studies show that people are still waiting to move out of cities. New towns, therefore, still have some major functions to fulfill in providing housing and satisfying the aspirations of city residents. Further, the primary function of relieving congestion and stress in the cities is still important as the first step towards city replanning and revitalisation. Unfortunately, the relief of stress has not been followed by a sustained policy of renewal and revitalisation comparable to that of dispersal and decentralisation. Resources from Urban Aid, for example, available for renewal programme, are in comparative terms, inadequate. And it may seem that even the redevelopment of Tower Hamlet or inner Liverpool can be described as a disaster. On the other hand, it is often forgotten (see Table 45) that up to 1975, it has cost the country within the last quarter of a century, at least £1,500m. to establish and to develop the new towns to their present stage. By 1975, English and Welsh new towns alone took £7 million in rents and other income; and paid about £5 million to central government - a good return for Exchequer investment.

According to the GLC Report (SPB 44), new and expanding towns programmes: "are now essentially seen as tools of housing policy". Perhaps, it is in the field of providing housing for city residents that new towns continue to play vital role in social and planning policy. The contributions that they have made and will continue to make in solving London's housing problems speak for themselves. In
the five years to 1974 (see table 48) it is estimated that the New Towns and Expanding Towns contributed about 33,000 lettings (12.4%) to the total of 264,000 available to the boroughs and the GLC for new tenants inside and outside London. Over the same five years, about 36% (13,000) of all dwellings completed (36,000) to which the GLC nominated the first tenant were in Expanding Towns (this calculation excludes housing association property). There are no nomination rights to the New Towns and the number of new tenants allocated to Londoners (15,000 in the five year period) were in addition to the construction figures given above. In quantitative terms, these figures represent a considerable and important contribution by the New and Expanding Towns.

As far as actual housing need is concerned, only 25% of those moving to New Towns and 32% of those moving to Expanding Towns contributed directly to relieving high priority housing need. But even so, total housing need of London will continue to grow and will continue to be met by the future contributions of new and expanding towns. It is estimated that there will be a shortage of housing in London, measured as an excess of households over dwellings, of about 157,000 in 1976 (Table 50). In addition to this overall shortage, there is a mismatch between available supply of housing and demand - neither the size nor the distribution of the existing stock corresponds sufficiently closely with the current needs of London's population. The existing stock is also inadequate in another way. Even if the gap between total supply and demand were closed by new building, the problem of increasing obsolescence in the present stock would still present major difficulties. The GLC Strategic Housing Plan, a consultation document,
suggests that the number of dwellings in urgent need of attention will double between 1971 and 1981, and redouble in the following decade to a total of 400,000. Even when a close examination of the existing stock is taken, a particular problem is being generated by the rapid shrinking of the privately rented sector, which declined by 24%, in terms of dwellings available in the sector between 1961 and 1971. This sector of the market has traditionally provided cheaper housing for poorer Londoners and newcomers to the city. The pressures arising from its decline, unfortunately fall disproportionately on the deprived inner areas, where overcrowding and poor conditions are concentrated. Furthermore, the steep rise in homelessness over the past five years provides another symptom of this decline, which local authorities have not, so far, been able to make good.

In the light of the issue stressed in the foregoing comments, what are the prospects of a modification, a change or even a reversal of the existing policy of decentralisation and dispersal? The recent Thirteenth Report of the House of Commons Expenditure Committee recognises "...the increasing concern for the problems of the older, inner parts of the metropolitan areas" and the need "...to consider carefully the implications of the New Town investment programme, in relation to the alternative claims on these resources from existing areas". To a large extent this point sets the tone for the attitude that both the GLC and the Government currently adopt. Both agree on the need to renew and revitalise the cities. The GLC suggests that new and expanding town resources could be switched for use in

### TABLE 48

**HOUSING PERFORMANCE 1970-74**

#### A  ALLOCATIONS

Dwellings available to new tenants from London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLC and London Boroughs (a)</td>
<td>49,881</td>
<td>49,804</td>
<td>44,031</td>
<td>43,803</td>
<td>44,000*</td>
<td>231,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London New Towns (b)</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>14,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Towns ** (b)</td>
<td>4,562</td>
<td>11,099</td>
<td>3,377</td>
<td>4,566</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total New and Expanding Towns 1970-74: (32,724)

TOTAL - all sources 1970-74: 264,243

**Notes:**
- * Estimated
- ** Since 1970, Expanding Towns data has not been available on a calendar year basis.

**Sources:**
- (a) Annual Abstract of GLC Statistics 1970-73
- (b) DoE M288 tables: Migration of Londoners to New and Expanding Towns.

#### B  COMPLETIONS AND ACQUISITIONS (New dwellings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Boroughs</td>
<td>21,965</td>
<td>18,126</td>
<td>15,131</td>
<td>11,473</td>
<td>13,859</td>
<td>80,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLC: in London</td>
<td>4,339</td>
<td>4,256</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>19,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLC: out London</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>3,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Towns</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>1,273*</td>
<td>12,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London needs</td>
<td>(424)</td>
<td>(369)</td>
<td>(281)</td>
<td>(215)</td>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>(1,431)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local needs</td>
<td>(281)</td>
<td>(215)</td>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>(1,431)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Towns (b)</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>17,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 34,050 29,339 24,304 21,246 25,447 134,283

Sub-totals by Agency: London Boroughs 80,554
- GLC in London: 19,350
- GLC out London: 3,771
- Expanding Towns: 12,883
- New Towns: 17,727

134,283

**Notes:** Expanding Towns: The total completions in Expanding Towns have been notionally split 90:10 between London needs and Local needs. Local needs figures are not included in the column totals.

**Sources:** Annual Abstract of Greater London Statistics, Department of the Environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1971 POSITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census enumerated households</td>
<td>2,669.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 1-person households under-</td>
<td>+ 46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enumerated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 'concealed' families in enumerated households</td>
<td>+ 40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE 1971 estimate of 'reasonably separate' dwellings</td>
<td>2,554.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less dwellings vacant at Census</td>
<td>- 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1971 TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>2,454.6 2,755.0 300.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ESTIMATED 1976 POSITION** |               |
| Households projections (GLC Research Memorandum 456) high estimate | 2,642.9 |
| Dwelling stock: DoE 1973 estimate (latest available estimate) | 2,604.5 |
| Plus annual net gain at 16,000 dwellings p.a. for 2½ years | + 40.0 |
| Less vacancies (allowed at 6% of total stock) | - 158.7 |
| **1976 TOTALS** | 2,485.7 2,642.9 157.2 |

city renewal. That decision lies with the government but for all sorts of reasons, it seems unlikely that such a decision can be taken. For example, response to GLC's report on planned growth outside London which suggests, among other things, limitation, scrapping or running down of existing commitments with local authorities in new and expanding town developments, has varied from cautious reception to outright opposition.\(^{148}\) There is a general recognition by local authorities that although London needs extensive resources for urban renewal, yet these resources must not be found at the expense of meeting essential needs outside London, including new and expanding towns. Solution to the problems of the city is likely therefore, to be considered vis-a-vis the problems of the country as a whole. Within the cities themselves, local authorities have their share of the responsibility for renewal. Within London, for example, the problem is being approached from different ways. The Strategic Housing Plan consultation document proposes a co-ordinated programme of action, which, if achieved, would eliminate the qualitative shortage of dwellings by 1981.\(^{149}\) The Plan aims at providing for a household distribution associated with a projected 1981 population of 6.85m. The Secretary of State for the Environment's recent policy statement on the GLDP, while noting that the Plan should refer to the need for a substantial commitment of the same order as the present programme, at the same time accepts that this will need to be kept under review in relation to the changing position on industry, employment and population in London, and the availability of economic resources. The White Paper: Policy for the Inner City,\(^{150}\) contains

\(^{148}\) Planned Growth Outside London (Report_ 22.12.75), Ref. SPB.44, Appendix B.

\(^{149}\) Strategic Housing Plan.

proposals for revitalising the inner cities which indicate not only awareness of the problems but also a commitment to tackle them.

Fundamental to the change in policy are the long-term amendments to the population targets of the six, third generation, New Towns. Their total original aim of 1.5 million people will be reduced by 38,000. At best, this is apparently a token gesture since it does not go far enough in satisfying those that favour running down (albeit, gradually) the new town developments. In fact, this reduction might have a minimal effect but even so not before the next eight years, during which time the momentum of population movement to new towns would remain the same. It is, perhaps, in the fiscal help that the inner cities will obtain in the near future that the effectiveness of the policy change may lie.

The White Paper confirms the increase in the budget for urban programme from £30m a year to £125m in 1979/80. The priority areas are Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, Salford and in London, Lambeth and Docklands. Shortly before the publication of the White Paper, the details of the allocation of a £100m aid for inner cities provided in the March 1977 budget were announced showing that of the £83m due to England, £17m goes to Docklands, £11m each goes to Liverpool, Manchester, Salford, and Birmingham; £5m goes to Lambeth and £2m to London Inner Education Authority (for Docklands and Lambeth also). Inner City Areas, other than those named above have been asked to put forward schemes which will qualify for a share of the remaining £26m. The expenditure is generally intended for the reclamation of land in inner urban areas, the preparation of industrial sites and the rehabilitation of older houses. In addition, the White Paper gives local authorities greater powers to encourage and possibly attract industries to their areas by offering
loans to companies at commercial rates to cover up to 90% of land purchase, building construction or improvements. The location of Offices Bureau (LOB) as well as the Industrial Centre at the GLC whose original role was to encourage office and factory jobs to be decentralized to new towns from the cities will now reverse that role and attract industries to the inner city areas.

In the short run, it is a matter for public debate as to whether or not these measures, in support of a change or modification of policy, will go far enough. But there is little doubt that the measures mark the beginning of a continuing process in the revaluation of the wisdom and incidence of dispersal from the cities. Nevertheless, it is doubtful whether firms, which invariably move out of the urban areas for commercial and economic reasons, will now be attracted back to these areas for sentimental reasons. Will the inner cities provide the facilities for expansion required when prosperous periods arrive? Does the White Paper consider seriously the problem of providing jobs for the unskilled, the poor and the trapped within the inner cities? The aim of the inner city policy must not lead to the mistake of concentrating resources on these areas so much that proper balance in national economic and social development will be affected. With this in view, the revitalisation of the cities and the continuation of new town development must be kept in step with each other.
7.4 Summary and Conclusions

If it is necessary that new towns should continue to perform those positive roles for which many have persuasively argued, there is little doubt from Table 43 that a good number of new towns have got the potential capacity for further developments and population in-take from the cities. Yet, a continuing exodus of population and employment from the cities holds the potential danger of hastening the decline or death of the cities. The problem, therefore, is one of developing policy alternatives and balancing devices that would ensure that while new towns provide alternative habitat for city residents, they do not at the same time, become by deliberate act of policy, such powerful magnets that can make obsolete the cities they were created to serve. The suggestion that the new town developments should be scrapped or/and run down is not only too much of a simplistic and prescriptive measure but also irrational in that it ignores the long-term commitments that have been entered into between Development Corporations and Local Authorities. Similarly, newspaper reports to the effect that the policy of dispersal and decentralisation to new towns should, after more than thirty years, be reversed, are at best, the reflections of the attitude of politicians anxious to calm down public anxieties about the general effects of economic recession and the fate of their cities. Even the recent "Get out of Town" plea for low paid workers from London (Evening Standard: January 12, 1977), fails to recognise that the decision to move by city residents is the product of 'a cost-benefit analysis' carried out differently by people from various social groupings.
When all the factors are, therefore, taken into account, it would appear that the best way into the future is to continue new town developments whilst increasing the resources for the renewal and revitalisation of the cities. By so doing, alternative environments for work and living are thus provided for different sections of the society.
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Chapter 8:
SOCIOLOGY OF PLANNED MIGRATION

8.1 Sociology of Planning: A Functional Evaluation

The application of sociological analysis to planning is intricately interwoven with the understanding of the function of the sociologist in planning. Defined as the application of scientific method to policy-making, planning implies two things. First, the presence of conscious efforts directed to increasing the validity of policies in terms of the present and anticipated future of the environment; and second, the existence of underlying ideas or notions, based on which such policies have been developed. As Faludi points out, validity is an attribute of that process by which (planning) decisions are made. This process involves advisers, suppliers of scientific intelligence, analysts and assessors, interpreters of human needs and aspirations, experts in social behaviour and environmental design and decision-makers. As a social scientist, the sociologist usually claims to be a neutral observer; but when he becomes an adviser, he joins the ranks of activists and participants; so that his social responsibility begins where his neutrality ends. In planning, the sociologist must be seen partly as a social philosopher providing information in various forms from his observations and ideas about the society; and partly as a critic of the assumptions of planning and the ideologies and beliefs of the monitors of public interest. The functions of the Sociologist in the planning

profession ought, therefore, to derive from a body of knowledge that he brings into planning. To understand the knowledge, it is essential to review briefly the substance of the sociology of planning.

