



Australian Housing
and Urban Research Institute

The links between housing and nine key socio cultural factors: a review of the evidence positioning paper

prepared by the
Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute
Queensland Research Centre

authored by
Patrick Mullins, John Western
and Bridget Broadbent

March 2001

AHURI Positioning Paper No. 4
ISSN 1834-9250

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This material was produced with funding from the Commonwealth of Australia and the Australian States and Territories. AHURI Ltd gratefully acknowledges the financial and other support it has received from the Australian, State and Territory governments, without which this work would not have been possible.

We are very grateful to Sue Scull for her research assistance on this project; specifically for tracking down the published and unpublished material that have been reviewed for this paper. We are also grateful to Jan Embury for her administrative assistance.

DISCLAIMER

AHURI Ltd is an independent, non-political body which has supported this project as part of its programme of research into housing and urban development, which it hopes will be of value to policy-makers, researchers, industry and communities. The opinions in this publication reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of AHURI Ltd, its Board or its funding organisations. No responsibility is accepted by AHURI Ltd or its Board or its funders for the accuracy or omission of any statement, opinion, advice or information in this publication.

AHURI POSITIONING PAPER SERIES

AHURI Positioning Papers is a refereed series presenting the preliminary findings of original research to a diverse readership of policy makers, researchers and practitioners.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	2
Executive Summary	4
Introduction	5
The Evidence	8
Housing and Community	8
Housing and Crime	14
Housing and Anomie	19
Housing and Health	22
Housing and Perceived Well-Being	25
Housing and Social Exclusion.....	27
Housing and Poverty	29
Housing and Employment	31
Housing and Education.....	33
Data and Methodology	35
Conclusion	40
References	41
Appendix	51

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The main conclusion arising from this review is the need for caution in claiming a causal link between housing and non-housing outcomes. A relationship has certainly been shown for a number of outcomes – even a causal link under some circumstances – but in most cases the relationships can be explained by the characteristics of the people living in particular housing, rather than the dwellings themselves. This suggests that improving people’s housing may not, *in itself*, negate other social problems.
2. This review shows that the quantity and quality of research evidence is variable. Certain areas, notably housing and health, have an extensive literature, while others, such as housing and perceived well-being, have little or no data. Even in the case of housing and health, it is not possible to be too enthusiastic about the findings since the amount of good, detailed data is still relatively limited
3. Still, from the evidence reviewed, there does appear to be a clear relationship between housing and crime, housing and education, housing and health, housing and social exclusion, and housing and poverty. A relationship has also been demonstrated between housing and labour markets, but it is imprecise. The relationship between housing and community – a critical relationship for policy purposes – is also vague. The nature of the relationship between housing and perceived well-being, and housing and anomie, is not apparent because of the absence of research.
4. With regard to causality, housing has been shown to have a clear negative impact upon residents’ health, and upon the educational attainment of children, but in both cases this happens under very specific circumstances; it occurs in the poorest quality housing; that which accommodates the most disadvantaged.
5. Yet, it would be wrong to assume from the evidence that solving the housing problem first would have an important flow-on effect on other problems. Certainly, this would be a major step in assisting the homeless, but many of the homeless have a great range of other serious problems that are unrelated to housing. Thus, providing them with decent accommodation will not necessarily solve these other problems.
6. Similarly, while those living in public housing have had their housing needs ‘solved’, they still experience a wide range of other serious problems, from unemployment to ill health. The resolution of their housing needs clearly does not resolve these other problems. By implication, the difficulties that these people experience are rooted in more fundamental social, cultural, and economic conditions.
7. Finally, the evidence does recommend that housing problems be tackled in tandem with the other social problems.

Introduction

- 1.1 This paper reviews the research and policy literature on the relationships between housing and nine 'non housing outcomes'; the latter referring, euphemistically, to key socio cultural factors. These nine are community, crime, poverty, social exclusion, perceived well-being (subjective quality of life), anomie, health, education, and labour force participation. Anomie is possibly the only one of the nine unfamiliar to readers, but it is defined in some detail below. A number of these socio cultural factors are closely related to one another: poverty and social exclusion, for example, overlap, and perceived well being and perceived health status are highly correlated (see Phibbs, 1999).
- 1.2 The review is predicated upon the belief voiced by policy makers – and clearly enunciated in the March 2000 AHURI Research Agenda – that good housing, including that acquired through government assistance, has positive social, psychological, cultural, and economic outcomes for individuals and households. A causal relationship is thought to exist: an improvement in people's housing circumstances will, for example, increase their perceived well-being, decrease fears of and experiences of crime, and improve health. While this argument sounds plausible, there is – as we will see – little direct evidence to demonstrate these outcomes. There is certainly considerable indirect evidence, the most notable being with regard to health, and the level of poverty before and after housing costs have been taken into account.
- 1.3 The review raises doubts about the supposition that good housing, *in itself*, leads to positive non housing outcomes, which means that policy makers must be cautious in formulating and implementing plans based on this belief. Before policies can be formulated, it would be necessary to undertake research that would test for a causal relationship, and this is a project that could only be adequately done with good longitudinal data.
- 1.4 Our review does clearly suggest that non housing outcomes have similar socio economic and socio cultural roots. Privilege, on the one hand, and disadvantage, on the other hand, seems largely to account for the outcomes. This therefore suggests the importance of a 'whole of government' approach in tackling the outcomes; since the disadvantaged have multiple problems, it is important to confront these problems together, rather than separately.
- 1.5 Apart from reviewing the research and policy literature on the links between housing and these nine non housing outcomes, the second main aim of this paper is to discuss the data and methodology employed in the research component of the project: our empirical examination of the relationships. Data and methodology are covered in the last main part of the paper.

- 1.6 The paper is the first of four reports to be produced from an AHURI-funded project titled *An Empirical Examination of the Relationship Between Housing Systems and Non Housing Outcomes*. The next three reports will disseminate findings from the empirical analysis; an analysis drawing on survey data collected in 1997 from 1347 South East Queensland (SEQ) respondents. This was part of a quality of life project on this rapidly growing region. The next paper will be a work in progress report and will provide early findings from the empirical analysis. The third report will provide a summary of the key findings. The final report will give detailed discussion to the main findings.
- 1.7 This assessment of research and policy literature, and the empirical analysis, will – it is anticipated – contribute to efforts currently underway in Australia to achieve more effective policy outcomes (i.e. obtaining better results) and more efficient policy outcomes (i.e. in money spent, in administration). Rather than providing separate funds to assist the disadvantaged in a range of separate areas (housing assistance, health care, retraining, etc) (the ‘silo’ approach) an integrated perspective on social assistance is currently being sought. This will only be possible, however, if we understand the nature of the relationships between housing and other key socio cultural factors.
- 1.8 In examining these relationships, two key issues need to be addressed. The first is whether they are mere correlations; housing’s link to, say, poverty is statistically significant, but housing does not cause poverty. The second is whether the relationships are causal: whether, for example, poor housing causes sickness and, conversely, whether good housing generates high levels of well-being.
- 1.9 In evaluating the nature of these relationships, it is important to raise a note of caution. If we start claiming that housing, as a built form, has a causal impact on human life, we come dangerously close to environmental determinism: to claiming that a manipulation of the built environment, through architecture and urban design, will reduce and/or prevent crime, or poverty, or ill health, etc. There is, of course, nothing new about this claim, and design may have some impact, but environmentally deterministic arguments emerge during times when quick and easy solutions to an increasingly complex set of problems are sought. It was, for example, one of the bases of the 19th century Garden City Movement, and early slum clearance programs assumed that the removal of the physical entity ‘the slum’ would remove the social existence of the slum: improve conditions for the deprived residents. But social problems are rooted in a complex set of socio cultural, socio economic, and socio political factors, and so their solution rests with tackling problems at their source (see Gans, 1968; Michelson, 1976; Fischer, 1976). If we wish to search for causes, then the answer is to be found here. As we will see, there is a significant contemporary debate among researchers about whether poor housing and neighbourhood design predisposes a high level of crime, suggesting that a change in design would reduce the rate of crime. Two recent Australian studies of public housing areas – cited below - have pinpointed the erroneousness of this argument.

- 1.10 The paper is divided into two main parts. The next section reviews the research and policy literature on the links between housing and the nine socio cultural factors, while the second section discusses the data and methodology employed in the empirical part of the project.
- 1.11 In conclusion, one of the most striking outcomes of this review is the variability of the literature. While there is a considerable amount on housing and health and housing and crime, there is essentially nothing on housing and perceived quality of life, and housing and anomie, with information on the remaining five outcomes being located somewhere between these two extremes. Moreover, research in each field does not focus on the same issues, although the characteristics of the residents, and of the location, are most frequently covered. It is not possible, then, to identify common threads running through all of the work; threads that would help pull together the findings from each of the nine outcomes into a coherent summary.
- 1.12 Finally, it is worth noting that the bulk of research and policy discussions originate in the US and the UK, the two largest English speaking countries. There is relatively little Australian material.