Eric Reade states that: "the Sociology of planning (by contrast with urban or rural sociology) is as yet underdeveloped ..... It would concern itself with the social assumptions which underlie planning concepts, with the planning process, and with the planning profession."152 By examining the general conceptions of the nature of planning, specific planning objectives and the planning profession itself, Reede concludes that "sociology of planning should be involved with the study of those ideologies which dominate the activities of planners and the reasons why they hold them; that it involves the study of why specific planning objectives are often rooted in implicit social doctrines of, say, advocate planners, and that it should be involved with the way that the planning profession broadens its orientations and relationships with other disciplines. It is, for example, believed that British planning leaves its underlying assumptions unstated and that there is a reluctance to study the nature of its ideology.153 If these seem to be the outstanding weaknesses of British planning, it seems that the areas of continuous questioning which promotes self-consciousness and the advancement of knowledge in planning ought to be both the planning doctrines and philosophies and their ideologies and assumptions.


A planning ideology seen as a system of ideas may simply provide a general operating rationale for the profession and the basis for justifying a particular activity. These ideas are not systematically set out, neither are the assumptions on which they are based empirically verifiable except that their operations are legitimised by the self-evident truths of their protagonists. As Foley suggests: "While the ideology provides an essential kind of concensus supporting the activity, its self-evident and self-justifying nature may also contribute to a smug and traditional outlook and discourage a healthy self-awareness and sceptical re-examination". With particular regard to new towns Orlans has rightly asserted that much of the ideological content of the post-war new towns development reflected the intellectual orientations of a particular school of social reformers. Indeed, the ideological contents of the new towns development represent partly the translation of the dreams of the philosophy of social transformation and reconstruction; pointing to the fact that ideologies, doctrines and social philosophies provide the contextual framework and hypothesis on which planning ideas are based. Yet, paradoxically, the ideas expressed by the guiding philosophy, in the long run, often become anachronisms and 'ideas fixes'. For example, although the social philosophies of the 19th century reformers, directed to social transformation, were basically the reflections of the social conditions of that period, they have become part of the ruling ideas in planning for the present. This fact explains the need for ideas handed down from the past to be subjected to re-assessment in the light of present

conditions. Sociology of planning must, therefore, partly concern itself with continuously asking searching questions not just about the assumptions and ideas of planners, but also about the intellectual orientations that precede those ideas.

It is relatively easier to identify planning as an activity because its products are visible in buildings and architectural designs, in the construction of roads and in the spatial ordering of the immediate surroundings. It is, however, rather difficult to argue and to demonstrate that planning is a process of social change. Yet, planning may produce such changes which affect the physical nature of the environment as well as the social structure and social relationships. Given this, sociology of planning ought to direct its activity also to the critical examination of the consequences of planning strategies. Slum clearance, for example, is invariably based on the idea that improving the physical quality of the environment is essential for the promotion of a healthy and civilised life. But opposition against redevelopment plans do point to the opposite direction, and often demonstrates that planning ideas and conceptions often reflect the judgement of planners and not necessarily the needs and aspirations of people. Norman Dennis deals excellently with the problem of distortion and interpretation of needs of the ordinary people by the planner who, as he puts it, is responding both to political processes and to his own judgement as a professional. Planned migration, similarly, has its own ideologies and assumptions about social benefits. But as I

156. Foley, Ibid., p. 217.

have shown, when they form the basis of public policy, their potentialities for bringing about changes in demographic structures, are significant even though they are surprisingly not always appreciated or evaluated. It seems, therefore, essential that all the social influences, the doctrines and ideas on which planned migration was developed must similarly be subjects of critical evaluation in the sociological analysis of planning. Viewed as an ideology, planned migration needs to be equally sociologically evaluated for its validity. The test for such validity will depend partly on the critical assessment of its contribution to planning policy, and partly through an empirical examination of the planning strategies which were developed through it.

One of the most original and significant contributions to the development of the sociology of planning has been made by Ruth Glass. Basically, her approach can be summed up by the following remarks: "It is in the appraisal of planning principles and processes that the main contribution of sociology to planning can and should be made". Although it is not necessarily the prerogative of sociologists to evaluate social policy and administration, yet as social analysts and philosophers, they are professionally qualified to evaluate policies, interpret planning concepts and by and large carry out studies of value judgements on which planning is based. They may also undertake studies for the purpose of developing and applying criteria of appraisal.

Glass says that such studies should constitute a continuing process and should have several branches, prominent among which will be the following:

1. The social history of those ideas which are implicit or explicit in planning policies. An awareness of their content and genesis, is essential for making the planning process self-conscious and for preventing such concepts from becoming 'ideas fixes'. Thus, for example, the concept of 'Garden City' or/and 'Social City' as alternative habitats can be better understood and appreciated if kept in constant historical perspective, at least, in terms of the social conditions that generated the ideas; and in terms of the prevailing social philosophies of the time, these ideas were developed.

2. An investigation of the factual evidence for, and socio-economic changes relevant to particular planning principles, and also to particular areas. It will be necessary here, for example, to make continuous investigations that test specific planning principles relating, say, to the distribution of urban settlements by types and size. A systematic study of planned migration can test, at least, the influence of planned migration on demographic structure and patterns of settlement in new towns. Other relevant studies could include assessment of the effects of migration on structure of population and industry; location and use of amenities, often discussed under the neighbourhood theory; journeys to work; and transport and linkages between different land uses and activities.

3. Studies on the administration of planning. This group of studies underline the importance of evaluating the influence of planning agencies in the way that policy decisions are made as well as in
identifying how such agencies interpret, administer and control policy directives. In the case of new towns, for example, such studies may direct attention to the interpretation that a Development Corporation gives to the planning principles of "self-containment and balance"; or the way that the GLC interprets 'housing need' in implementing the policy of providing housing for those in need. Similarly, in pursuing a policy of helping Londoners to migrate to new towns, such studies need to examine the necessary and sufficient criteria for selection in the recruitment of new town population.

What ought to be the goals of planning is a question which has provoked much comment among sociologists. That is whether, for example, planning should be concerned with land use or physical design; or whether or not it should be directed to the creation of an appropriate physical environment that can optimally satisfy social needs. Accepting planning to be a process, or a mechanic for influencing changes in our environment, the goals of planning are easily conceived as the by-product of planned change. It matters less whether that change affects the physical nature of the surroundings; whether it was desired to alter social relationships, the structure of the population and the pattern of settlement. It is not important whether it was intended to bring about the re-allocation of land for various uses, the distribution of national income or the re-ordering of institutional arrangements. Paul Davidoff and Thomas Reiner have shown that a theory

of planning directed to the problems of **Effectuation** can reconcile the divergence of opinions on planning goals. By defining planning as a process for determining appropriate future action through a sequence of choices, they hold the view that planning is a type of behaviour or action directed to relating general ends to particular ends. In other words, as a method, planning is concerned with choosing appropriate course of action to satisfy certain ends. They, however, avoid the problem of defining objectives first, and rather prefer to explain planning as an act. Davidoff and Reiner emphasize that the planner can by adopting the right method, effectively and skillfully influence change. Planning process, can, for example, be usefully employed to widen and to publicise the range of choice of future conditions, goals or means. This function can be extended so as to include the widening of opportunities to enable choices to be made. In discussing the goals of planning in British town planning, Donald Foley distinguishes between three major functions which planners tend to pursue namely:

1. To reconcile competing claims for the use of limited land so as to provide a consistent, balanced and orderly arrangement of land uses.

2. To provide a good (or better) physical environment: a physical environment of such good quality is essential for the promotion of a healthy and civilised life.

---

161. **Effectuation** has been used by Davidoff and Reiner to refer to the administration of planning development programmes and the exercise of controls by executives (officers or agencies). The use of the New and Expanding Town Scheme to administer and control planned migration is an example. The administrators devise their rules and forms of control. The N.E.T. Scheme, for example, is an administrative machinery in the control and monitoring of population movement to new and expanding towns; it has its own rules and procedure in the Selection of migrants.

(3) Providing the physical basis for better urban life. The main ideals toward which town planning is to strive are:
(a) The provision of low-density residential areas
(b) The fostering of local community lifes; and
(c) The control of conurban growth.

Foley maintains that these functions are ideologically based, i.e. they are derived from basic ideas and beliefs of dominant groups of people which planners seek to put into operation. The existence of goals presupposes that there is a consensus (and no conflicts of interest) in the determination of such goals. On the contrary, the goals or functions of planning are invariably based on the normative judgements, ideologies and values of those people in Society who exercise political and economic powers. James Simmie in his book: Citizens in Conflict, aims at exploding the myth that town planning is an objective, rational, and political professional activity conducted in the public interest. He argues that instead of the normative assumption that underlies planning goals pursued in public interest, there is the continuous struggle for the acquisition of scarce resources and power reflected in the conflicting ideologies of different social classes or groups with opposed interests. Planning, as Simmie points out, in this situation becomes a problem of why some objectives rather than others should be sought for. The question that needs asking is, therefore, how the Sociologist could make an impact in planning in which he is relatively a new-comer.

It is in the interpretation of what they profession is concerned with that demonstrates attitudes of planners towards those that may be regarded as "outsiders" - an attitude that very much affects recruitment into the profession. The planning profession, basically an amalgam of several old ones - architectural design, engineering (including public health), and surveying, has a long history. Each of these branches has already established high professional standards and strong organisations of their own. The Royal Town Planning Institute, Town and Country Planning Institutes and Associations, and other Planning Movements have encouraged and recognised them; and Governments have always included departments in their administrative structure and machinery which give credence to their functions in town planning. They have become established and recognised specialists operating as technical experts. As can be expected, they jealously guard their specialisation and show little urge to establish new relations nor even question the reasons for the instructions they carry out which are usually comfortably explicit.

However, they need not question underlying assumptions of their activities since, as Ruth Glass says: "these disciplines are not taught so as to produce scientific curiosity and a scientific attitude". 164 The attitude of planners from these disciplines to sociologists is typically to regard them as those who supply information of a factual kind, which have unambiguous implications for policy. Thus sociologists have, in the main, been engaged to carry out social surveys: sometimes

164. Ruth Glass, See Faludi, Ibid., p. 54.
to provide facts on which plans will depend; sometimes providing inventory and appraisal for plans already produced, and often called upon to evaluate (post facto) the social implications of planned projects. Although physical planners have obviously engaged in significant piecemeal social engineering, they are invariably aware of the lack of relevant information about social problems and social phenomenon which are linked with their activity. Yet sociologists who are best qualified to supply this crucial information are invited to do so only generally in terms of handling peripheral issues. The dictum 'survey-before-policy' sums up the only function which planners tend to credit the sociologist to perform in planning. Many, if not all the master plans for new town development can at best be regarded as the product of the kind of preliminary surveys usually associated with sociologists. But Ruth Glass's study of Middlesborough particularly pointed to possible technical and theoretical guidance that such surveys could additionally provide the physical planner. The Middlesborough study, for example, recommended the delimitation of neighbourhoods; advised on the location of services and institutions, and suggested the directions of transportation lines. These, in themselves, raise theoretical sociological implications for planning, namely: the importance of a theoretical backing to planning decisions; the need for interdisiplinary approach to planning; and the mutual enrichment of the dialogue that the approach can generate.

All things considered, even though planners drawn from architecture, engineering, geography and surveyors, may have typically seen the function of the sociologist as one of 'providing factual information for policy making', it seems that the sociologist's most valuable contribution must be seen in terms of the assistance he can give to the profession to examine its own assumptions and hence to advance its theory. The potentialities of the sociologist in stimulating the kind of self-awareness necessary to planning has already been described by Glass as: "the sceptical habits of thought of the social sciences which might help to advance self-consciousness in planning". His contributions to planning, therefore, ought to include the development of a monitoring system for re-assessment of the planning process; and the evolvement of satisfactory theories that can bridge the gap between planning ideologies and planning practices. The process of evaluation is basic to the contribution of sociology to planning. Whether the evaluation is directed at the philosophy, the principles, or at the social influences in the history of planning ideas, the sociologist must constantly question their sources, validity and relevance before they are translated into planning policies. As Ruth Glass points out: "It is undoubtedly the ideology of planning, far more than techniques of design and administration, which needs to be considered and advanced. Planning without social policy does not make sense, and social policy without systematic thought and research is liable to become meaningless and eventually unacceptable....."

and empirical testing. And the need for monitoring planning activities and their results imply that the profession must have a means of assessing its work, of welcoming appraisal, and by being receptive to findings and responsive to trends and opinions. Planning as a profession can achieve more, make progress and gain greater credibility if it is not monopolised by one branch of knowledge no matter how much relatively longer a branch has been established. An inter-disciplinary approach is more fruitful and the mutual advantage derived from a continuing dialogie between the various disciplines involved in the pursuit of the same interest is certainly a necessity.

8.2 Development of Sociology of Planned Migration

The ultimate aim of this research is to delineate and develop a distinctive area of knowledge within the sociology of planning to be known as Sociology of Planned Migration. The development of the concept of planned migration follows from an examination of the history of thought, government intervention and policy measures which have been directed at changing the physical surroundings and to improving the general social conditions of people in society, at least, within the past fifty years. By definition, planned migration refers to rational and systematic planning for dispersing and decentralising national population, offices and industries from cities to new towns, sponsored, encouraged and backed by clearly defined public policy and measures. It is therefore, a method and a process in planning directly influenced by government intervention, and combines public policy and measures with administrative control and central direction. Planned migration is an example of 'planned change' whose goal has been globally
defined in terms of social transformation that brings benefits to the masses. It is this ambiguity in goal-definition, that the frames of reference in migration decision-making have tried to expose. It has been demonstrated that the planner's notion of public good has been defined only in terms of creating physical environments of some quality believed to be essential for the promotion of a healthy and civilized life. These prescriptions when matched against the aspirations and needs of people have differed markedly from reality. This point becomes more apparent when the ideology of planned migration is compared with the preferences of migrants expressed in their migration decisions. Migrants demonstrated that physical design is not enough in creating happiness; nor could the aspirations of city residents be defined in terms of reducing the population density. The notion of public good as an aim of planned migration, has not only been shown to conflict with the needs and aspirations of people, but its administration has also adopted methods which tend to exclude the very poor who were intended to benefit from the declared objectives.

A feature of new town development is that intrinsically it combines the processes of social development with social reconstruction. As a social development it contains all the main elements of a revolutionary process: the creation of new community with internal growth and differentiation, continuity and diffusion, and self-selection; and the direction of that growth towards further developments and general progress. By the rational act of dispersing national population and economic activities, it is possible to alter at will not only the pattern of human settlements but also redistribute more evenly both
present and future population. By the same token, the structure of the population at the new centres of growth can be changed. Thus, planned migration, has been used as a mechanic for social change, a process of social evolution and a method in planning.

The movement of population away from the highly urbanised large cities of the world is relatively a new phenomenon compared with the rural-urban migration of the industrial revolution. Movement out of the city centres may indeed be regarded as a behaviour characteristic of city residents in the post-industrialised societies. It is partly associated with the image of the cities as places of overcrowding, poverty and crime; and as places where the social conditions of living are rejected by the well-to-do in terms of their insanitary and unhealthy surroundings and their rapid decline in physical attraction. The squalor and the ugly faces of the cities were the pre-occupation of many critical comments by writers as well as the concern of many 19th century social philosophers and utopian reformers who were so moved as to propose the transformation of society by physical re-planning and the building of new and decent alternative settlements. The works of Robert Owen, James Buckingham, Edwin Chadwick, Sir Benjamin W. Richardson, W.H. Lever, George Cadbury and others, represent the beginning of physical and social reconstruction as a result of the effects of industrialisation. While the doctrine of laissez-faire prevailed, only the lucky few who were provided with homes in the new settlements built by industrialists and the rich, could escape from the deteriorating conurbations.
Ebenezer Howard shares one common quality with utopian, advocate planners and social philosophers, namely: the possession of the power of rational persuasion backed by ideas and convictions for change. The new town idea, for example, may carry with it a basic anti-metropolitan philosophy, yet its implicit belief in the virtues of small scale and controlled urban development is ideologically its persuasive strength. The same argument holds for the different purposes which the new towns were thought to promote. Lloyd George, after the first World War viewed new towns as providing "homes fit for heroes"; Ebenezer Howard himself called them "Social Cities"; Lord Reith Committee wanted them to serve as "self-contained and balanced communities for work and living"; and urban planners see new towns as "experiments in social and urban development".

Apparently romantic, elusive and rather difficult to interpret practically, these descriptions, nevertheless, have persuasive appeal. But as links in the same chain, they re-inforce the belief in an absolute design solution to the social problems associated with the congestion of cities - a belief currently held as a central feature of British town planning. In other words, British town planning is said to be based on the firm belief that the physical quality of the environment directly determines human character and social structure, so that physical reconstruction of the environment is regarded as a universally valid measure that promotes happiness and the good life. This ideology is believed to have apparently influenced the development of new towns because the policy of dispersal and decentralisation is firmly based on the need to de-congest the cities, to rebuild them on more open plans, and for their excess industry and population to be
offered better accommodation in decentralised situations in new towns. Nevertheless, the complete acceptance of this basic ideology has blurred a full and comprehensive understanding of the social implications of altering the structure of the physical environment by planning. Attention has been drawn in this research to the fact that in some cases, community, social ties and linkages are more important for some people than the physical design. Even those who showed interest in the quality of the environment focussed on the natural features more than on the man-made alterations. However, whether or not the goals of planned migration converge with the needs and aspirations of city residents, the conclusion that is reached is that new towns are the expressions of ideologies and philosophies associated with social reconstruction.

8.3 The Substantive Issues in the Sociology of Planned Migration

What issues, pursued on a continuing basis, should provide Sociology of Planned Migration with the features that make it a distinctive area of knowledge within sociology of planning? In terms of function and approach, sociology of planned migration, like sociology of planning itself, must be essentially evaluative. In addition to those functions outlined above which sociology of planning broadly deals with, the following are the issues which, I propose, ought to be the specific concern of sociology of planned migration:

1. The critical evaluation of the history, ideology and philosophy of dispersal and decentralisation of urban population and industries to new towns. In particular, the critical assessment of the implications of the concepts of 'Self-containment and
balance, social city, etc., for new town development. The aim of such assessment must be to maintain continuity in questioning the assumptions, value judgements and ideas on which new town development is based; as well as the development and application of the criteria of appraisal. In this way, self-awareness and the process of re-evaluation on which the advancement of knowledge depends, will be promoted. The current debate on the relevance of the policy of dispersal and decentralisation to new towns and the renewal of cities, seems healthy in so far as it is a process of appraisal in which the participants are members of the wider society.

2. A study of or investigation into the conflicts between policy aims and administrative objectives. The administration of planned migration policy to new towns is normally vested in a government agency or agencies. It involves setting up administrative machinery which develops its own rules and procedures to implement policy directives. The GLC, the Ministry of Trade and Industry, the Department of the Environment and the Department of Employment share the administrative and controlled responsibilities for transferring workers and industry to new towns, through the New and Expanding Town Scheme. These bodies (through the Scheme) determine who moves to a new town. It may be the policy aim that those in housing need must have preference for housing allocation in a new town. But rules and procedures of NET Scheme may be such that other categories of people rather move. A continuing re-evaluation of this kind of administrative selectivity of new town migrants is necessary if informed modifications can be made on existing policy instruments.
3. A study of the contributions of new town development to social policy, national economic development and regional planning. In addition to an evaluation of the achievement of the original aims of creating new towns, their contribution must be seen in a wider context.

4. A systematic study of the consequences of planned migration. As a mechanism of social evolution, the effects of planned migration must be assessed in terms of its impact on demographic characteristics and the social structure of new towns; and on the effects on population distribution and changing settlement patterns for the country as a whole.

5. Sociology of planned migration viewed as a monitoring system, must concern itself with the study of phenomena connected with mobility generally. For example: the internal migration process, migration decision-making, social mobility based on residential location and housing. What effects has movement to new towns on family life, community ties, style of life, class structure in a new town, voting behaviour of migrants in a new town, etc? Whose city will the new town be by the year 2000: a city of technicians, professionals and skilled manual workers? Will the new town be a melting pot, promoting one class community, possibly middle class suburbanites?.

6. Sociology of Planned Migration should develop as one of its aims the provision of a focal point for inter-disciplinary dialogue between sociologists, architects, surveyors, engineers, geographers, economists and strategic planners. Such dialogue is fundamental if sociology must influence planners to equip their
decisions with theoretical backing.

7. Sociology of Planned migration must continuously evaluate new situations and circumstances in which the new town idea as an instrument and technique of planning, can be usefully applied. For example, how and with what modifications can the new town idea be applied to national planning in developing countries? It seems that it is in this context that the historical and philosophical thinking that preceded the new town idea can be resurrected to play significant roles in new situations.
Chapter 9

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The aims of the research on which this thesis is based were: that of developing the concept of planned migration; providing a descriptive account of a typical planned migration as a background for studying attitudes to migration and the various stages of transition in moving from the inner city to a new town; providing a theoretical explanation to planned migration decisions to new towns, including the frame of reference on which the decisions were made, and exploring the wider theoretical issues and policy implications, raised by planned population movement. These aims have been pursued by testing the hypothesis that the migration decision of city residents tend to be motivated by the desire to satisfy non-work aspirations. I believe that the hypothesis has been substantially confirmed and that the aims have been reasonably achieved. It is necessary in this concluding chapter to focus on, develop or re-state some of the points and conclusions which I regard as relatively more important to the thesis.

In developing the concept of planned migration, it was essential to recall the part played by the ideological and philosophical contributions of reformers and advocate planners, such as Ebenezer Howard, in influencing public opinion, and government intervention, so as to provide the legislative instruments and the administrative machinery which translated the dream for social transformation into programmes of physical reconstruction. By legislation, a policy of progressive dispersal and decentralisation of population and industries from the large conurbations to new towns permanently established two main
features of the concept of planned migration, namely: a rational and planned re-distribution of national population, sponsored by the government and backed by a clear policy; and, the use of new towns as purposely-built, developed and complete communities for work and living in absorbing the dispersed population. These features imply that planned migration is clearly distinguishable from unplanned migration. Whereas the later refers to the movement of individuals and groups of people from different locations to destinations chosen by them, the former involves the simultaneous movement of people, industries or offices from given locations (the cities), to given destinations (the new towns), directed, controlled and administered by public body or bodies. It is in this context that the creation of new towns and their development since 1946 should be understood.

Planned movement of population has, therefore, become an important feature of the social and physical planning policy of the United Kingdom developed within the past forty years. Its effects extend to significant changes in the overall redistribution of the national population, current settlement pattern and variation in population concentration. The effects also include the creation of new centres of growth and the redistribution of amenities; as well as in significantly influencing national economic development and regional planning. The more specific policy implication raised by planned population movement will be summarised later.

Given a policy of dispersal and decentralisation to new towns, the question which the thesis examines is how the city residents make the choice between moving out to live and work in a new town or staying behind in the city. It seemed necessary to conduct the research within
a situation in which the decision-making process clearly involved the exercise of choice between the two alternatives. That situation was an occasion in which a firm moving out of London to relocate in a new town offered its workers the opportunity of choosing to move or to stay behind. Case study of four firms moving out of London to relocate in new and expanding towns provided the ideal situation. The descriptive account of the preparations, including the managerial orientation stimuli directed to conditioning and inducing workers; the various incentives offered to workers to enable them to make their minds up; the various familiarisation processes undertaken so as to clear the way for adaptation; the meaning that workers attached to relocation and the tensions and reactions of workers, all this enabled me to draw some very interesting and perhaps provocative conclusions about the attitudes of workers to moving and managerial behaviour in relocation.

First, migration studies, heavily relying on the push-pull hypothesis, invariably tend to regard migration as governed by the events before and after the move. This division, therefore, cuts off the migration process itself which, in fact, deals with human conditions and experiences and with the immediate task of sifting information, responding to influences and deciding on taking the plunge or not. These factors, present in the complex migration process need to be analysed and related to the inter-play of a variety of other variables. On the contrary, an examination of the various stages of transition through which the potential migrant passes before moving or deciding to stay behind has either been scantily treated or regarded as unimportant or indeed, taken for granted. Yet without a clear understanding of
this process, migration cannot be justified as a social change, nor
can the nature of migration decision-making be better understood.
It was to remedy this omission that a descriptive account of
migration process was undertaken particularly to demonstrate:

(a) That migration process involves three stages (not two):
    Before, During and After.

(b) That in planned migration, the second stage (during the process
    of moving), is dominated by the in-put of managerial action
    directed to making migration work (Management Orientation
    Stimuli).

(c) That the three stages are linked with each other. An activity
    taking place within one stage takes into account and is
    affected by another activity that may take place within another
    stage. Thus, as the worker responds to the management
    incentive to move, he is also considering simultaneously his
    situation in the old as well as in the new environment.
    Similarly, as he decides whether to move or stay behind, he
    is at the same time considering uprooting and adapting.

(d) That the dichotomy of Before-and-After is a fallacy, because
    between the two events, there is an intermediate stage within
    which crucial events, including decision-making itself takes place.

An examination of the planned migration process indicates that
migration behaviour is better understood when viewed as a process of
social change. Describing social change as a process responsive to
many types of change such as changes in man-made conditions of living;
changes in the attitudes, beliefs and ideas of men; and the changes that go beyond human control to biological and physical nature of things, MacIver and Page were emphasizing the point that a shift in work and residential location especially over a reasonable distance, involves not only new places, but also new faces, new norms and (new) physical habitat. 169 For many, migration is a journey into the unknown, involving new experiences. Indeed, movement over physical space implies the crossing of social system boundaries whether the systems are defined in terms of national entities, regional subcultures, immediate kinship and friendship networks, professional or recreational associations or mere street and neighbourhood acquaintances. The migrant leaves behind the supports as well as the stresses of the exporting system from which he departs. He looses the support of physical familiarity, social attachments, and long-term relationships and values acquired, learned or internalized over the years whilst growing up. An element of dis-sociation from the familiar world is involved in migration; that is a transition from the old and an involvement with a new environment and a new context of physical and social relationships. The new environment is usually unfamiliar, so that a new process of familiarisation is required. To be able to set into motion the necessary processes of adaptation and adjustment, familiarisation requires new attitudes, re-socialisation, and the development of new attachments and social net works. Generally, however, a migrant to a new environment carries with him much of the old habits and values, although how much of these will depend upon age, personality, sex, ethnicity and the particular circumstances of the move. It is, therefore, true that the migrant might have been excited by new stimuli, expectations and prospects of satisfying long standing aspirations; but at the same time, he was confronted with new threats from anticipations about the unknown as well as from the problems of uprooting from a familiar environment so as to adjust into a new one.