The Evidence

2.0 Housing And Community

- 2.1 This chapter reviews the literature on the link between housing and community. It opens with a discussion on the ambiguous nature of 'community', then outlines the way community is defined for purposes of our project, and finally goes on to review the literature more generally.
- 2.2 Although community is a notoriously confusing term, it remains important for social policy. Yet, considering its ambiguity and imprecision, it is surprising that policy makers and those who undertake policy-oriented research have not either discarded it or attempted to define it unambiguously (Mullins, 1987, 1995). It seems foolhardy to try to formulate and implement policy around something that is not clearly understood.
- 2.3 In policy terms, community focuses on two main issues. The first is a felt need to promote and strengthen community in order to generate mutual support so as to counteract negative effects of an increasingly harsh world. The Australian Department of Family and Community Service's 'strengthening communities' program is a clear example of this trend. The second and related issue centres on governments' efforts to promote a 'third way' (Giddens, 1998); i.e to steer a policy course between permitting the market to determine the level of well being, on the one hand, and establishing and maintaining elaborate welfare states, on the other hand. This has been explicitly stated by the British Government, and indirectly implemented in Australia through, for example, community development programs and school devolution, with Australia's most vocal advocate being the Federal Labor backbencher, Mark Latham (1998). Community is seen to be the vehicle for achieving this 'third way'. Local social networks are to be mobilised for the mutual benefit of the individuals and households residing in the community.
- 2.4 There are some indications that researchers and policy makers are moving away from 'community' as a policy-oriented concept and replacing it with a term almost as ambiguous: 'social capital'. Indeed, the decline of social capital debate (Putnam, 1995) parallels past – 19th and early 20th century - concerns about the loss of community (Stein, 1960). The latter concern emanated from conclusions reached about impacts resulting from the destruction of European rural-based communal societies; societies that disintegrated following the industrial revolution of the mid 19th century. Social disorganisation, as it was called, was said to be one outcome of this massive change.

- 2.5 The social capital debate focuses on the same type of loss; the severing of communal ties, but this time following the destruction of the industrial/modern (1920-75) society as the postindustrial/postmodern society emerged over the last 25 years. Yet, in the same way that the rise of industrial capitalism did not result in the destruction of social and interpersonal ties, as claimed by those who took the affirmative side in the decline of community debate, it seems a parallel finding is likely when we evaluate claims about a decline in social capital (for an Australian discussion of this debate, see Winter, 2000).
- 2.6 For purposes of this paper, and for the other reports arising from this research project, community is defined as
- A locality about the size of a suburb, or contiguous suburbs, or a country town, that houses people with similar socio cultural, socio economic and socio political characteristics. In this way, community has a clear spatial dimension: there are geographic concentrations of people with similar characteristics.
 - The people sharing the locality maintain *interpersonal* ties with one another, although of varying levels of intimacy. Many close, interlocked, ties identify a cohesive community, and a preponderance of loose-knit ties pinpoint a community with a weak social network.
 - There are also a series of local *social* relations, such as those between households, and between households and local voluntary organisations, local formal organisations, and local government.
 - There is a community culture covering the rules, customs, laws, norms, etc, that state how individuals and groups who form the community should behave.
 - Housing is the key material resource for the individuals and households making up the community.
- 2.7 Of interest here, then, is seeing whether different forms of community accompany different forms of housing. If 'strengthening communities' is to be a national goal in Australia – this goal being most clearly enunciated by FaCS – and if housing (notably housing tenure) plays a role here, then the link between housing and community must be understood. Thus, do those renting public housing have a different type of community from, say, homeowners? Do apartments dwellers have a different community from those living in, say, detached housing?
- 2.8 Research has rarely addressed these questions, although there is some suggestion that homeowners, because of their greater affluence, have networks that are more geographically dispersed, while renters' networks are more localised; more communally based (Atkinson and Kintrea, 2000; University of Glasgow, 1998; Ditovsky and Van Vliet, 1984; see also Hornburg and Lang, 1997). Yet, homeowners have also been found to be more involved in community affairs than renters (Reingold, 1995) (for Australian research see Troy, 2000; Winter, 1990, 1994). This involvement is in the form of memberships in local voluntary organization, and in political activity. With regard to dwelling types, few differences in community are apparent; because little research has been undertaken. However, an Israeli study of those living in temporary

accommodation found that the dwelling had very little to do with a sense of community; social factors determined this outcome (Sagy et al, 1996).

2.9 In the Western world, the community type most valued by policy makers, and also promoted by the wider culture, is that which builds upon a strong local social network, while the form of community most vilified, because it is thought to be associated with social disintegration, is one lacking strong local ties (see Wellman and Berkowitz, 1988). Yet, we lack empirical evidence pinpointing the form of community most closely tied to a high quality of life.

2.10 The physical design of housing and neighbourhood, it is claimed, can promote contact between neighbours and thus generate community. There is little recent research on this issue, with most work having been undertaken over the years from the 1950s to the mid 1970s. This shows that design is important only if residents are socially similar to one another and if they perceive this similarity and wish to make contact (Gans, 1968; Festinger et al, 1963; Fischer, 1976; Merton et al, 1951; Michelson, 1976). The presence of children can be a major catalyst for developing these contacts, although other instances where households feel the need for mutual aid can be important as well. If none of these conditions are present, then design will not help promote community. Indeed, antagonism may result in instances where markedly different people are thrown together in close proximity.

2. 11 Most research examining the link between community and housing has focused on community renewal/community development projects. These partly involve physical renewal of housing and neighbourhood and partly an attempt to stimulate local networks for residents' mutual support.

- A study of four English cities found that disadvantaged neighbourhoods did not lack social cohesion, but they lacked facilities, such as community halls, that could consolidate local cohesion (Forrest and Kearns, 1999), and Australian research on a Melbourne public housing suburb in the 1960s and, following another study, in the 1990s, arrived at similar conclusions (Bryson and Thompson, 1972; Bryson and Winter, 1999). Women were critical in the formal and informal activities across the neighbourhood and they tended also to mobilise actions over schooling and childcare. Ethnic diversity was found to aid cohesion; it enabled links to be made across the locality.
- Hillier (1995) examined the renewal of residential areas in a country town and in two inner city working class areas, and specifically attempts to facilitate positive physical and social changes. These changes involved both the physical renewal of housing and neighbourhoods as well as attempts to stimulate local social mobilisation for mutual benefit. These initiatives appear to have received positive responses from residents
- A University of Glasgow (1998) study examined a Scottish Homes initiative for stimulating local ties within disadvantaged public housing areas. Measures included assistance to enable a number of households to become homeowners, these being taken under the assumption that the resulting greater social mix

would reconnect communities currently isolated by deprivation. Although it is too early to assess the success of this initiative, there is the suggestion that ties within these housing areas have been strengthened for local advantage.

- The Queensland Department of Housing's (2000) community renewal scheme, which is focusing on 100 areas around the state over three to five years, aims to achieve goals similar to the above schemes: the physical renewal of the areas, and increasing social and economic well being among households. It is too early to assess outcomes. Of course, it is important to note that other state and territory housing departments are undertaking parallel schemes

2.12 The importance of social capital for assisting households to protect their housing and community has recently been identified. It is the mobilisation of individuals' and households' personal and social networks that lead, it is claimed, to personal and social advantages. Putnam (1998) highlighted the way deprived households in US inner city areas invest their social capital to 'get by'. In a detailed empirical study of five deprived housing projects in New York City, Saegert and Winkel (1998) showed the way social capital was mobilised by disadvantaged households to improve the quality of their housing and to increase security in their locality. Similarly, Lang and Hornburg (1998) see increases in social capital as a key mechanism for improving the quality of life among low income neighbourhoods (see also Andreasen (1996).

2.13 In all of this discussion, an emphasis on promoting strong, cohesive local ties – communal ties – underlies policy recommendations. Yet, we know surprisingly little about the level of interconnectedness of ties – how loose-knit or how close-knit – and the level of social well being. Is it possible, for example, to score highly on well being but live in a network of very loose-knit ties, and score low on well being but live in a network that is very close knit? In other words, it may not be strong community ties that are critical; weak ties may be as important, or more important for well-being (Granovetter, 1974). Weak ties, as the name implies, are interpersonal relationships that are either socially distant, such as acquaintances, or those links with people not known to an individual but known to persons the individual knows, such as friends of friends.