The study of planned migration process enables us to understand the changes in the circumstances of the migrant, the problem of having to move away from a familiar environment and the basic reasons why people are generally reluctant to make a change. It has also enabled us to understand the various adaptive responses and defence mechanisms from our respondents directly generated by the threat of a change of their environment.

Second, the meaning that both management and workers attached to out-migration was, on the whole, the major determinant of attitudes to moving, the response to management incentives for workers, and of the drop-out rate. The subjective meaning and interpretation that workers individually attached to the opportunity to move to a new town underlines the significance of the Weberian action theory and of the interactionist approach in sociology to the explanation of behaviour. It is to be expected that different workers interpreted the situation differently and therefore attached different meanings to moving. To the management of migrant firms, moving out of London was an opportunity to reorganise and to expand so as to survive and remain competitive. To some workers, moving out of London was an occasion to realise outstanding aspirations and satisfy important needs; while to others, the price tag for moving out was too high and the advantages were outweighed by the disadvantages. Subjective interpretation of the situation was not only a classificatory factor distinguishing Movers and Non-movers; it was also to become the prime determinant of attitudes, behaviour and the volume of movement ultimately achieved. In order to ensure that relocation was successfully completed, management had the duty of preparing, conditioning
and inducing workers to make the move. But the way that workers responded, especially to the offer of financial assistance and incentives, suggests that workers in general, had aspirations and needs to-satisfy which no size of monetary incentives could provide. In other words, moving or staying was good enough an instrument to enable such aspirations to be satisfied without the assistance of financial incentives. Nevertheless, a small proportion of workers needed help to enable them to move; and almost all the workers benefitted from the familiarisation process. Yet, managerial ideology and philosophy about the nature of the working man on which the offer of financial assistance and incentives were based, did not seem to have helped to sway the workers away from the direction in which their interpretation of the situation appeared to have enabled them to move. Indeed, inspite of the conditioning processes and the offer of incentives, only 41% of staff was, on average, transferred to the new location; and more than half of the respondents (59%) preferred to stay behind. It would seem that in planned migration, more attention of the management ought to be directed to providing the worker with more information about the move, especially about the new location, and about the essentials of adapting into a new environment. It seems also that the notion of the working man as simply an economic man is becoming increasingly an obsolete aspect of managerial ideology. Managerial behaviour towards workers needs a major revolution, away from the rabble hypothesis and rather towards greater understanding of workers' non-work aspirations.
Turning to the actual decision-making process, it is essential not only to examine the determinants of and the constraints on mobility but also to determine the frame of reference on which the decisions were made. Movers, inspite of the attractions that new town has for them, still valued city life in some important ways. But they had to sacrifice the advantage of staying in the city in order to satisfy other relatively more important needs and aspirations. Similarly, while Non-movers had obvious reasons for not taking the opportunity to move, they certainly were also aware of the advantages that moving to a new town could offer. The advantages of new towns they could not have were sacrificed in order that they may retain the advantages of staying in the city. This implies that in order to arrive at the decision to move or to stay, migrants were involved in a rough calculation of relative advantages and disadvantages before choosing one thing or the other. That is to say, migration decision-making was based on a kind of cost-benefit analysis. On the credit side, Movers took into account the new town environment, their housing need, concern over work and career, family and the children's upbringing, the state of London's environment and other personal matters. On the debit side, they took into account the losses arising from dis-sociation from community, family and social attachment; poor amenities of new towns, possible higher cost of living and the problems of adapting into a new environment. For Non-movers, calculating and balancing of gains and losses for staying behind took a similar pattern, although the significance they attached to communal, familial attachment, social networks, and what new towns could offer them was apparently relatively higher than it was for Movers. However, whether we are referring to Movers or Non-movers, a group of common factors on which
respondents based their migration decisions emerged as follows: -
environmental quality, housing need and concern over neighbourhood,
work and career progression, community and social networks and
associations, the family and children's welfare. Among the Movers,
only 17% of the reasons for moving was attributable to work and
career, the remaining 83% accounted for the pursuit of satisfying
non-work aspirations and needs. In particular, movement to new
towns because of their environmental quality accounted for 23% of
all reasons, while housing need accounted for 21%. On the other
hand, the major constraints on movement were attachment to the
community (15%) family and personal problems (28%), loss of contacts
(16%), work (14%), and lack of adequate urban amenities of new towns
(10%).

At least two main factors suggest that there was a significant
application of rationality in the decision-making process, namely:
the subjective interpretation and the meaning that workers attached
to the opportunity to move to a new town; and the rough calculus of
costs and benefits involved in the choice between moving or staying.
As already noted, the needs and aspirations that respondents wished to
satisfy by moving or staying were not affected by the size of financial
assistance they would have got from their employers, nor by any actual
or promised incentives. It is, therefore, reasonable to infer that
for some respondents, especially the Movers, the decision to move was,
in fact, an instrument for the satisfaction of a set of needs and
aspirations - housing, career progression, a better environment in
which to bring up children. On the other hand, some movers were
leaving the city because its environment no longer commanded the
respectability which matched their social status; others were leaving because they hoped to be residentially located in an environment which enhanced their social standing. It seemed, therefore, that a movement to a new town was both a route to status maintenance as well as status enhancement in the same way that patterns of consumption, style of life, and patterns of child-rearing may determine class distinctions. It was tempting to draw the conclusion that mobility to new towns, especially by members of the working class city residents, could be interpreted as a new and emerging process of the embourgeoisement of the working class. This seemed particularly plausible when we take into account the enthusiasm of respondents to move who were identified as working class people from the migrant firms, from the stress area of Islington, and from a sample of those already settled in a new town. There were, nevertheless, Movers who moved either because movement to a new town is an aspect of the retreat into the suburbs, or because they wanted to join their friends or relatives already living in a new town. In other words, the rational action of workers in migration decision-making involved the application of Weber's Zweck rational (instrumental action), Wert rational (value-orientated action) and effectual action (emotional action). Or using Pareto's typology of action, the actions of respondents were both logical and non-logical: where logical action approximates to instrumental action, and non-logical action approximates to Weber's affectual action. The actions of Non-movers, were similar to those of Movers in this context. For, while some of them stayed behind as a result of their rational  

calculations of losses and benefits, others did not wish to move as a result of their sentimental attachment to their environment. Thus, moving or staying behind in each case, was the instrument for achieving the given ends of the worker, whilst at the same time serving as the end in itself.

It is important to bring into focus the meaning and implication of the kind of comparison between the new town environment and the (inner) city environment which respondents constantly made because of its contribution to the propensity to move. Especially for Movers, the comparison between the contents and the quality of the two environments was a major frame of reference in the decision to move. The extent to which London's environment had deteriorated in terms of congestion, age, health, etc., compared with the clean, healthy, respectable environment of the new town was an important consideration. On the other hand, the new town has a low-level of social investments compared with the inner city area. While the inner city environment may have lost some of its respectability, it was still highly valued by many in terms of its rich urban amenities and facilities. But, the new town, inspite of its attractions, is still inadequately provided for especially with those facilities which form part of the urban environment. If the policy of dispersal and decentralisation encourages the development of an alternative urban community in new towns, it seems logical and necessary that the new town environment (in terms of content) must be a replica of the inner city environment. It seems that the failure to reproduce the urban environment in new towns has contributed significantly to the unwillingness to migrate to new towns by those who could have wished to do so from the cities.
For those who managed to move in spite of this basic lack, the problem of adaptation seemed much greater. Their migration decision-making was, therefore, partly an adaptive response to the change of a familiar environment and partly a process of re-establishing the interactions with the factors and institutions within the new town environment. The socio-spatial interaction model (fig. 8, p185) illustrates the complexity of these processes.

What connections, if any, have the attitudes and the decisions of the respondents with their characteristics? Can we put respondents into categories and predict their propensity to move? These questions can be examined by considering the age, social class, ethnic composition and educational attainments of respondents; and their objective characteristics and socio-psychological traits. Although the tendency for younger people migrating was confirmed, the proportion of those between the age of 35 and 65 who moved was similar to that for those who did not. But it was surprisingly higher than the proportion of much younger people between the age of 25 and 35. It would have been expected that the older people are, the less mobile they become. In this case, it was different: more older workers moved than the younger ones. The migration behaviour of respondents according to their social class showed remarkable differences. The proportion of skilled manual workers who moved was smaller than the proportion that remained behind (14% and 18%, respectively). Compared with ISS Registrants, Greater London residents and migrants already in new towns, the higher proportion of Non-movers seems inexplicable. There was also a high proportion of both Movers and Non-movers within the Semi-skilled group; but with the unskilled workers a higher proportion
(22%) moved compared with 16% that did not. Taking the semi-skilled and the unskilled workers together, the high proportion of both groups that moved (61%) was one of the most surprising findings of the research. Compared with ISS Registrants, and with other migrants of the same socio-economic group who are already in new towns or resident within the GLC area, this proportion is revealing. More so, when compared with the general assumption about the immobility of the working class and with the findings of other studies, it seems plausible again to infer that movement to new town by the working class appears to hold some kind of new hope in the realisation of aspirations that cannot otherwise be satisfied in the inner city environment. Similarly, the proportion of Non-manual workers, Professional and Technicians who stayed behind instead of moving was strikingly very high compared with the proportion that moved, the proportion of Islington stress area residents that moved, and with migrants already in new towns. Although this was partly explained by the fear of the workers in this group of lack of alternative jobs in new towns, it raises a much more general question about the age and social class composition of migrants to new towns. Similarly, the ethnic composition of respondents explains, in part, why ethnic minorities are relatively too few in new towns. Unfortunately, the migration behaviour of ethnic minority respondents did not provide any clear picture about the small proportion of minorities in new towns. However, it seemed that those who decided not to take the chance to move did so because of perceived fear of hostility and discrimination.

It is in order to throw more light on the obstacles to the mobility of ethnic minorities that a further study is currently being undertaken. On the educational attainment of respondents, an equally surprising picture emerged. A higher proportion of Non-movers was made up of people who either learned a trade, or hold professional qualifications or/and university degrees. Here again, the finding contradicts existing evidence from migration studies which generally indicate that the highly qualified and well educated tend to be much more mobile.

Why then, it may be asked, are the findings about the migration behaviour of respondents in terms of their age, social class and educational attainment so different from the conclusions of existing or past studies? A possible explanation may come from the very nature of planned migration itself in which movement involves the worker, his job and his organisation. In other words, where the migrant already has a job to go to, an employer supporting or encouraging his movement, and a designated destination, it seems likely that his migration behaviour may not be determined by what are known as selective influences - age, sex, social class, skill and education. The very fact that planned migration offers the worker a choice between moving or staying suggests that considerations other than the known constraining influences are more likely to determine his choice. Thus, old age was more likely (for some people) to determine

---

172 This study was proposed and launched by the author for and on behalf of the Community Relations Commission, now succeeded by the Commission for Racial Equality. It is financed by the Department of the Environment, and it is entitled: "The Movement of Ethnic Minorities to New and Expanding Towns".
migration decision, particularly in those cases where a move meant an opportunity to own a country cottage to retire into eventually. On the other hand lack of alternative jobs in new towns was likely to discourage even the most qualified and the most professionally equipped worker from moving. It seems reasonable to conclude that in planned migration, what selects the migrants are not the objective characteristics but their needs and aspirations. It is, therefore, possible to put migrants into categories according to their aspirations, their psychological qualities in so far as these determine their propensity to move.

Summary of Findings

1. For moving firms, out-migration from the city was construed as a rational action most likely to ensure the survival of the organisation. To Movers, moving to a new town was an opportunity to realise outstanding aspirations; and to Non-movers, attachments to the city and the poverty of new towns were strong constraints on mobility.

2. The workers' response to management conditioning and inducements to move and the drop-out rate achieved in the firms taken together significantly summarised attitudes to moving. The drop-out rate was 59%. This implies that while the firms, on average, transferred only 41% of their staff, 59% of their workers actually did not favour the idea of moving.

3. Migration decision-making has been shown to be an adaptive response to the change of environment, and is based on a cost-benefit analysis of relative advantages and disadvantages. The decision-making
unit is the household, not the worker alone.

4. The frame of reference on which migration decisions was made was multi-dimensional based on: Environmental quality, Housing need, family life and welfare, Community ties and associations, work and career. While 17% of the considerations in migration decisions related to work and career, 83% was about the satisfaction of non-work aspirations.

5. The proportion of those who moved was higher among middle-aged and older workers, than among younger ones; more workers from the working class group moved than those who come from the middle class group. More people with formal training, and with professional and university education, tended to stay behind than those who were less qualified. Very few people from ethnic minority group took the opportunity to move.

6. Contrary to general belief and from evidence of existing studies, respondents from the working class group showed some unexpected and extraordinary interest in moving to new town. Up to 61% of members of this group moved, compared with only 39% who did not.

7. Environmental quality was a decisive factor in migration decisions of respondents.
8. Within the (inner) city area, the propensity to move for the following was relatively significant:

(a) Working class movers aspiring to middle class status (Working Class Aspirants)

(b) Middle class escapists, wishing to maintain the status quo by residential location. (Middle Class Escapists).

(c) The Homeseekers - young family raisers and retiring workmen.

(d) The Spiralists and Organisation men, moving with their employers in order to retain jobs and maintain a career progression.

As social categories, these groups are more likely to leave the city for new towns than the cosmopolites, the locals and burgesses, the trapped and the ethnic villagers.