2.14 The most cohesive of the communities, historically, has been the traditional working class community, a community of the urban industrial society, and a community whose households resided in private rentals. This community has also been called the 'occupational community' because of the very close links between (male) employed work (e.g. in mines, factories, on the waterfront) and home; the community (e.g. see Damer, 1990). This was a low-income community, and was close knit for reasons of mutual support; to help one another in constantly difficult times. Cohesion was a matter of necessity, suggesting that increased material well-being (e.g. better wages) would not have necessitated these close ties. Indeed, this community began disappearing with post war (1945-75) affluence and disappeared completely with deindustrialisation (post 1975); when semi skilled and unskilled manual work that sustained (male) community members disappeared.

2.15 Australia appears not to have had the traditional working class community, primarily because of greater working class affluence from the 19th century, relative to the European and North American working classes (Mullins, 1988). Greater working class affluence also helps explain why Australia had such an early high rate of home ownership.

2.16 A recent analysis of the community structure of major Australian cities – cities accounting for 70% of the country's population – identified nine community types, four of which were affluent, four were vulnerable, and one was 'average' - a working class - community (Baum et al, forthcoming; see also Baum et al, 1999). The four affluent communities are:

- The high income, high consuming privileged community of the global age, such as Brisbane's western suburbs;
- The affluent community of the metropolitan fringe, such as Sydney's Hawkesbury;
- The gentrifying community of the inner city areas of metropolitan centres; and
- The threatened affluent community, primarily of former government employees, such as North Canberra.

The four vulnerable communities are:

- The community of deindustrialisation, such as Elizabeth in South Australia;
- The rural-urban fringe community reliant on declining primary industries, such as Perth's York;
- The vulnerable community of the urban/metropolitan fringe, such as Sydney's Canterbury; and
- The vulnerable community of the mega metropolitan fringe (e.g. Gold Coast in mega metropolitan Brisbane).

The 'average' community is a working class community; a community that is neither affluent nor vulnerable (e.g. Melbourne's Melton).

2.17 Finally, cultural changes over the last quarter century have changed the meaning of community for individuals and households. Consumerism is now a key component of contemporary culture, being the imperative that demands we consume more goods and services, and do this for fun and enjoyment rather than for necessity (Mullins, 1995; Mullins et al, 1999). Household and community life is therefore increasingly directed towards this goal and not just towards accessing necessities, like health care and education (Mullins and Kynaston, 2000). Having easy access to major consumption spaces, such as sports stadia and theme parks, will contribute to how individuals and households define a good community life. Indeed, quality of life is a driver of the new (postindustrial) economy. In the US, for example, those with skills in demand are moving to, or remaining within, those places (both cities generally and communities within

these cities) that are perceived to offer a high quality of life (see US Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2001).

2.18 In sum

- Community is a key concept for social (including housing) policy, but it is a concept that is poorly defined, thus raising questions about its efficacy both for social science research and for policy making.
- There is little information on the types of community accompanying different housing tenures, although the limited evidence available suggests that close knit communities have tended to be located in low income rental areas; the poorer the area, the stronger the local ties (i.e. the stronger the community)
- The more affluent the community, the more geographically dispersed are householders' social networks, with these ties tending to be loose-knit, meaning that the people involved do not live in strong communities, at least as defined by strong local ties. Their community is of weak ties, but they have an extensive network going far beyond their community.
- It is clear, then, that we need extensive research to be undertaken on the nature of contemporary communities, including seeing whether any types of community are more likely to be associated with particular forms of tenure. Unless we know this information, community-focused policy will be based merely on a romantic notion of community, rather than on knowledge about the place that community (i.e. the local area) holds in people's lives.
- The empirical part of this project will involve the construction of a community variable – measuring the extent to which key aspects of social life are concentrated within the suburb - and this measure will be considered against each of the tenure groups.

3.0 Housing and Crime

- 3.1 Although there is a correlation between housing – and public housing in particular - and crime, there is no evidence to suggest that housing *per se* causes criminal behaviour. This chapter will consider the research and policy literature on housing and crime.
- 3.2 Research in this field has focused on four main areas. The first is on the way low-income housing areas, and public housing projects of medium to high-density in particular, have both high crime rates and significant concentrations of residents with criminal records. Second, this concentration is explained by the system of public housing allocation; those who gain access to this housing include a disproportionate number who are, or who have been involved, in criminal activity. The third and fourth areas of research focus on ways of reducing crime in problem areas. The third considers the way poorly designed housing and poorly designed neighbourhoods predispose criminal activity, leading to the suggestion that a change in design would reduce and/or prevent criminal behaviour. The fourth field of research considers the way community ties can be mobilised – particularly in public housing areas with high crime rates - for purposes of vigilance and surveillance, for this is felt to be a measure to reduce and prevent crime. Each of these four will be discussed in turn.
- 3.3 First, low-income housing areas, and public housing estates in particular, have both high crime rates and concentrations of people with criminal records (Burby and Rohe, 1989). The 1988 UK Crime Survey, for example, found that public housing tenants were twice as likely to be burgled, compared with homeowners (Murie, 1997; see also Bottoms and Xanthos, 1981; Goodchild et al, 1997; Hope, 1986, 1987; Neild and Paylor, 1996; Roncek et al 1981; Smith, 1986). There is also the suggestion that Australian public housing areas have high crime rates relative to other areas, with Matka (1997) and Weatherburn et al (1999) providing the most detailed recent analyses. Both tested the crime-housing design question (discussed below), coming to the conclusion that socio economic characteristics of the residents explain the level of crime, not the nature of housing and/or neighbour design.
- 3.4 It is important to note that not all low-income (including public) housing areas have high crime rates, or major concentrations of criminals. A 1970s study of ten large public housing projects in St Louis, US, for example, found crime rates in five of these to be below the city average, while the remaining five had rates little different from that of city as a whole (Farley, 1982). Murie (1991) came to similar conclusions for Britain, emphasising the way wide variations in the level of crime can be found between different housing areas. Moreover, a Swedish study found that housing was not a predictor of juvenile crime; the receipt of social welfare and the person's social class were the best predictors (Wikstroem, 1991). All of this work, then, suggests that it is the characteristics of the residents, not the type of housing, that determine the level of crime.

3.5 Thus, it is not dwellings themselves that predispose crime, as some populists would have us believe, but the way that those with criminal records are disproportionately concentrated in particular areas. Murie (1991) has shown, for Britain, that it is the concentration of criminals in public housing that explains the problem. In the case of Australia, Matka (1997) and Weatherburn et al (1999) came to similar conclusion after testing the crime-housing design thesis for Sydney: it was not housing and urban design, but the characteristics of the residents. Weatherburn et al (1999, p270) say

(O)ur work...lends considerable credence to the view that the public housing allocation process is largely, if not entirely, responsible for the association between public housing and crime.

Such a conclusion ought not to read (sic) as diminishing the significance of public housing as a crime prevention issue. If economically disadvantaged people are given priority access to public housing, public housing policies that concentrate public housing dwellings will have the effect of concentrating economic disadvantaged. Over time, this can be expected to lead to a concentration of crime-prone individuals. Skogan (1990) has presented persuasive arguments holding that such an effect by itself can lead to a breakdown in informal social control, thereby further exacerbating neighbourhood crime problems. If these arguments are accepted, public housing allocation policy may be important to crime prevention even if public housing design is not.

Certainly, high crime rates on public housing estates lead to these areas becoming stigmatised, and there may be subcultures of crime that aggravate the situation, but the dwelling *per se* does not create the problem (Bottoms and Xanthos, 1981).

3.6 Although low-income housing areas have disproportionately high crime rates, relatively few of the crimes are serious. The majority appear to be nuisance crimes, such as vandalism, rowdyism, and littering (Murie, 1997).

3.7 Holzman (1996) questions the way US research has disproportionately focused on very large public housing projects; those with high rise apartments and high crime rates. Apart from the fact that it is difficult to obtain reliable data from the residents of these projects, this type of public housing accounts for less than 5% of all US public housing. There is the suggestion, then, that this form of research misrepresents US public housing areas as a whole.

- 3.8 The public housing allocation system seems essentially 'responsible' for the disproportionate concentration of those with criminal records in public housing areas; a concentration that leads to these places experiencing high crime rates. More specifically, public housing authorities locate 'difficult' households in particular areas, while 'respectable' claimants are allocated 'respectable' areas (Pyle, 1976). For Australia, as indicated above, Weatherburn et al (1999) emphatically made this point in their Sydney study, with location, in itself, they suggest having little effect on adult and juvenile crime. The public housing allocation system clustered those with criminal records in these areas. Yet they provide no evidence for this claim, arriving at this conclusion because their evidence led to a rejection of the claim that housing/housing estate design predisposed criminal behaviour.
- 3.9 A British (Sheffield) study demonstrated potential complexities in this link between housing allocation and the incidence of crime. A Sheffield housing authority's decision to move households from one street with a high crime rate to another dragged the problem from the old to the new. Thus, whereas crime and the number of criminals declined in the old street, they increased in the new. When many of the residents of the new street left, the allocation system replaced them with similarly difficult people (Neild and Paylor 1996; see also Bottoms and Xanthos, 1981; Bottom and Wiles, 1986). The allocation system, then, essentially explained the crime problem.
- 3.10 One solution widely canvassed for the problem of high crime in public housing – and other problem housing - areas is to change the physical design of dwellings and neighbourhoods. This has already been discussed briefly, but it is worth considering in a little more detail. Poorly designed housing and residential areas are thought to predispose crime; a claim most forcefully made several decades ago by Oscar Newman (1972) (see also Brantingham et. al. 1981; Coleman 1998; Holzman et. al. 1996; Mawby, 1977). It is interesting to find in this regard that high rise public housing – so often condemned for poor design – may offer design advantages in terms of crime. A US study found that those living in high rise apartments rented from public authorities felt safer and were less likely to express serious concerns about crime, compared with those living in lower density public housing (Holzman et al 1996)
- 3.11 Oscar Newman directed his criticism at specific design features. He maintained, for example, that fire escapes on apartment blocks and the high levels of residential privacy demanded by many households made it easy for burglars to gain access to homes. Moreover, locating children's play areas away from places enabling easy parental supervision made children vulnerable to assaults. The solution was better design.
- 3.12 Further doubts have been raised about the efficacy of architecture and urban design in alleviating and preventing crime. Lee (1985), for example, warns against a belief in easy solutions, specifically the belief that fiddling with the

physical form will reduce crime. While not denying that good design may be important in preventing and reducing criminal activity, faith in design is doomed to failure because it is environmentally deterministic. It fails to see that the roots of crime, and of concentrations of crime in particular areas, are a consequence of socio cultural, socio economic, and socio political factors, not poor design (Gans, 1968; Matka, 1997).

3.13 Of particular importance today is an understanding of the way criminal activity is associated with the marginalisation of large numbers of people, meaning that those that are marginalised are more likely to live in poor housing, as well as in government assisted housing (Wilson, 1987). This is closely tied to the decline of the old (pre 1975) economy; an economy that had provided well paid full employment for a workforce that was largely male, manual, and unskilled/semi skilled. These jobs have now essentially gone, for the new economy requires high-level service skills. As a result, large numbers of unskilled people, and those with old work skills, are no longer wanted and are thus struggling to make a living. And this is a generational phenomenon, with the second and third generations being affected. Here, then, are conditions predisposing both a new poverty and increasing criminality.

3.14 The other method cited for preventing and reducing crime is mobilising residents and making use of their local social networks to create a local security system; the resulting surveillance will inhibit prospective criminals (Foster et al, 1993; Reiss, 1986). The key players, then, are the residents themselves, thus indicating the key role played by social capital. It is their ability to exert informal control over behaviour in the area that is critical in preventing and reducing local crime. Yet, this system can only be established if the population is stable. High levels of residential mobility act as a deterrent to community mobilisation, with high rates of outmigration being indicative of resident dissatisfaction (Foster and Hope, 1993).

3.15 James' (1993, 1997) Melbourne study identified the importance of community mobilisation. It emphasised the value of providing tenants with decision-making opportunities, of initiating a resident-based security system, as well as providing more communal facilities for young people. These measures, in turn, brought a sharp decline in crime rates and this, in turn, led to all housing vacancies being easily filled and to tenants feeling secure.

3.16 Some doubts have been raised about the effectiveness of these community initiatives. A British study found that such schemes brought both increased control and increased disorder (Hope, 1987; Hope and Foster, 1992, 1993). Resident's vigilance brought security for a number of tenants, but crime and criminality came to be concentrated in a particular part of the estate. Vandalism was a catalyst for the outmigration of the area's older people, leading to an influx of young adults, specifically singles. While burglary declined, car theft and assaults increased. Similarly, a US study by Warner and Rountree (1997) raised doubts about the effectiveness of local social

capital in reducing crime. While finding that strong local social ties reduced neighbourhood assaults, the incidence of burglary did not decline.

3.17 In sum

- Housing *per se* does not cause crime.
- Low income housing areas, and public housing estates in particular, tend to have a higher incidence of crime and a disproportionate concentration of those with criminal records.
- These concentrations are a product of housing authorities' allocation systems, although, for Australia, we need detailed research on how this process occurs.
- While architecture and urban design may have some influence on preventing and reducing crime, their influence is limited because the causes of crime are rooted in a complex interplay of socio cultural, socio economic, and socio political forces.
- Community mobilisation, and thus the use of local social networks, may contribute to the prevention and reduction of some crimes in residential areas.
- Australian research has not clearly identified differences between those living in different housing tenures according to their fear of crime and experiences of crime. Our empirical analysis will test this question.

4.0 Housing And Anomie

- 4.1 This chapter focuses on a disturbing element of contemporary culture – anomie – and seeks to understand its relationship with housing; specifically among residents living in different forms of housing.
- 4.2 Anomie is a concept recently reintroduced into the social sciences, following decades of disinterest. Its renewal is a direct response to cultural consequences wrought by the very rapid and profound changes that have occurred around the world over the last quarter century. These changes include, for example, the dissolution of the former communist states, and the emergence of a new diaspora; that is, a new wave of international migration, one exceeding the enormous migration stream leaving Europe for settler societies over 1840-1920, and one that is now scattering millions of people around the world. The arrival in Australia, over recent decades, of new groups of migrants and of 'boat people' is indicative of this new diaspora.
- 4.3 Anomie is a cultural condition with marked social consequences. It identifies situations characterised by a relative absence of social cohesion and social order because of confusion over the rules guiding behaviour. It arises, for example, when the rules are ambiguous, when they are enforced (as laws) in an arbitrary way, and when they operate in favour of particular people to the disadvantage of others. The term 'normlessness' is frequently used as a synonym of anomie; meaning the absence of clear rules to guide behaviour.
- 4.4 Anomie emerges following the disintegration of the old culture and before the core rules of the new culture have been fully established. Over this period of transition, the rules guiding behaviour are therefore unclear. Here, then, is a situation of 'normlessness'; of anomie. Such confusion precipitates deviance and other behaviours evoking moral comment. These behaviours include high rates of crime, suicide, substance abuse, corruption, family dissolution, and so on.
- 4.5 The most socially disadvantaged – the most marginalised - are more likely to experience anomie (Atteslander et al, 1999).
- 4.6 The Swiss Academy for Development has initiated a major research project that attempts to measure the level of contemporary anomie and its social consequences. As an international initiative it recognises the way globalisation is bringing profound socio economic, socio political, and socio cultural changes, with anomie being a consequence of these changes (Atteslander et al, 1999).
- 4.7 Though having its origins in the philosophy of ancient Greece, anomie was introduced into late 19th social science scholarship by the French sociologist Emile Durkheim. He wished to identify the nature of the confusion existing in late 19th century/early 20th century Europe over the rules that guide

behaviour. These changes to norms and customs emanated from the industrial revolution, for it destroyed the old culture and society, leading to the rise of anomie over the transition period: the period immediately preceding the time when the new culture and society was established.