9. The new and Expanding Town Scheme (formerly the Industrial Selection Scheme), is biased in the selection of migrants in favour of the skilled, technicians and the professionals. The selection procedure appears to contain an element of social selection built into it.

It must not be assumed that the cities are on the verge of being abandoned. The indications are rather that although some people might wish to leave the cities for new towns, others still find the city an exciting environment to live and work. But the attraction that new towns have for the business world, the encouragement that the current policy of dispersal and decentralisation gave to move out, and the
increasing concern for environmental quality, tend to suggest that the scale of the flight from the cities and the suburban retreat might be increased in the future. How this will affect the future of the cities is a matter that may depend on future planning strategies.

Planned population movement, in the wider sense of its connection with the historical development of the redistribution of urban population to new towns, inevitably raises issues of theoretical interest to sociology and have policy implications which planners must constantly keep under review. It is these two aspects that I shall now briefly review. Earlier in this thesis, attention was repeatedly directed to the term 'environment' as an important element in migration. What is this environment in sociological terms? Although I have described it as the social and physical space to which we react and attach meaning, the environment is indeed, also people, association, relationship of people with people, institutions and physical things around. Environment is community written larger; it is a sense of place and belonging. Whether the emphasis is on the social or the physical side, environment varies in quality, namely: the quality of the association within it or its physical attraction or repulsion. How far did the environment determine migration behaviour? Respondents clearly indicated that the deteriorating state of London and the healthier and cleaner surroundings of new towns were significant considerations in their migration decision; so that environmental quality was an important frame of reference. In content, the abundance of urban amenities in London and the lack of these amenities in new towns, also determined migration behaviour. At the same time, moving away meant loss of established contacts, associations and community ties. The inseparability of environment and community becomes apparent here. Respondents worried
about the loss of familial, communal and social networks as they did about abandoning familiar surroundings and loosing their sense of place and belonging. In the new towns, the need for new friends, new concepts and new associations explains the fact that the gregarious nature of human beings needs to be recognised when people are expected to move from what was once a home to what will become a future home. These considerations underline the reconciliation of the concept of the environment with that of the community in migration. Viewed in these contexts, the environment and community are social facts and are also determinants of migration behaviour. This conclusion compares with that reached by Julian Wolpert\textsuperscript{172} who, after studying migration from urban environment, concluded that migration decision is an adjustment to environmental stress: where stress elements include all noxious environmental forces that were threatening and stressful to the individual's harmonious living. In addition to the claim of human ecologists, the series of studies reviewed in chapter 6 have sought to establish beyond doubt that the environment determines human behaviour. This research has provided an additional evidence obtained from the direct experiences of respondents which demonstrates the deterministic capacity of the environment. The growing concern about environmental quality and health, and about the preservation of the natural surroundings seems to suggest that the environment may, in the future, exert more influence on the behaviour of people within it.

When the behaviour of management and workers in a firm that was undergoing a change is considered, the importance of the environment in an organisational context becomes also apparent. The point has already been made that for an organisation to persist and maintain a stable state, it must depend upon and interact with its environment. The movement of a firm from the city to a new town was a valuable occasion in which we can study and assess the significance of the environment to the organisation, including its workers. It was also appropriate to apply and test out the open system theory in the analysis of an organisation undergoing a fundamental change. Managerial action and behaviour were directed to responding to influences external to the organisation as much as they were directed to internal forces, in so far as these equally affected the organisation. The action and behaviour of workers were rather a reflection of what they wanted from the organisation and not necessarily related to organisational survival. In other words, the actions of workers indicated that the organisation was at best a means of realising aspirations which can be considered as external and unrelated to the tasks they performed in the organisation. Thus, while the behaviour of management could be explained by the concern for the organisation's survival, the behaviour of workers was partly the function of their subjective interpretation of the opportunity to move to a new town and partly their motivation for moving or staying. For the workers in particular, the attitudes, values and aspirations which they brought into work, in the main, determined their migration behaviour. As it was noted, it was more of the social needs of the workers that provided the major action frame of reference for their migration decision. That is to say, more of the non-work aspirations of workers less than their motivation to keep their jobs, determined
whether they should move or stay behind. This particular finding compares with the conclusion that Goldthorpe and his associates reached about the instrumental attitude of the affluent workers they studied. As they pointed out, the instrumental attitude of affluent workers in their work organisation was necessary concomitant of the kind of private and community life which they pursued outside the work environment. In other words, the instrumental attitude enabled them to define their work as a means of gaining the resources they needed for the pursuit of more extrinsic ends: largely familial. 173 Similarly, migrants adopted a rather more instrumental attitude towards the firm's relocation. How much they will gain by moving, less than what they will gain by staying with the firm, was of greater importance to Movers. On the other hand, it did not seem to matter to Non-movers whether the firm needed their expertise to make the move worthwhile or not. What was apparently uppermost in their minds was what they will gain by staying behind.

This attitude confirms March and Simon's original thesis 174 that it is the orientation that the worker brings into work that mainly determines his behaviour in the organisation. Where that orientation is socially generated, for example, linked with social status, life style and respectability, the worker is more likely to adopt an instrumental attitude in order to achieve the ends that are expressed by his orientation. The behaviour of management and workers in the migrant firms is of great interest to organisational analysis especially in discussing work and non-work sociology and in the application of

174. See March and Simon, Chapter 6.
action frame of reference (as a sociological theory), to the study
of planned migration.

The management and control of population flow to new towns has
continued to attract a lot of critical comments for a long time now.
The main defect is in the mechanism of recruiting the new town
population in which securing a job first entitles a potential migrant
to be allocated a house. This implies that the selection of migrants
depends upon the employers' needs; in other words, the employer is the
final arbiter of who moves to a new town. Even the allocation of
houses to migrants itself depends upon whether the migrant has been
judged as socially acceptable - clean, respectable, able to pay his
rent, etc. The rigidity of the recruitment mechanism and the element
of social selection built into, have both significantly contributed to
the bias of new town population in favour of young people, skilled
manual workers, the professional and the technicians; and in terms of
class, in favour of the middle class. Partly for the same reason and
partly as a result of perceived fear of discrimination, ethnic
minorities are also minimally represented in new towns. In a situation
in which the recruitment and administration of the population flow to
new towns is mainly influenced by the needs of the employer, the social
policy objectives, especially their contribution to providing homes
for residents of large cities, will be continuously constrained. By this
same token, the problem of social balance is more likely to increase
as the years roll by. Further more, the level of urban amenities and
facilities that new towns provide do not seem to attract the movement
of various members of the society, except those who are already well
off to live a family-centres life; or those who can afford a private
car so as to travel to nearby shopping areas, hospitals, etc. Given the aspirations and needs of the sample of workers from the city, how far can it be said that existing policies affecting the cities and new towns have promoted or blocked the realisation of the aspirations? And how far can it be claimed that the same policies have achieved the goals for which they were adopted? Although these questions can be answered in terms of the assessment of what the new towns have achieved and what they have failed to achieve as instrument of social policy, yet the extent to which new town development may affect the future of the cities seems to dominate current debate on the relationship between city renewal and new town development. As the middle class people, the professionals and the skilled technicians find their way relatively easily to new towns, the working class, in need of housing and enthusiastic to move to new towns, may find themselves immobilised by lack of skill, discriminated against by the selection procedure and unwanted by employers.

The poverty of new towns provides a clear example of the conflict of objectives. While the dispersal policy encourages the movement of all sorts of people to new towns, an administrative machinery lays down the rules and applies controls which have the effect of conflicting with policy objectives. On the other hand, while the policy of dispersal encourages movement from cities to new towns, the unintended consequences of this movement have included the loss of the economically active people and of manufacturing jobs in the cities, but results in some gains for new towns. In this case too, the policy objectives of new towns conflict with those of keeping the cities alive. The research has shown that while many favour moving to the new towns,
others still prefer to live in the cities. What kind of policy compromises the two situations? Should it be a discontinuation of new town development and a switch of resources to revitalise the cities? Or should it be, a continuation of new town development combined with the revitalisation of cities in order to provide alternative communities for living? In a situation in which resources are limited, which of the two lines of action will serve best the needs and aspirations of people in society will remain a subject of public debate.

Forty years after the policy of dispersal and decentralisation of population, industry and office jobs to new towns has been firmly established by legislation and vigorously pursued with public support, it now seems necessary to begin a systematic study of this innovation in social reconstruction and transformation. It is this study and the issues that it should deal with that I have called Sociology of Planned Migration. Although conceived as a distinctive area of knowledge, it is nevertheless to be seen as an integral part of the Sociology of Planning. In order to place it in a proper context, part of chapter 8 was devoted to showing how it fits into the general functions of Sociology of Planning. In addition to those general functions which must always be kept constantly in view, Sociology of Planned Migration must address itself specifically to the following tasks:

1. The critical evaluation of:

   (a) the ideology and philosophy of the policy of dispersal and decentralisation to new towns.
(b) the conflicts between policy aims and administrative objectives in the administration of planned migration policy, e.g. the operation of the New and Expanding Town Scheme.

(c) The contributions of new town development to social policy, national economic development and regional planning.

2. A continuous assessment of the effects of planned migration, as a mechanism of social evolution on demography, social structure, population distribution and national settlement pattern.

3. Viewed as a monitoring system, sociology of planned migration should provide the backdrop for the study of different phenomena associated with publicly-sponsored mobility. This should include, Slum Clearance, migration process, migration decision-making, social mobility by housing and residential location.

4. Sociology of planned migration should serve as a focal point for interdisciplinary dialogue between sociologists, architects, surveyors, engineers, geographers, economists, strategic planners and politicians.

5. Sociology of Planned migration should promote the continuous evaluation of the new town idea as an instrument and technique of planning. The potentiality of selling the new town idea to developing countries as an instrument of national planning should be usefully explored.
To conclude this thesis, it is important to underline the fact that planned migration has become a firmly established feature of the social and physical planning policy of the United Kingdom. There is little doubt that new town development, which is a vital element of this policy, has been a great success and a national pride. However, in order to ensure that new towns will continue to play ever important roles in social policy, planners must look not so much at what has been so far achieved; they should rather continuously ponder on how new towns can contribute further to social reconstruction. Looking in this direction and into the year 2000, the findings of this research should, therefore, not be seen as simply highlighting either the poverty of new towns or raising theoretical issues of academic interest. Instead, they should be looked upon, at least, as raising questions and pointing in the direction to which planners and sociologists need to look constantly in order to find new evidence and experiences of people in the society which suggest urgent need to change existing policy or to modify it. It is not intended that the findings should by any means, represent solutions to existing problems; rather they have drawn attention to issues of public interest as well as contributed to continuing debate on various issues relating to new town development and social and planning policies. In this context, I expect that the contributions of this research should be evaluated partly as an approach to promoting understanding of the extent to which the issues raised by it impinge on the daily lives of people living in large cities and new towns; and partly as a means of encouraging self-awareness and critical appraisal of these methods proposed by planners and approved by policy-makers which have far-reaching effects in changing society.
Future Research and Specific Proposals

One of the usual but uneasy realisations after a piece of research is the vast need for more relevant and detailed data required to shed more light on competing variables. To enable more relatively accurate forecasts to be made about future population movements to new towns, and to facilitate necessary plans for years to come, it is essential that more research should be undertaken which will enable some of the unknown quantities to be identified and taken into account when making future forecasts. There will always be unforeseen circumstances, unintended consequences of present action as well as new elements that might emerge. To control such influences and to give them a place in monitoring the progress and the effectiveness of policy, further research is needed. The following areas seem to require further studies in order to throw more light on the issues raised by this research:

(a) A study of the Development Corporation's policy of attracting industries and recruiting migrants to new towns needs to be undertaken. The study should assess, in particular the criteria for the choice of industries, e.g. capital intensive industries, smokeless industries; and for recruiting migrants, through their housing allocation.

(b) It has been suggested that a move to a new town, especially when undertaken for purposes of enhancing the migrants' social standing, often leads to change of attitude, style of life and voting behaviour. The extent to which this is true may be tested by a specific study. The focus of attention may be on voting behaviour; and the general interest may be on whether
or not the new town promotes one-class community.

(c) A specific study of the various means of population movement to new and expanding towns needs to be undertaken so as to refine the distinction between planned and unplanned movement; as well as to promote greater understanding of the mechanics for the recruitment of new town population.

(d) A study of planned migration to Expanding Towns. For an overall picture of movements from cities, the aspect of movements that take place to expanding towns require a similar study comparable to that carried out about new towns.

It cannot be over-emphasized that the new town idea, as an instrument of change and planning, has played and will continue to play an important role in social policy. The contributions that new towns can make in this direction in the future might be greater if their present performance can be improved. The undernoted specific proposals and suggestions are made in the hope that their implementation will take the general contributions that new towns have made to social policy, a step further.

1. New towns, for a longtime, will continue to relieve the cities of their housing needs. But unless housing is available to those actually in need in the cities, this function, whilst absolutely essential, might continue to be provided for those in the cities not under pressing need. Housing need must, therefore, be redefined so as to favour those actually in need. The element of social selection built into housing allocation needs also to be abolished.
2. The selection procedure of New and Expanding Town Scheme in the recruitment of new town population needs radical change. Job before housing as a condition for moving to a new town makes the employer the judge and jury over who moves. Special Schemes should be operated along with the N.E.T.S. directed to attract the unskilled, the elderly, one parent families and ethnic minorities. A statutory duty should be imposed on Development Corporations to recruit up to 30% of its population through this Special Scheme.