- 4.8 No research has directly addressed the relationship between housing and anomie. There is some peripheral work influenced by Durkheim, and this was responding to the socio cultural impact of the industrial revolution. It is largely US in origin and tended to use anomie in a metaphorical way, rather than in the way defined above. That is, it was used in a general sense to refer to people's feelings of disillusionment and alienation, rather than to a precise study of normlessness. This work focused on three main areas: tenure; dwelling type; residential mobility. These will be discussed in turn.
- 4.9 Interest in tenure and anomie centred on the positive cultural advantages of homeownership and the negative cultural impact of renting in countries of the more developed world. Homeownership is said to promote self worth, remove the alienating effects (for the tenant) of the tenant-landlord relationship, and encourage people – because they have a stake in their housing - to be involved in the community in which they live (Marcuse, 1975; Saunders, 1990; for Australian evidence, see Winter, 1990, 1994). On the negative side, a strong economic interest in a dwelling can work against a sense of community, because it may lead to homeowners ostracising neighbours who rent (Marcuse, 1975).
- 4.10 A second group of studies focused on the way dwelling types, and high rise apartments in particular, predispose feelings of despondency. In physically, and thus socially, isolating residents, these dwellings are thought to create malaise. The culprits, once again, are architecture and urban design. A study of six Chicago (US) public housing projects housing non-elderly low income earners, found a high incidence of alienation among those living in high rise apartments, but a low level of alienation among those residing in lower density housing (Amick and Kviz, 1974). Ankele and Sommer (1973) came to similar conclusions from three surveys of residents of a low-cost rental US apartment block. Social isolation was widespread, with the majority of residents knowing no other person in the complex. In contradistinction, a Canadian study of malaise among public housing tenants living in Edmonton and Calgary, found that neither the size of the public housing population nor project density were linked to malaise (Gillis, 1983). Feelings of distress were associated with social and psychological factors, rather than matters of design. Finally, a study of women 18 years of age and older who lived in a public sector, low-income housing project in Flagstaff, Arizona (US) in 1968, found that the level of education influenced anomie, and not the form of tenure (public housing): the lower the education, the higher the rate of anomie (Barnett, 1970).

4.11 Third, anomie was thought to be a consequence of residential mobility: in changing dwellings individuals experience malaise. A 1970s US study of 107 people who moved into low income public housing projects for the elderly in Vermont, found malaise to be lowest amongst those who had lived in a similar type of dwelling as before, as well as among those who maintained high levels of contact with outside friends and relatives, and among those who maintained contact with other tenants (Larson, 1974).

4.12 Although there has been no research on the link between contemporary housing and contemporary anomie - the anomie of the emergent global era - Holley et al's (1999) study of a South African township comes closest, because it focuses on a low-income (indigenous) housing area. Conducted as part of the Swiss Academy of Development's anomie project, the township was found to have a very high rate of crime and this was used as the major indicator of anomie.

4.13 In sum

- Although there has been no research conducted on the relationship between contemporary housing and anomie, a relationship is likely to be found today from any research undertaken because we are now in one of these transitional stages – between a declining culture and society and an emerging culture and society – that gives rise to anomie.
- We clearly do not know, then, whether different forms of tenure are associated with anomie. The empirical part of our project will examine this relationship.

5.0 Housing And Health

- 5.1 There is an extensive research literature on housing and health, some of which has focused on the causal link between housing and health. This chapter will review this, and related, literature.
- 5.2 Research has demonstrated a clear relationship between housing and health, with poor housing impacting negatively on people's health. Thus, by implication, good housing is necessary for good health (Acheson, 1991; Blackman et al, 1989; Burnett, 1991; Byrne et al, 1986; Dunn, 2000; Marsh et al, 1999; Ranson, 1987; Wilkinson, 1999; Wilner and Walkley, 1963). No clear definitions are given of 'poor' or 'good' housing, but they are implied in the research findings outlined below. In effect, poor housing is that which causes ill health, and 'good' housing has no negative impacts.
- 5.3 Yet the health problems emanating from poor housing tend to be minor. They do not usually relate to serious outcomes, such as heart disease and high blood pressure (Brimblecombe et al, 1999; Hunt and McKenna, 1992).
- 5.4 The key issue is the way the most disadvantaged live in the most inadequate dwellings and thus experience negative health outcomes. The root cause of the problem, then, is disadvantage; the disadvantaged get the worse housing. Despite the statistically significant relationship between housing and health, medical and government agencies rarely coordinate initiatives for improving health in tandem with initiatives to improve housing (Conway, 1995; Wilkinson, 1999). Yet, the precise nature of causality remains unclear.

There is a correlation between poor housing and ill health, but attempts to prove that poor housing actually **causes** ill health have often failed. Research in the field is characterised by weak, and sometimes contradictory empirical findings (Wilkinson 1999, 1) (bold in original).

- 5.5 Cold, dampness and mould have persistently been shown to pose the greatest risks, and this is specific to cold climates (Evans et al, 2000; Hopton and Hunt, 1996; Packer et al, 1995; Wilkinson, 1999). These conditions particularly affect children, while the evidence for adults is more mixed. Ailments range from respiratory illnesses to aches and pains, with most of the problems being resolved with adequate heating.
- 5.6 Measures to counteract the effects of cold, damp, and mould are successful if a full refurbishment is completed; partial improvements have no effect (Hunt and McKenna, 1992). Indeed, housing improvements improve health in general and not just conditions causing cold, damp, and mould (Allen, 2000; Evans et al, 2000; Kearns et al, 1992; Wilner, 1962). This finding, then, identifies a causal relationship between housing improvements and health outcomes.

- 5.7 On this question of climate, housing, and health, it is worth posing the question of whether inadequate housing in tropical Australia – in terms of insulation and problems of air circulation in a hot and humid climate – poses health risks; either in terms of physical illness (e.g. dengue fever) or mental ill health (e.g. going ‘troppo’).
- 5.8 Overcrowding can have a negative impact on mental health. It particularly affects low-income households, with the health outcomes taking the form of depression, sleep deprivation, fatigue, and family discord (Gove et al, 1979; Howden-Chapman, 2000; Schor, 1964; Wilkinson, 1999). However, it affects other people as well. An experimental design using students – a privileged population - identified similar psychological distress arising from overcrowding (Evans et al, 1996).
- 5.9 Living in low-income high-rise apartments – specifically public housing - has been shown to be associated with mental health problems, including depression (Gillis, 1977; McCarthy et al, 1985; Wilkinson, 1999). Similar outcomes have been recorded for the homeless residing in British bed and breakfast accommodation (Wilkinson, 1999). Yet, the cause of these health problems is likely to be residents’ social circumstances, rather than the high rise buildings in which they live. No one seems to have conducted equivalent research on the well off residing in condominiums – very tall apartment blocks – to see whether they suffer similar maladies.
- 5.10 Several studies have found that those living in low-income rental accommodation have higher overall stressor scores compared with those who are home owners (Blackman et al, 1989; Easterlow et al, 2000; Gingles et al, nd; Nichols et al, 1998). A Sydney study of public housing tenants examined the link between stressors (e.g. the psycho social environment) and resources (e.g. support networks) and found many with mental health and drug problems (Wearing et al, 1998). Based initially on interviews with 25 tenants of Sydney’s Waterloo estate, the study undertook in-depth interviews with 13 of these 25. The focus was on the adaptive patterns taken by these low-income residents towards social services available to them. Many of the respondents were found to have emotional and physical health problems and have diverse lifestyles, and there appeared to be a mismatch between the problems experienced and social services available. This mismatch was associated with resident’s negative views of the NSW Department of Housing (Wearing et al, 1998).
- 5.11 Homelessness has serious negative health consequences (Wilkinson, 1999). Poor health is shown to cause homelessness, but poor health is both caused by and exacerbated by homelessness. Those sleeping rough, living in hostels, residing in bed and breakfast accommodation, etc, have a higher risk of death and disease than those who are well housed (see Western et al, 1999).

5.12 The health consequences of a number of minor Australian dwelling types show clear links between the type of dwelling and health outcomes

- Kamien's (1978) study of Aboriginal housing in Bourke showed a clear tie between poor housing and poor health.
- Manderson et al's (1998) study of permanent caravan park residents also identified high rates of ill health among these residents.
- Neil's (1990) study of single men's quarters in a Western Australian mining area found only minor mental health impacts associated with crowded temporary accommodation.

5.13 There are several other health consequences of poor housing worth noting

- Poorly designed housing predisposes accidents (Acheson, 1991), with children and the elderly being particularly affected. Accidents took the form, for example, of falls and burns.
- Radon gas emitted from brickwork and stonework of dwellings poses the most serious health risks: lung cancer (Wilkinson, 1999). However, the risks remain small.
- The internal air quality of dwellings is affected by tobacco smoke and from carbon dioxide generated by gas heaters, and these cause ill health (Wilkinson, 1999)
- Lead water pipes, which are uncommon today, have a neurological impact upon children (Farr and Cushing, 1996; Wilkinson, 1999).

5.14 In sum

- Poor housing has a clear negative impact on residents' health, although the illnesses tend not to be among the most serious.
- The most significant impacts result from cold, dampness, and mould.
- Overcrowding can cause mental illness
- Homelessness can be caused by poor health, it causes ill health, and it aggravates poor health
- Still, there is urgent need for far more research focusing on the causal link between housing quality and health.