3. The statutory requirement to operate the Special Scheme under 2 above, should be an integral part of a clear policy on social balance to be carried out by Development Corporations. The absence of a clear policy on the issue of 'balance' seems to have contributed to the social structural bias of new town population in favour of the young, the technicians, the professionals and the skilled manual workers.

4. The contractual and legal arrangements between the exporting authority and the Development Corporation which determine the responsibilities of these parties, ought to be a subject of study and public scrutiny. In some cases these arrangements are believed to have justified the unwillingness of development corporations or the receiving authorities in new and expanding towns, to take on unskilled workers and groups at risk from the cities who are actually in housing need. To enable receiving authorities to accept such groups of people, it may be necessary to operate a Social Security Subsidy Scheme financed by the Central government.
5. The level of social investments in new towns needs to be raised. New towns have failed to attract a variety of social groups from the cities partly because of the selective nature of the N.E.T.S., but also partly because some of the facilities and amenities that are part of the city environment are not available in new towns. As alternative urban communities for work and living, new towns should ideally be a replica of the urban environment.

6. New towns are attractive to some city residents just as the city itself is very much preferred by others to any alternative habitat. The discontinuation of new town development and the revitalisation of the cities cannot therefore, be seen as policy alternatives. Instead, new town developments pursued simultaneously with city renewal provides alternative communities for city residents.
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THE NEW TOWNS PROJECT (1971-1973)

This project, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, was based at the Centre for Environmental Studies, London, and lasted from January 1971 to March 1973. The research team consisted of the following:

- Nicholas Deakin, Chief Investigator
- Clare Ungerson, Senior Research Fellow
- Ukwu Ejionye, Research Fellow
- Gary McDonald, Research Fellow
- Charles Thaomson, Assistant Research Fellow
- Audrey Maxwell, Assistant Research Fellow

The main aim of the project was to find out why the 'socially disadvantaged minorities' are unable to move from London to new and expanding towns even though they seemed most likely to benefit from out-migration. The group described as socially disadvantaged are defined on a continuum and included the following: the elderly, the unskilled, ethnic minorities from New Commonwealth countries, unmarried mothers, and people from large families. The project was in five main parts, namely:

1) The Inner City Study, involving the Survey of (Islington) Stress Area Residents

2) The Movement of Firms and Workers, involving the Survey of Migrant Firms

3) Movements of Workers from Stress Areas to New/Expanding Towns - Survey of Islington Migrants to NETS.
iv) Analysis of Industrial Selection Scheme Registrants - Survey of I.S.S. Registrants

v) The Asians in Crawley - A Study of Adjustment of Asians in Crawley

A report (in Six Volumes), incorporating the various parts of the project was submitted to the Social Science Research Council in March, 1973. Since then, (January 1974), some aspects of the study have been published in Town and Country Planning, Vol. 42, No. 1, especially pp. 15-28, written by N. Deakin and C. Ungerson, on behalf of the research team. The author was responsible for the second aspect of the project dealing with the Survey of Migrant Firms. Details of this particular study, including the background, scope, hypothesis and methodology are provided separately below.

THE SURVEY OF MIGRANT FIRMS

1. Background and Aim of the Study

The Survey of Migrant Firms was one aspect of the New Towns Project, described above, with the overall broad objective of identifying the human constraints and the main blockages in the mechanism of planned migration and to assess their effects on mobility from London to New Towns of these people described as socially disadvantaged. Within this context, the aim of the Survey of Migrant Firms itself was to identify the reasons for and against the movements of the workers of firms which planned to relocate in New (and Expanding) Towns. Relocation decisions usually take place at two levels: Organisation and Individual. At the organisation level, the firm first decides to relocate; and at the individual level, the workers within the migrant firm have to choose
(by their decision) between relocating with their employer and staying behind. An understanding of the structure of that decision would throw some significant light on the determinants of and constraints to the social aspects of planned industrial migration. This was the task to which the survey of migrant firms addressed itself.

2. **Hypotheses**

Certain suggestions and Common-sense statements have been made which tend to explain why people generally do not wish to move to live and work in New (and Expanding) Towns. These hunches invariably point to the direction of further investigations, in order to establish which of them are concrete facts. Further more, it was necessary to determine whether or not any new facts established constituted real constraints of all potential movers, and if so, how far they affect both the situation of an individual wishing to move out of London and of a worker moving with a firm that planned for a change of location. The situation of a migrant firm appeared to be so unique as to require a special study. Within the concept of the planned migration of a firm and its workers, the survey was geared to testing the following hypotheses:-

(a) That the decision not to move is a function of the worker's degree of attachment to the physical and social environment.

(b) That the decision to move was a function of:

(i) the worker's attachment to his firm;

(ii) the worker's pressing or perceived housing need

(c) That the decision to move or not to move was influenced by skill, pay, social facilities, rent and cost of living in New Towns.
(d) That the decision to move or not to move depended on the amount of information and communicated flowing from management on the planning process, personal policy (incentives, promotion and wages) and the future of employees.

3. Scope

A study of four firms that planned to move out of London was conducted. For a number of reasons, it was necessary to follow these firms through: from the time they announced their intention to migrate, until they have actually moved and settled into their new environment. First, it was essential to obtain reasonable information on the reasons for their firms' decision to move. Second, it was necessary to understand the kind of immediate and sustained reactions from both management and workers generated by a planned migration. It was expected that this might provide, at least, a general understanding in this situation of the resistance and the management of change. Third, the problem of uprooting from one neighbourhood and adapting into a new environment is so important to the study that it requires clear exposition. Although the capacity to adjust into a new environment should be general determined by the "push" and "pull" of migration, the process of adaptation itself must be based on a fairly good knowledge of the quality of the new environment. Probably for this reasons migrant firms usually spend a great deal of time and money providing information to workers about the new location through displays the exhibitions and by organising trips to the particular location in New Towns. Migrant firms also hold meetings and interviews with staff in order to answer their questions and to keep them fully informed of the planning processes. It was crucial, therefore, to be able to evaluate the influence such information and communication had on the final decisions and choices made by different workers.
Methodology

(a) Collection of Information

Essentially, the survey was by case studies. Method of collecting information were by depth interviewing and through structured questionnaires administered by professional interviewers. Inquiry in the firms was geared to obtaining the following information: a brief case history of the firm, and the reasons why it decided to move. The researcher conducted fairly extensive depth interviews and informal discussions with directors, managers, heads of departments and personnel officers both in the migrant firms and in the relevant government departments associated with industrial decentralisation, population redistribution and the planning of new environments.

Information from employees of migrant firms was obtained through structured questionnaires administered by interviewers. Two sets of questionnaires were used: one for movers and the other for non-movers. In both cases, the respondents were heads of households, majority of whom were males. The questions were intended to determine factors that influenced the decision to move or not to move. Provision was made to assess the attitude of a spouse who was not the respondent, in order to have some insight into the structure of the decision-making process of the family. Interviews took place at home, except in the case of one firm where interviews were carried out in the factory during working hours. The interviewing took place a week or two before the firm moved. Where it was possible, the researcher was also a participant observer at meetings held between the staff and management, or between the staff, management and representatives of the Greater London Council, New-and Expanding Town Development Corporation and the Importing local
authority. In a number of cases, the researcher went on some of the trips to New or Expanding Towns, organised by the migrant firms for the staff. The researcher also held informal discussions over lunch (provided by one of the firms) with groups representing movers and non-movers on different days. These discussions provided additional information on attitude of both groups towards moving.

(b) Sampling

The four firms studied were drawn from both the manufacturing and the service industries. Three of the firms are in the manufacturing industries: light engineering, cold rolled metal sections and galvanized purlins, and paper conversion. The fourth one is from the service industry and deals with warehousing and distribution (Brief case history of each firm is appended).

While these firms were by no means representative of migrant firms, nevertheless, their choice was determined by the need to satisfy certain basic conditions. First, the firms studied were drawn from both manufacturing and service industries as already noted. Second, they must be moving from the congested urban environment of London to the newer and more desirable environment of New and Expanding Towns. On this ground, two of the firms were actually moving to a New Town and the other two to Expanding Towns. Third, the firm must be actually preparing itself and its employees for a change of physical and social environment, a process within which planned migration could be studied sociologically. Fourth, it was necessary that one of the firms should be unionised in order to enable a comparison to be made between individual and interest group reaction to the proposed change. Three of the
firms had no unions representing the group interest of all staff, although individuals belonged to different national unions. The fourth firm had a very influential national union representing staff of all grades.

Fifth, choice was significantly influenced by the problem of access to information. For this reason, it was necessary to ensure that the firms ultimately chosen were themselves interested in understanding more about the problems of relocation and were, therefore prepared to subject their relocation to empirical study and analysis.

On the workers' side, a total of 162 people representing all categories of workers, but split into MOVERS and NON-MOVERS were interviewed. This sample was drawn from lists containing 210 employees provided by the migrant firms after consultation with the staff requesting their co-operating in the study. In the case of one firm where interviews were held in the factory during working hours, the list contained carefully selected respondents drawn from all grades of workers from various departments who moved and are already in the new premises. NON-MOVERS in this particular firm were not interviewed as a result of union objection.

(c) Pilot Survey and Fieldwork

The suitability and effectiveness of the questionnaires were tested through a pilot survey involving 12 employees (6 movers and 6 non-movers) before waves of fieldwork started. Minor amendments were made and a provision introduced into the questionnaires by which spouses who were not respondents were given interviews in order to assess their views on the household decision. The fieldwork, itself, which covered three
firms was handled by the British Market Research Bureau who submitted a technical report. The fourth firm was covered by a depth interviewing carried out by the researcher with 10 employees on the new premises of the firm after the move. This last wave of interviews was particularly useful in testing the rationality of the decision taken and in assessing progress towards adaptation into a new environment. A response rate of about 80% achieved from the interviews covering the first three firms. There was a corresponding non-response rate of 20%, which included 8% refusals.
APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR THE "SURVEY OF MIGRANT FIRMS"

Introduction

I am from the University of Sussex and we are conducting a survey among people who have had the chance to move to new towns. We've been given your name by (name of firm) which is one of a number of firms which are co-operating in this survey. Your answers will not be given to the firm and will be treated in strictest confidence.
A. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MOVERS

1. (a) How long have you been living at this address,
(b) Where did you live before you came here?

2. (a) In general what do you think of this part of London as a place to live in?
(b) And what do you think of this street/block?

3. Summing up what you've told me how satisfied are you with this area?

4. (a) Now thinking only of this house/flat is there anything you particularly dislike about it?
(b) Is there anything you particularly like about it?

5. In general then how satisfied would you say you are with this house/flat?

6. Now some questions about relatives and friends. Apart from people living with you in this household, do any of these relatives live within easy reach of here? (Mother, Father, brothers, etc.)

7. When was the very last time you saw any of these relatives (mentioned at Q.6 to talk to?

8. (a) How important is it to you to live near your relatives?
(b) Can you tell me a bit more about that?

9. And how many close friends (including girl-friend/boy-friend) would you say you have living within easy reach of here?

10. When was the very last time you saw this friend/any of these friends to talk to?

11. (a) How important is it to you to live near your close friends?
(b) Can you tell me a bit more about that?

12 (a) Now some questions about you and...............(name of firm)
How long have you worked for this firm?

(b) How did you get your job?

13 Does anyone else from your household work at...............(name of firm)?

N.B. Q.14 not used on this version.

15 Did you know that .........................(name of firm) is
moving to.........................(name of New or Expanding Town)?

16 When did you first hear that the firm was moving to
(New /Expanding Town)?

17 How did you first find out?

18 (a) When you first heard, how interested were you in the idea of moving
to the new town?

(b) And how interested was your wife/husband when you first told him/her
that the firm was going to a (new town) and you had a chance
of moving too?

19 (a) Did the firm put on an exhibition or display about the new town after
the announcement to move was made?

(b) Did you yourself go to it?

(c) What did you think of it?

(d) After seeing the exhibition how interested were you in moving?

20 (a) Did anybody else from your household go?

(b) And how interested were they in moving after seeing the exhibition?
21 (a) Was there a general meeting between the workers, management and council people to talk about the move?

(b) Did you yourself go to the meeting?

(c) What did you think of the meeting?

(d) After the meeting, how interested were you in moving?

22 (a) Did anybody else from your household go?

(b) And how interested were they in moving after going to the meeting?

23 (a) Did you go and have an interview with the personnel people or management because the firm was moving?

(b) What sort of things did you discuss in the interview?

24 (a) Did you yourself go on the (first) trip the firm organised to.... (New Town)?

(b) Did you yourself go on the second trip the firm organised to........ (New Town)?

25 (a) Thinking of the (first) trip (only) to.... How did you feel about living there?

(b) Can you tell me a bit more about how you felt?

26 (a) And thinking of the houses you saw (on the first trip only). How did you yourself feel about living in one of them?

(b) Can you tell me a bit more about how you felt?

27 (a) Apart from seeing the town and the houses, could you think about the other things you saw or were told about on this (first) trip. Was there anything which discouraged you from the ideas of moving?

(b) And was there anything you saw or heard on this (first) trip which encouraged you in the idea of moving?