6.0 Housing And Perceived Well-Being

- 6.1 This chapter focuses on whether there are variations in perceived well-being (perceived quality of life) between residents of different housing tenures. Is there, for example, any difference between public housing tenants and private housing tenants?
- 6.2 Surprisingly, there appears to be no published research employing a perceived well-being (a subjective quality of life) scale; a scale that has attempted to assess differences in perceived well being between individuals according to their housing circumstances, and specifically according to housing tenure and dwelling quality. In other words, no well tried and reliable measure – like the one we will use – has been employed in research on the housing question. We therefore have no clear understanding of differences in perceived well-being between, for example, those living in public housing and those in private rentals who receive assistance, or between home owners and renters.
- 6.3 Still, housing is a key variable both in objective measures of quality of life and in subjective measures (in measures of perceived well-being). In our empirical analysis, housing is one variable in the perceived quality of life scale employed (see below).
- 6.4 There is certainly a research literature on housing satisfaction, but it is largely peripheral to the perceived well being question being addressed here. This is because the former focuses on housing satisfaction specifically, while a study of perceived well-being focuses on a person's judgement about his or her life in general. It is, nevertheless, worth discussing the findings from a select number of studies that have focused on satisfaction with public housing; housing of the most disadvantaged.
- 6.5 Angrist (1974) found residents' evaluation of two large US housing projects to be closely tied to their perceptions of their immediate neighbourhood and their type of dwelling. Good housing and a positive predisposition toward the neighbourhood led residents to be positively predisposed towards the area as a whole. In another US study of a low income housing area, Rent and Rent (1978) found that the overwhelming bulk of residents displayed satisfaction with their neighbourhood and positive sentiments towards their neighbours, and this was tied closely to general satisfaction with life.
- 6.6 In a US study, Fried (1982) found residential satisfaction and neighbourhood attachment to be based largely on features of the physical environment. Local social relations, regardless of type, seemed to contribute little to local residential satisfaction. In a similar US cross sectional study covering a number of different dwelling types, Gruber and Shelton (1987) found that overall residential satisfaction was tied to positive sentiments about the

neighbourhood as a whole, rather than to the specifics of the dwelling (see also Sagy et al, 1996).

6.7 A 1960s Australian study by Bryson and Thompson (1972) of a Melbourne public housing area found a high level of satisfaction with the housing and with the area. This level of satisfaction was largely retained in the 1990s, even though many households had been hit hard by 1970s/80s economic restructuring, with high rates of unemployment and poor job prospects being the major consequences of this restructuring (Bryson and Winter, 1999).

6.8 Another 1960s study, this time of Porirua, a large New Zealand public housing suburb on the northern periphery of Wellington and built over the 1950s and 1960s, found considerable satisfaction with the dwelling, with those residing in detached housing being more satisfied than those living in duplexes and walk up apartments. Residents were also satisfied with the area as a whole, although they complained about perceived shortages of necessary services, notably public transport (Mullins and Robb, 1977).

6.9 Since the research just cited was undertaken 30 or more years ago, and because government provisioning of housing has changed profoundly since then, these studies are of limited value for contemporary policy. A more recent study on public housing satisfaction, and thus one of greater policy significance, compared two types of US public housing; one old (high rise projects) and one new ('scattered-site' public housing) (Varady and Preiser, 1998). Scattered-site public housing includes a relatively small number of dwellings of varying types (detached, walk up apartments, etc), and they are scattered around the city rather than concentrated in one place. They had been built in response to a 1995 US Department of Housing and Urban Development policy. The study found that residents living in scattered-site public housing were more satisfied than those in high rise projects. This was because of detached housing; a dwelling type that residents felt promoted neighbour interaction, and it was this interaction that determined satisfaction.

6.10 In sum

- No research appears to have examined the link between housing and residents' perceived well-being, and specifically research that employs a tried measure of perceived well-being.
- We do not know, then, whether there are marked variations in perceived well-being between people living in different housing tenures or in housing of different quality.

7.0 Housing and Social Exclusion

- 7.1 This chapter considers the literature on social exclusion and housing. In this regard, social exclusion needs to be considered in tandem with poverty, for, although they are conceptually different, there is considerable overlap between the two (McGregor and McConnachie, 1995). While poverty is about material deprivation, social exclusion relates to a cluster of material and non material issues which marginalizes people and leads to their exclusion from mainstream society. In effect, it disenfranchised them as citizens.
- 7.2 In the literature on housing and social exclusion, social exclusion is defined as a condition in which people suffer from a combination of related problems: unemployment, ill health, the effects of crime, poor housing, the lack of skills, low income, and family instability (Marsh and Mullins, 1998; Somerville, 1998; Social Exclusion Unit, 1998). Poor housing, then, is one among a combination of elements defining this condition (Lee, 1994, 1999; Lee and Murie, 1997, 1998).
- 7.3 Social exclusion is a consequence of the profound socio cultural, socio economic, and socio political changes that have occurred over the last 25 years. A new economy emerged, resulting in a labour force different from the one present until the 1970s; one that was largely based on unskilled and semi skilled (and primarily male) manual work. This type of work has now largely disappeared, resulting in large numbers who are unemployed or who leave the labour force before the age of 65 years. Concomitantly, there have been changes to the government provisioning of welfare, as well as a series of wider social changes, such as the transformation of conjugal role relationships and a change in family structure.
- 7.4 The major consequence of social exclusion is marginalisation and the inability of the people concerned to exercise their economic, political, and social rights as citizens.
- 7.5 Social exclusion is spatially expressed, taking the form of clusters of individuals and households living in poor housing in deprived suburbs or parts of cities (Madanipour et al, 1998). These locations are characterised by, for example, high rates of unemployment, low levels of skill, low income, high rates of crime, and high rates of poverty. Social policies directed at resolving this complex set of problems come therefore to be geographically focused (Glennester et al, 1999; Goodlad, 1999; Reference Group on Welfare Reform, 2000). Not all of these, however, have been successful. In the UK, claims have been made that a disproportionate share of resources has been directed at non-deprived estates, rather than at those that are the most disadvantaged (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998).
- 7.6 In Australia, social exclusion has been highlighted by the 'locational disadvantage' debate, although the Australian situation does not appear to be as severe as that of Europe and North America (Maher, 1999). The most

disadvantaged locations are at the metropolitan fringe, a location housing many low income households whose situation is aggravated by difficulties in accessing basic goods and services, such as adequate transport, health care, and education. Unfortunately, there is surprisingly little empirical work demonstrating the nature of social exclusion at the fringe (though see Baum et al, 1999).

- 7.7 In the US, African American ghettos in large US cities are amongst the clearest cases of social exclusion (Power and Wilson, 2000; Wilson, 1987). They have increased in number since the 1970s because of the loss of secure, well paid, and unskilled manual work (for men), with the socially excluded coming disproportionately to be concentrated in certain public housing projects. Unemployment, poverty, crime, family dissolution, teenage pregnancies, female-headed families, substance abuse, etc, have all increased dramatically in these areas. In combination with the geographic consequences of racial discrimination, African American ghettos, then, have become major sites for the socially excluded.
- 7.8 In Britain, social exclusion tends also to be concentrated in public housing areas, and it is the public housing allocation system that is said to channel deprived households into these places (Goodlad, 1999; Murie, 1983; Spiers, 1999; Taylor, 1998). Those with greater bargaining power who are eligible for public housing are allocated better housing, while the most disadvantaged – especially the aged and ethnic minorities – get the least desirable housing (Ratcliffe, 1998).
- 7.9 The homeless are also a key category of the excluded, with their plight being influenced particularly by recent reductions in specific types of government expenditure. Certain government cutbacks on health services have affected those with severe mental health problems. Aggravating this problem in the UK has been a reduction in the social rental stock, with the mentally ill homeless therefore having great difficulty accessing and retaining rental accommodation (Anderson and Sim, 1999; Pleace, 1998).
- 7.10 In sum,
- Public housing estates have a disproportionate concentration of the socially excluded
 - The homeless represent the other major group of the socially excluded.
 - While there is an Australian literature on locational disadvantage, there is a dearth of detailed research on social exclusion, including its geographic expression.

8.0 Housing and Poverty

- 8.1 There is a relatively extensive research literature on housing and poverty, the most significant focus being on the level of poverty before and after housing costs are taken into account. The measure of poverty before housing costs are taken into account is based upon total household income, while the measure after housing costs are taken into account is based upon total household income less total housing costs, controlling for any housing assistance (e.g. rent assistance).
- 8.2 Poverty in Australia increased substantially over the 10 years to 1981/82; from 1.7% to 11.2% of households, after housing costs were paid (Bradbury et al, 1987). In a study using a different measure of poverty, the household rate was found to have fallen between 1982 and 1999, from 14.6% to 13.3% - but this was before housing costs were taken into account (Harding, A. and Szukalska, 2000). In considering these two studies, it is important to recognise differences in the way poverty is measured, with debate on how to measure poverty being ongoing, and heated, within Australia and elsewhere.
- 8.3 When housing costs were considered, Harding and Szukalska (2000) found that the 1999 poverty rate was 17.3%, with almost half of these people being the working poor (24%) or families with an unemployed head (23%). The remainder included households dependent upon social security (15%), and sole parent families (14%).
- 8.4 Of all poverty stricken Australian households – after housing costs are taken into account - 37% are private renters, 7% rent public housing, 17% are homeowners, and 30% are home purchasers (Harding, A. and Szukalska, 2000, 15). However, when each tenure type is examined, proportionately more of those who are public housing tenants are poor today compared with those living in other forms of tenure, whereas in the early 1970s, proportionately more private renters were poor (Burke, 1998; Wulff and Burke, 1993). The slower growth in poverty in the private rental sector is a consequence of benefits flowing from government assistance, and because incomes increased faster than rents over this period (Burke, 1998). It is also important to note the way home ownership affordability has varied over the last couple of decades of the 20th century, with purchasers experiencing the greatest proportionate increase in poverty.
- 8.5 As public housing becomes welfare housing – i.e. restricted to the most deprived households, where previously (1950s/60s) it catered for a broader cross section of the working class (notably in Europe, but also in Australia) - public housing estates have increasingly become places for the poor, and this is a situation common to a number of countries. In the US, poverty-stricken public housing areas have a large African American population, with out-migration of the more able increasing as poverty increases (Massey and

Kanaiaupuni, 1993. Still, it is worth noting for Britain that not all of those living in public housing are poor (Byrne et al, 1985).

- 8.6 Moreover, the poorest quality housing generally houses the poor, with the poorest quality housing being more likely in rural areas (Newman and Struyk, 1983). The problem is exacerbated by the loss of jobs in and near these areas of low-income, with easy geographic access to jobs critical in reducing poverty (Kleinman and Whitehead, 1999)
- 8.7 The link between homelessness and poverty is widely recognised, with homelessness referring both to those who sleep rough and to those who are badly housed (Western et al, 1999; Wright et al, 1998). The seriousness of the problem indicates the need to tackle the two issues together, although they are invariably treated as separate problems, with far more programs focusing on short term help for the homeless, than on changing the economic conditions to help reduce poverty (Shinn and Gillespie, 1994).
- 8.8 Growing concerns in Australia about homelessness are clearly reflected in continuing government support for the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP). SAAP services particularly target young people, women escaping domestic violence, families with dependent children, and the mentally ill.
- 8.9 In sum,
 - Public housing estates have a disproportionate concentration of the poverty stricken.
 - In Australia, households who are private renters and those who are home purchasers form the largest tenure groups of those who are the poor. However, proportionately more of those in public housing are poor, relative to those living in other forms of tenure.
 - The homeless are also a major group experiencing poverty.

9.0 Housing and Employment

9.1 Research on the link between housing and employment has focused on five main areas: where people live relative to job locations; the specific problem of public housing areas and job location; the significance of residential mobility (i.e. changing houses) for accessing jobs; the link between occupation and tenure; and the effects of the new economy on the job-housing relationship. Overall, the work is disparate and imprecise.

9.2 Although labour and housing markets are linked, they operate largely independently of one another. Linkages exist in terms of households' abilities to access housing in particular locations, with this access being tied to householders' position in the labour market, with high income earners having the greatest choice of where to live (Allen and Hamnett, 1991; Hamnett and Randolph, 1988; Randolph, 1991). The increasing concentration of households and employees on the outskirts of Australia's large metropolitan areas, where local jobs may be relatively scarce, pose difficulties in the form of commuting costs and travel time. As Yates and Vipond (1991, 247) have put it:

Here on the fringes of urban development, the quality of housing is usually reasonable – except for those people who can afford only the caravan parks. However, local jobs are scarce and, on average, commuting costs and travelling times are very high. Should one become unemployed, one's chances of getting another job will not be as good as if one lived closer to the centre and nearer to the vacancies that arise.

9.3 In Australia, Britain, and the US, the unemployed and the poor are disproportionately concentrated in public housing areas (Burke, 1998; Hamnett and Randolph, 1988; Murphy and Sullivan, 1986; Reingold, 1997). In terms of public housing tenancies, the 1970s saw a major change: from the economically active to the unemployed and the economically inactive, particularly the elderly and the marginalised. In assessing this outcome, US research suggests that public housing areas may even have a negative effect on employment: those who live there are disinclined to work. However, the author cautions against fully accepting this finding, suggesting that there may be a considerable amount of unreported self employment within the population (Reingold, 1997; see also Ong, 1998). Moreover, a range of factors prevents public housing tenants participating in the workforce. For Australia, Funder and Millward (n.d.) suggest that the relatively low levels of labour force participation among female sole parents is related to factors that allowed them entry into public housing, such as ill health and children's special needs.

9.4 There is a link between labour market position and home ownership, with Hogarth et al (1994) suggesting that the possession of a mortgage and the requirement to make regular repayments is an incentive for people to gain employment. Although, today, it is popularly believed that many households

require two income earners - because it makes it easier to pay mortgages - evidence for this claim is scarce.

- 9.5 With regard to residential mobility, those most likely to move house are the most skilled, specifically professionals, managers, and other high-income earners (Forrest and Murie, 1997). Those least likely to move are unskilled workers and the unemployed. Moreover, two income-earning households, households outside the labour market, and single parent households are least likely to make long distance moves (Munro et al, 1993). Private renters are more mobile than either homeowners or public tenants, probably because they are more likely to be young adults involved in the early stages of their careers and involved in new household formation.
- 9.6 Understandably, those who hold the strongest labour market positions are those most likely to be home owners, while those in the weakest positions are more likely to be renters, specifically government renters. In the case of tenure and occupation/social class, Australian research shows professionals and managers to be more likely to own or purchase, and labourers the least likely to be homeowners (Winter and Stone, 1999). A 1993-4 survey of English housing found that the self employed were more likely to be homeowners than employers or employees (Burrows and Ford, 1998; Pratt, 1996).
- 9.7 In communities linked to new industries – notably hi tech industries – it is the professional and managerial workforce who most easily satisfy their housing needs (Barlow and Savage, 1991). The local working class gets shunted into the poorest housing and the most insecure jobs. Moreover, the high price of housing forces many low-income workers to commute into these areas because they cannot afford to live there. This process is also evident in the inner city of metropolitan areas, where the inner city economy now revolves around high skill service jobs, and inner city housing, which once housed working class, has been gentrified; refurbished for the new service workers (Marcuse, 1989).
- 9.8 In sum
- The work in this field is disparate and inconclusive
 - While many of those who hold the most disadvantaged positions in the labour market live at a distance from major employment locations, it is their weak position in the labour market that is the major barrier to them accessing work.
 - Residential mobility is most likely among the most skilled and least likely among those who hold weak labour market positions.
 - A new relationship between home and work is becoming apparent with the rise of new industries in the new economy, such as hi tech industries and the CBD services industries.

10.0 Housing And Education

- 10.1 A clear link has been shown between housing and education, but the relationship exists under very specific circumstances, with the key intervening variable being the socio economic circumstances of households. Negative education impacts on children occur when they are homeless, when they live in overcrowded conditions, when they are slum dwellers, and when they live in noisy accommodation. Positive education outcomes have been shown for children living in owner occupied housing.
- 10.2 When comparing the cognitive functioning of homeless and housed children in New York City, Rubin et al (1996) found little difference in verbal and non verbal intelligence, although homeless children performed poorly at reading, spelling, and arithmetic. The education problems were related to frequent house changes (i.e. residential mobility), which meant frequent changes of school, rather than to anything inherent in housing itself (see also Clark, 1996; Clark et al, 1999).
- 10.3 A British longitudinal study found that children living in overcrowded housing, and in those lacking amenities, scored poorly on educational tests (Essen et al, 1978). The educational consequences of overcrowding were found to be equivalent to two or three months retardation in reading age, although there were smaller effects for arithmetic (Currie and Yelowitz, 2000; Davie et al, 1972). Finally, Radin and Weikart (1967) showed it was possible to provide educational programs to assist children living in crowded conditions.
- 10.4 A 1950s US study focusing on one group of slum children who were rehoused with their families, and one group of children who continued living in the slum, found surprisingly little difference between the two in terms of school performance (Wilner et al, 1962). The expectation that the rehoused children would perform better did not eventuate.
- 10.5 Noise has been shown to have a negative effect on the auditory discrimination, reading level, and related task performances of primary school children living in a 32-floor apartment building spanning an expressway (Cohen et al, 1973). Children living on the lower floors showed greater impairment than those living higher up.
- 10.6 Home ownership is positively associated with children's school performance. In a study of 400,000 school children in San Diego, USA, Rost et al (1985) found that gifted children were far more likely to live in expensive owner occupied dwellings, a finding that seems to reflect the socio economic circumstances of the parents, rather than there being anything intrinsic to housing. Boehm and Schlottmann (1999) maintained that parent's homeownership was associated with the greater educational success of their children, with even the children of low-income homeowners doing better at a school than the children of renters (Green and White, 1997). In the latter

case, it is possible that the discipline required to pay off a mortgage flows through to children in terms of the discipline that is required to achieve success in school. Still, this discipline can only be applied when there is sufficient income enabling householders to access a mortgage.