28 Now summing up what you've been telling me, after this (first) trip to........, how interested were you in moving there?
29. (a) Did anybody else from your household go with you on this (first) trip?
(b) And how interested were they in moving after going on this (first) trip?

30. Can I just check, did you go on both the first and second trips the firm organised, or only one of them?

31. Before you went on the second trip had you definitely made up your mind whether or not to move to the new town, were you more or less certain, or hadn't you made up your mind either way, or what?

32 (a) What sort of things did you particularly want to find out about when you went on this second trip?

33 (a) Were you able to find out what you wanted to know?
(b) Can you tell me about that?

34 (a) Can I just check, are you intending to move to.........(new town)?
(b) Are you absolutely certain, more or less certain, or are you still rather unsure?
(c) Why do you think you might still change your mind?

35 (a) Are you absolutely certain you are not going to move, more or less certain, or are you still rather unsure?
(b) Why do you think you might still change your mind?

36 (a) Can you tell me as fully as possible why you've decided not to take this opportunity to move?
(b) Any other reasons at all?
(c) When did you finally make up your mind to move?

37 (a) Is the whole household moving?
(b) Who is staying behind?
(c) Why is.......staying behind?

38 (a) Are there any people who don't live here with you who have made arrangements to move to....(new town) as well. I mean relatives or close friends but not people at work of course?
(b) Who is that?
39. Why have they made arrangements to move?

40 (a) Can you tell me as fully as possible why you've decided to move?
   (b) Any other reasons at all?
   (c) And when did you finally make up your mind to move?

41. What sort of things concerned you or worried you at all while you were making up your mind whether to move or not?

42. And how do you think you have got over these worries?

43. I understand that people who are moving to.....get help through the firm towards removal costs and towards getting new furniture etc. If they hadn't offered any of these things, do you think you would have moved?

44 (a) Can you tell me how much extra money altogether you are getting through the firm to help with the move?
   (b) Do you think that's going to cover your expenses?

45. About how much out of pocket do you think you might be with the actual moving and furnishing of the new place?

46. (a) Will you be renting or buying your new house or flat?
   (b) Do you know how much rent and rates you will be paying for your new house or flat?
   (c) About how much do you think it might be?
   (d) Do you think you can afford the amount?
   (e) Is that on your money alone, or does it include money coming in from other members of the household?

47 (a) You know that there is a rent rebate scheme?
   (b) Do you intend to apply for a rent rebate?
   (c) Why is that?

48 (a) Some people move into a rented house in a new town thinking that eventually they will buy a house of their own in or near the town. Have you yourselves thought of buying a house once you have moved and settled in.....(new town)?
   (b) Are you still thinking about it seriously or are you just considering it as possibility?
49 (a) Do you know how much mortgage and rates you will be paying for your new house or flat?

(b) About how much do you think it might be?

(d) Is that on your money alone, or does it include money coming in from other members of the household?

50. Can you tell me why you are (thinking about) buying rather than renting?

51. (a) Does your wife/husband intend to have a job after you've moved to .......(new town)?

(b) Will that be in the new town or somewhere else?

(c) Where will she/he be working?

52 (a) Has she/he already got a job fixed up?

(b) What job will she/he actually be doing?

53. What sort of job does she/he intend to get?

54. What are the main reasons for her wanting to work?

55. (a) Now some more general questions about moving. Before the possibility of moving to....(new town) with.....(firm) had you ever thought about moving from here?

(b) When did you first think about moving?

56. Was there any particular reason why you didn't in fact move?

57. Did you do anything to find a new home?

58. Why were (are) you thinking of moving?

59. What areas were you thinking of (are you) moving to?

60 (a) Do you know anybody who lives in a new or expanding town?

(b) Have you ever visited your friends or relations in their home in the new town?

(c) Was their home in a new-type estate?

(d) What was your impression of your friends/relatives house. How did you feel about it as a place for you yourself to live in?

(e) Why did you feel that way?

61. Before the opportunity arose to move to...(town) with....(firm) had/have you ever been to a new town?
62. When you went to this new town, how did you feel about living there?
   (b) What made you feel that way?

63 (a) Before the chance came to move to .... had you ever registered to move to a new town - I mean) have you ever been on the CLC's Industrial Selection Scheme?

64. How did you first find out that it was possible to register for a job and a house in a new or expanding town?

65. How did you first get on the Industrial Selection Scheme list?

66. How long were you on the list altogether?

67. Which new or expanding towns did you say you wanted to go to?

68 (a) As a result of being on the Industrial Selection Scheme list were you offered any jobs (apart from the one of ......(firm))?
   (b) How many other jobs were you offered?
   (c) Could you tell me (for each job) why you turned it down?

69. Why did you take the particular job at ......(firm)?

70. In general, how do you feel about the Industrial Selection Scheme? Can you tell me how it all worked out for you.?

71 (a) Do you rent the house/flat furnished or unfurnished?

72. How much rent do you pay every week?

73 (a) Now can I ask you about the accommodation here. Do you have exclusive or shared use of any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exclusive Use</th>
<th>Shared Use</th>
<th>Does not have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed bath/shower?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside WC?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside WC?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/yard?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. Now apart from kitchens and bathrooms etc. What other rooms do you have?

75. Do you yourself (or does anyone else in the h/hold) own/control the use of a car or any other motor vehicle?

76. Could you show me the group on this card that gives the total amount of money actually coming into the house each week, counting all wages and salaries, after deductions, and other things like family allowances, pensions, any rent you get from letting and so on?
77. Are you looking forward to the move?

78. Is there anything you'd like to say at all about the move, or the company, or the new town?
B. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NON-MOVERS

1. (a) How long have you been living at this address?
    (b) Where did you live before you came here?

2 (a) In general what do you think of this part of London as a place to live in?
    (b) And what do you think of this street/block?

3. Summing up what you've told me how satisfied are you with this area?

4 (a) Now thinking only of this house/flat is there anything you particularly dislike about it?
    (b) Is there anything you particularly like about it?

5. In general then how satisfied would you say you are with this house/flat?

6. Now some questions about relatives and friends. Apart from people living with you in this household, do any of these relatives live within easy reach of here?

7. When was the very last time you saw any of these relatives (mentioned at Q.6) to talk to?

8 (a) How important it is to you to live near your relatives?
    (b) Can you tell me a bit more about that?

9. And how many close friends (including girl-friend/boy-friend) would you say you have living within easy reach of here?

10. When was the very last time you saw this friend/any of these friends to talk to?

11 (a) How important is it to you to live near your close friends?
    (b) Can you tell me a bit more about that?

12 (a) Can I just check, do you still work for ........(name of firm)?
    (b) How long did you work for the firm?
    (c) When did you leave the firm?
    (d) Why did you leave?
    (e) Did you know that ....(Name of firm) moving to ....(New or Expanding Town)?
(f) When did you first hear that the firm was moving to......(new town)?

(g) How did you first find out?

(h) Did you know before you left the firm?

13 (a) Does anyone else from your household work at ....(name of firm)?

(b) Who is that?

(c) How long has he/she worked at ......(name of firm)?

14 (a) How long have you worked for the firm?

(b) Does anyone else from your household work at ......(name of firm)?

(c) Who is that?

(d) How long has he/she worked at.....(name of firm)?

15 (a) When you first heard, how interested were you in the idea of moving to the new town?

(b) And how interested was your wife/husband when you first told her/him that the firm was going to a....(new town) and you had a chance of moving too?

16 (a) Did the firm put on an exhibition or display about the new town after the announcement to move was made?

(b) Did you yourself go to it?

(c) What did you think of it?

(d) After seeing the exhibition how interested were you in moving?

17 (a) Did anybody else from your household go?

(b) And how interested were they in moving after seeing the exhibition?

18 (a) Was there a general meeting between the workers, management and council people to talk about the move.

(b) Did you yourself go to the meeting?

(c) What did you think of the meeting?

(d) After the meeting, how interested were you in moving?

19. (a) Did anybody else from your household go?

(b) And how interested were they in moving after going to the meeting?
20. (a) Did you go and have an interview with the personnel people or management because the firm was moving?
(b) What sort of things did you discuss in the interview?

21 (a) Did you yourself go on the (first) trip the firm organised to ......
(b) Did you yourself to on the second trip the firm organised to ...(new town)?

22 (a) Thinking of the (first) trip (only) to .... How did you feel about living there?
(b) Can you tell me a bit more about how you felt?

23 (a) And thinking of the houses you saw (on the first trip only). How did you yourself feel about living in one of them?
(b) Can you tell me a bit more about how you feel?

24 (a) Apart from seeing the town and the houses, could you think about the other things you saw or were told about on this (first) trip. Was there anything which discouraged you from the idea of moving?
(b) And was there anything you saw or heard on this (first) trip which encouraged you in the idea of moving?

25 Now summing up what you've been telling me, after this (first) trip to ... how interested were you in moving there?

26. (a) Did anybody else from your household go with you on this (first) trip?
(b) And how interested were they in moving after going on this (first) trip?

27 Can I just check, did you go on both the first and second trips the firm organised, or only one of them?

28 Before you went on the second trip had you definitely made up your mind whether or not to move to the new town, were you more or less certain, or hadn't you made up your mind either way, or what?

29 What sort of things did you particularly want to find out about when you went on this second trip?

30 (a) Were you able to find out what you wanted to know?
(b) Can you tell me about that?

31 (a) Can I just check, are you intending to move to ..........(new town)?
(b) Are you absolutely certain, more or less certain, or are you still rather unsure?
(b) Why do you think you might still change your mind?

32 (a) Can you tell me as fully as possible why you decided not to take this opportunity to move?
(b) Any other reasons at all?
(c) When did you finally make up your mind not to move?

33 (a) I understand that people who are moving to... get help through the firm towards removal costs and towards getting new furniture etc. Did you know about this before you decided to not to move?
(b) Would it have made any difference if you had been offered more?
(c) How much more would have made you change your mind?

34. If you had known about this extra cash, would you have reconsidered your decision not to move?

35. (a) When you thought about moving did you consider the possibility of your husband/wife getting a job in the new town?
(b) Did you go as far as to enquire about jobs for him/her in the new town?
(c) What sort of job were you looking for?
(d) Was your husband/wife offered any such job in the new town?
(e) What sort of job was it?
(f) Did he/she turn it down?
(h) Why was that?

36. Did this fact affect your decision not to move?

37 (a) When the warehouse section moves to Wolverton, are you going to continue working for the company or will you be leaving the company?
(b) Do you know what sort of job you'll be doing next?

38. Do you know what sort of job you'll be doing when........(Name of firm) move to.......(Name of New and Expanding Town)?

39. (a) Now some more general questions about moving, apart from the possibility of moving to ......(new town) with.....(firm). Have you ever thought about moving from here?
(b) When did you first think about moving?
(c) Are you still thinking about moving or have you in fact found a place?

40. Was there any particular reason why you didn't in fact move?
41. Did you do anything to find a new home?

42. Why were you thinking of moving?

43. What area were you thinking of moving to?

44 (a) Do you know anybody who lives in a new or expanding town?

(b) Have you ever visited your friends or relations in their home in that new town?

(c) Was their home in a new-type estate?

(d) What was your impression of your friends/relatives house. How did you feel about it as a place for you yourself to live in?

(e) Why did you feel that way?

45. Before the opportunity arose to move to....(town) with....(firm) had/have you ever been to a new town?

46 (a) When you went to this new town, how did you feel about living there?

(b) What made you feel that way?

47 (a) Before the chance came to move to... had you ever registered to move to a new town - I mean) have you ever been on the GLC's Industrial Selection Scheme list?

(b) Did you in fact get your job with....(firm) through the Industrial Selection Scheme?

48. How did you first find out that it was possible to register for a job and a house in a new or expanding town?

49. How did you first get on the Industrial Selection Scheme list?

50. How long were you on the list altogether?

51. Which new or expanding towns did you say you wanted to go to?

52 (a) As a result of being on the Industrial Selection Scheme list were you offered any jobs (apart from the one at......(firm)).

(b) How many other jobs were you offered?

(c) Could you tell me (for each job) why you turned it down?

53. Why did you take the particular job at......(firm)?

54. In general, how do you feel about the Industrial Selection Scheme. Can you tell me how it all worked out for you?

55. Can I just check, you said you own/rent this house/flat have this House/flat rent free?

56. Do you rent the house/flat from the council or from a private landlord or what?
57. How much rent do you pay every week?

58. Now can I ask you about the accommodation here. Do you have exclusive or shared use of any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exclusive Use</th>
<th>Shared Use</th>
<th>Does not have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed bath/shower?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside WC?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside WC?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden/Yard?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. Do you share any of these rooms with any other household?

60. Do you yourself (or does anyone else in the h/hold) own/control the use of a car or any other motor vehicle?

61. Could you show me the group on this card that gives the total amount of money actually coming into the house each week, counting all wages and salaries, after deductions, and other things like family allowances, pensions, any rent you get from letting and so on?

62. Is there anything you'd like to say at all about the move, or the company, or the new town?
APPENDIX 3

BRIEF NOTES ON THE BACKGROUND OF THE MIGRANT FIRMS

ADAMS & SON (ENGINEERS) LIMITED
Clapham, South-West London

Adams and Son Limited, is a light engineering firm founded in 1932. It operated in many premises within London until after the war when its last offices were located in the South-West of London. It remained in this location until the move to Andover. It is a member of the Curzon Group of Companies, and manufactures and distributes catering equipment. Before the move, it employed a total of 70 people most of them skilled and semi-skilled workers earning an average of £25 per week. Of this number only 20 people from the existing staff and 12 recruits from the Selection Scheme moved. The firm lost about 25% of its West Indian workers and had about 52% drop-out rate. Concern over the loss of its West Indian staff, some of whom were described as key workers, was one of the reasons why the firm supported and co-operated with the study. Its new site, in Andover is shared with AEW Limited, another member of the Curzon Group. In the study, this firm has been referred to as Firm A.

BROWN BROTHERS LIMITED
Shoreditch, East London

This firm, established in 1889 and located in Shoreditch in East London, is a distributor of vehicle and electrical parts. It has a network of more than 60 branches operating on a national basis throughout the U.K, London (Shoreditch) being the Central Warehouse and the Headquarters. It is this Central Wharehouse which moved to Wolverhampton in Milton Keynes. Before the move, it had a total work force of about 160, most of them unskilled, earning an average £20 per week. Approximately 70 people moved (4 of these came from the Northampton Warehouse and 8 were recruited through the ISS). Of those who did not move (about 90), 13 females and 25 males were transferred to other branches within London. The drop-out rate was about 66.6% compared with the firms own forecast of 57%. Of the firms' three coloured workers only one moved. This firm has been referred to in the study as Firm B.
2.

METAL TRIM COMPANY LIMITED
Twickenham, Middlesex, Greater London

Metal Trim Company was established in 1935 and was located in Richmond/Twickenham. It is a light engineering firm and a manufacturer and distributor of cold rolled metal sections, drawer slides and galvanized red purlins. The firm is a subsidiary of Ayrshire Metal Products, and was at an advanced stage in its plans to relocate in Milton Keynes. It employed more than 80 people, some of them middle-aged and elderly, unskilled and semi-skilled and included 10 immigrants from the New Commonwealth countries. Its staff, most skilled, earned an average £35 per week at the time of the move. Only 16 people were initially willing to move at the time of this study compared with about 40 people who had no intention of moving. Although many people changed their minds both ways, the drop-out rate was as high as 71% and there were apparently no management plans to recruit staff either locally at Milton Keynes or through the Selection Scheme. The Company is referred to as Firm C in the study.

SAMUEL JONES AND COMPANY LIMITED
Camberwell, South East London

Samuel Jones Company was established as far back as 1775 and had a permanent premises in South East London before the decision to relocate the firm in St. Neots. It established a mill in Letchworth in 1946 and purchased another in St. Neots in 1950. The firm was bought in 1966 by Wiggins Teape and in 1970 the British American Tobacco purchased the Wiggins Teape Group. The transfer to St. Neots meant closing the mills in South East London and Letchworth. The firm deals in paper conversion and manufactures paper adhesives. Before the move, its South East London branch employed between 500-600 people and a similar number at St. Neots and Letchworth. It hoped to increase the number at Neots to 800 or more after the move. Minorities were well represented. The firm is unionised and has a good industrial relations practice. It seems possible that the effect of the unions opposition to the relocation might have pushed up the drop-out rate to as much as 88%. In the study, the Company has been referred to as Firm D.
APPENDIX 4

THE OPERATION OF THE NEW AND EXPANDING TOWN SCHEME

The scheme, designed in 1953 (then known as the Industrial Selection Scheme), ensures that when finding houses and jobs for Londoners* in New and Expanding Towns, priority is given, so far as it is consistent with the demands of industry, to those in housing need or to those whose movement will result in the indirect relief of housing need. For example, the movement of a Council tenant releases a dwelling in London which can be used for an urgent housing case. The scheme, jointly administered by the GLC and the Department of Employment (and to some extent involving the Department of the Environments' New Town Directorate) is therefore, a mechanism for reconciling the two primary objectives, namely: relieving housing need in London and providing for the labour demands of London employers moving to new and expanding towns. Those persons wishing to move to new and expanding towns for jobs and houses, therefore, register on the scheme with the GLC. Registrants must normally be resident in the GLC area, or be tenants of the GLC outside that area; or they must be those that are on the London Borough waiting lists for housing; and, above all, they must be willing to take up employment in the new and expanding towns. Thus, the scheme is, in the strictest sense, the official machinery for selecting those who finally leave the city for transfer to new and expanding towns.

Given the (officially) administrative machinery, what factors that actually determine who goes to new and expanding towns, and what rules that guide the selection procedure, are themselves influential determinants. In describing the objectives for which scheme is

* The Scheme applies to London as it does to other large cities within the United Kingdom from which movements to New and Expanding Towns take place.
designed to fulfill, it has already been indicated that in relieving housing need and providing for the labour demands of employers, needs of the employer seems to be the ultimate determinant of who moves. What constitutes a housing need, what distinctions can be made in defining social and economic objectives? These issues reappear when the Selection process itself is considered, together with the administrative rules that supply part of the criteria for selection. These rules too are based on the assumption that the transfer of population and industry to new and expanding towns affords relief of congestion and demands for land within London. At the same time this aim is stated in the Strategic Plan for the South East where it is rather related to the more general objectives of keeping population growth and employment growth in step with each other. This again highlights the lack of distinction between economic and social objectives and underlines the root-cause of the conflict between the two especially in determining who is suitable for movement to a new or expanding town.

It is necessary, to make clear the essential difference between New Towns and Expanding Towns. The former are under the control of the New Towns Directorate of the Department of the Environment, which originates from the New Towns Act, 1946. Although, the principal object of the New Towns in the South-East is to take people from London, they only have a moral obligation towards London and can in fact recruit more widely. The Expanding Towns, however, are formally tied to the 'exporting authority' through the Town Development Act, 1952, and thus the G.L.C. can insist on only Londoners being housed on overspill estates in these towns, as well as having the authority to make special arrangements for servicemen; 'key' workers, pensioners with relatives in E.T.s, and so on. The proportion of Londoners among
migrants to N.E.T. is thus much higher in E.T.s than in N.T.s.

The Selection process, as an administrative procedure, involves the GLC, (as "exporting authority") the Department of Employment, the Department of the Environment and the New and Expanding Towns (as the "receiving authorities"). An intending immigrant first applies, either directly or through his borough Housing Department, to the G.L.C. for registration in the G.L.C.s New and Expanding Town Selection List. The G.L.C. Housing Department, having checked on the applicant's eligibility (as indicated in the previous paragraph) and on his degree of "Housing need", then sends his application card to the Department of Employment for occupational classification. All necessary information about the applicant is now held by the G.L.C. and the D.E. The employer in the New or Expanding Towns notifies his local employment exchange of the vacancies he has to offer, is asked to fill as many as he can locally, after which any unfilled vacancies (notified under "orders") are notified to the Department's London and South-East Regional Office, and thence to the G.L.C. and to all 60 employment exchanges in the Greater London Area. The G.L.C. then sends details of up to twenty suitably qualified applicants to the Regional Office, whereupon the Department of Employment notifies suitable applicants of the vacancies and, in the majority of cases, submits those who are willing for interview to the employer. Applicants may then be engaged by the employer in the N.E.T.

It is particularly interesting to note that at this point, the procedures for the New Towns and those for the Expanding Towns diverge somewhat. In the case of the New Towns, the employer then contacts
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SELECTION PROCESS OF THE N.E.T. SCHEME

Registrant sends
in application → Application received by G.L.C. → L.B. Housing Dept.

G.L.C. Housing Departments ← D.E. occupational classification

All information now held by G.L.C. and all London J.C.s


D.E. Regional Office given details of suitably qualified applicants by G.L.C.

Interview through local employment exchange ← Preliminary selection on job suitability

Interview with employer → job offer

New Towns

Employer contacts Dev't. Corporation

Dev't Corporation makes arrangements for housing allocation

Housing Visit on behalf of N.T.

Nomination by G.L.C. (for job only)

Applicant begins job in N.T.

Applicant moves to house in N.T.

Expanding Towns

D.E. notified G.L.C. of placing in E.T.

Housing Visit on behalf of E.T.

Nomination by G.L.C.

Applicant begins job in E.T.

Applicant moves to house in E.T.

KEY

G.L.C. = Greater London Council  J.C. = Job Centre (formerly Employment Exchange)
L.B. = London Borough  N.E.T. = New or Expanding Towns
D.E. = Department of Employment  S.E. = South-East
the Development Corporation, which then arranges an appropriate housing allocation. Arrangements are made with the appropriate London borough (or, in some rare cases, the G.L.C.) for a housing visit to be made: if this is satisfactory, the Housing Manager in the New Town then allocates a house, and in due course the applicant, if he is still willing, starts his job, then moves to the house in the New Town.

In the case of the Expanding Towns, the Department of Employment notifies the G.L.C. of a placing; the G.L.C. then makes its own housing visit on behalf of the Expanding Town; if this is satisfactory, the Housing Manager in the Expanding Town allocates a house, and in due course the applicant, if he is still willing starts his job, then moves to the house in the Expanding Town. This difference between the two procedures arises from the fact that the G.L.C. has direct financial responsibility for the housing of Londoners in Expanding Towns, in that it has an agreement to pay the local council a subsidy \(^{18}\) for all the Londoners that it houses through the I.S.S. It is therefore clear that the prime determinant of the characteristics of people who move to N.E.T.s is the types of jobs that are available in those towns. It is therefore the employers, in conjunction with the N.E.T. authorities*, who, within broad limits, control migration to those towns.

The rules and procedures as described above are believed by their operators to be both rational, in terms of realising the aims and objectives of the I.S.E. as a whole, and administratively convenient in terms of their application by G.L.C. and D.E. staff. On the G.L.C. side, the objective of relieving "housing need" in London requires

* For new towns, in particular, the authority is the Development Corporation.
definitions of "Housing need" and priorities according to different types of housing tenure. Thus, tenants of the G.L.C., London Borough Councils, and Housing Associations, who are assumed to be in satisfactory housing, are given priority on the basis of the assumption that their movement to N.E.T.s creates vacancies in London for those in "housing need". "Housing need" itself, which is calculated on a points system, is categorised primarily on the basis of the degree of overcrowding, and applies solely to those who are in privately rented housing. Thus, apart from the assumption by the G.L.C. that "housing need" is most appropriately defined in terms of sharing/overcrowding, there is also the assumption that the movement of a council tenant releases a dwelling in London which can be used for an urgent housing case. These assumptions, in fact, form the basis of claims made by the G.L.C. that the I.S.S. is doing a good job in catering for London's housing need.

Additionally, those who are registered on a local authority waiting list receive priority over those not so registered, on the grounds that movement of the former to an N.E.T. reduces the length of the waiting lists and thus the size of the obligations of local authorities to re-house. Statistics on the movement of families from London to N.E.T.s through the scheme can thus be assembled by the G.L.C.'s Director of Housing in his reports to the Town Development Committee (e.g. that 86% of moves through the scheme in 1970 and 1971 contributed to the relief of London's housing need), to show that the scheme helps to relieve London's housing need and thus that the procedures work in terms of the Scheme's aims and objectives. This description of the selection procedure may give the impression that the G.L.C.'s claim of continuing relief to London's housing need is a trumped-up case with
very insecure basis in fact. However, that may be, it is necessary
to emphasise the multi-dimensions of the concept of "housing need"
and the difficulty of measuring it in terms which are both precise
enough for the evaluation of particular policy instruments and
flexible enough to take account of the variation in the feelings of
individual householders as to what actually constitutes 'need'. There
is little doubt that the Scheme does at least make some continuing
contribution to the relief of London's housing need. As an analysis
of returns from the Department of the Environment shows, about 75-80%
of all migrants to both New and Expanding Towns through the Scheme
have some degree of 'housing need', and a similar proportion is found
among migrants to N.E.T.s as a whole.

The Department of Employment's side of the operation is concerned
with the assessment of the employment skills of those who have registered
on the I.S.S. and with the submission of suitable applicants for
interview with employers in N.E.T.s who are unable to fill all their
vacancies locally. Thus a system of occupational classification has
been devised in order to describe employment skills adequately for the
purpose of submission to employers. In addition, a system called
"staging" of occupations is used by the D.E. to indicate degree of
shortage. The purpose of this system is to provide for certain
administrative "short-cuts" in the case of occupations for which demand
is great and supply small, to ensure the speedy submission of suitable
applicants to employers. Other things being equal, those who are
council tenants and those on the waiting lists with a high degree of
"housing need" will always be given preference to other applicants.
but the choice of the employer ultimately determines who is selected. Thus, the Scheme, is, in fact, one that is concerned with industrial selection and not necessarily dealing with housing and other needs of city residents. Certainly, the scheme is not expected to be a "social service", designed simply to help those with housing problems to move to better circumstances elsewhere, but as an administrative device aimed at reducing the burden of the rehousing obligations of local authorities at the same time as providing for the labour requirements of employers, it is more orientated to the latter. This has remained so in spite of the fact that the scope of the scheme has been progressively widened since it was started in 1953, beyond those in "housing need" and those linked by borough of residence to specific New Towns, to include any Londoner wanting to move to any N.E.T. This widening was affected in order to get more people housed and therefore to widen the scale of the scheme in such a way that the demands of industry were reckoned as being at least as significant as the wishes of London Borough to lighten the burden of their housing programmes. Nevertheless, the needs of industry still determine, ultimately, who moves.