10.7 In sum

- There is a clear link between housing and children's educational attainment, although the socio economic position of parents is a fundamental intervening variable.
- Overcrowding, noise, and homelessness negatively affect the educational attainment of children.
- Home ownership is positively associated with children's educational attainment

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

- 11.1 In this chapter we discuss the data used and the methodology employed in the research component of the project. We wish to see whether our data confirm or reject arguments discussed in our review of research and policy. We found that there is a relatively extensive research literature identifying the health consequences of physically poor housing, and on crime and low-income (particularly public) housing. There is a more limited literature on housing and poverty, but one that does identify the types of tenure in which the Australian poor – and the poverty-stricken in other countries – are concentrated. There is also a small research literature showing the links between housing quality and children's educational achievements, and a diffuse series of studies on labour markets and housing. But there is a dearth of research on community and housing, and on social exclusion and housing, and nothing on housing and anomie, and housing and perceived well-being. Thus, in our research we will test existing research findings, as well as exploring those outcomes where no previous – or very limited research – has been conducted. It should be noted that our education data are on the educational attainment of the respondent and not on children in the household, meaning that we cannot test arguments on the latter.
- 11.2 To test the relationships between housing and the nine non-housing outcomes – community, crime, perceived well-being, anomie, health, education, labour force participation, poverty, and social exclusion – we draw upon data collected in 1997 as part of the South East Queensland (SEQ) Quality of Life Survey. This was an ARC-funded collaborative research project (1995-7) involving academics from Griffith University, the Queensland University of Technology, and The University of Queensland, with the Queensland Government's Statistician's Office being the collaborative partner. The chief investigators were Robert Stimson (then Queensland University of Technology, but now The University of Queensland), Rodney Stimson (Griffith University), John Western and Patrick Mullins (The University of Queensland).
- 11.3 This quality of life survey was one component of a larger spatially based study of urban growth and development in South East Queensland, popularly known as the 'Urban Metabolism' project. The project covered an area from Coolangatta in the south to Noosa in the north and inland to Toowoomba.
- 11.4 Between February and May of 1997 a computer assisted telephone interview survey was conducted using random digit dialling. A sample of 1347 useable responses was obtained from an initial pool of 4,500 telephone numbers. Approximately 25 per cent of these numbers were out of scope, being either the numbers of business firms, government agencies, and non-government organisations. A further 5 per cent, despite five callbacks, were unanswered numbers. The in scope item pool was therefore 3,150. With 1,347 useable responses, the response rate was 43 per cent of the final pool of 3,150 in scope numbers.

11.5 The survey instrument used in the study was developed over a period of 12 months and incorporated a variety of measures of quality of life. These included:

- Individuals' perceptions of the quality of their lives as residents in the SEQ region.
- Attitudes towards urban, economic and social development, conservation and the provisioning of services and facilities.
- The extent of civic engagement
- Levels of satisfaction with neighbourhood in which respondents live and with various aspects of their lives more generally.
- Measures of current health status, including a measure of depression.
- The nature of respondents attachment to the paid workforce
- Nature of transportation to and from work and shopping centres.
- Type of dwelling in which respondents live
- Experience of crime and fear of crime
- Extent of social support networks
- Activities completed in spare time
- Recent consumption habits
- Demographics: household structure, country of birth, marital status, level of education, occupation and industrial and household income.

11.6 The key variables from this survey used in our analysis can now be considered in turn.

11.6.1 Housing

Housing is defined here according to tenure and housing quality. Tenure distinguishes between households according to whether they were homeowners ('owner occupiers'), home purchasers ('purchasers'), low income private housing tenants (households in the bottom 25% of household income who are in receipt of any government benefits), other private housing tenants, public housing tenants, and those households living under other forms of tenure. The latter include defence force housing, a dwelling owned by a relative, and church-owned dwellings.

A measure of housing quality was constructed from the following variables: the number of bedrooms (1 to 2 versus 3+); material used (timber/brick/other); floor construction (timber/concrete/other); insulation (yes/no); air conditioning (yes/no); number of toilets (1/2/3+); age of dwelling (less than 20 years/20-50/50+); swimming pool (yes/no).

11.6.2 Community

Community is defined by the extent to which life is localised; that is, concentrated within residents' suburbs. It was measured using four variables (see Ahlbrandt, 1984). The first is the number of intimates (e.g. friends, kin, neighbour-friends)

living in respondents' suburb. Respondents were asked to identify up to four intimates, having been asked the following question (Q66).

Now thinking about people who do NOT live in your household: outside working hours whom do you see most often socially? What is the relationship? Where do they live? How often do you see them?

The second part of the measure is based on whether they did their main shopping within their suburb. The third part is whether their doctor is based within their suburb. Finally, the fourth part of the measure centred on whether they had attended, in the previous five years, a public meeting about an issue in their local area. Each respondent scored one for each intimate that lived locally (thus, a maximum of four could be scored) and one each if they shopped locally, if their doctor was locally-based, and if they had attended a local public meeting. Thus a maximum of seven could be scored, with the scale ranging from zero - for those who had no local intimates, who shopped outside their suburb, went to a doctor located elsewhere, and had not attended a local public meeting – to seven.

11.6.3 Crime

Crime is measured two ways. First, from responses to three questions on fear of crime and, second, from responses to three questions on respondents' experiences of crime. The three on fear of crime (Q009D, Q009E, and Q009F) were part of a larger question (Q9).

I'm now going to read out some statements that refer to you, your neighbourhood, and your neighbours. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

- Vandalism is a problem in this neighbourhood
- Breaking and entering is a problem in this neighbourhood
- I feel safe walking around this neighbourhood after dark

The three questions on experiences of crime are as follows

- Q63: In the last 12 months, did anyone break into your home?
- Q64: In the last 12 months, has a registered motor vehicle been stolen from this address?
- Q65: In the last 12 months, has anyone threatened you with force or attacked you in the area in which you live?

11.6.4 Social exclusion

There appears to be no statistical measures of social exclusion. Under such conditions, we have based our measure on the ABS Index of Deprivation because it covers the main items discussed above. Our measure is constructed from the

following items: the bottom quartile of household income; no qualifications; labourer; unemployed; no car in household; rent housing commission or the household is a low income private renter; primary education only; one parent family; separated/divorced; dwelling with one bedroom; tradesperson; Aboriginal or TSI; ethnic variable (born in non English speaking country/other overseas). The first four received heavier weighting and the last four a lower weighting.

11.6.5 **Poverty**

Those households in the bottom 25% of the household income distribution are defined as poor. This is an arbitrary definition since it was not possible to calculate a poverty line from our income data.

11.6.6 **Labour force participation**

This is measured in two ways: 1) employed/unemployed/ home duties/not in workforce. 2) In the workforce/unemployed and outside the workforce. The latter is used in the analysis (ANOVA) and in the multiple regression analysis

11.6.7 **Anomie**

Travis' (1993) adaptation of Srole's anomie scale is used as the measure of anomie. The items included in this scale (from Q84) are as follows.

I feel all alone these days
No matter how hard people try in life, it doesn't make any difference
I feel discriminated against
My whole world feels like it's falling apart
I wish I were someone important
It's hard for me to tell just what is right and wrong these days
I don't live by society's rules

11.6.8 **Perceived quality of life (perceived well-being)**

Heady and Wearing's (1992) perceived well-being scale is used. It is based on responses to the following question, one item of which is on satisfaction with housing (Q86).

How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your life?
Your employment situation
The amount of money that you have available to you personally
Your housing
The amount of time that you have to do the things you want to do
Your relationship with your partner
Your independence or freedom
Your overall standard of living
Your life as a whole

11.6.9 Health

Health is measured in two ways. The first, called 'health status', uses a standard health scale: the Short-Form36 (SF36) instrument (Ware and Sherbourne, 1992). It is constructed from the following questions (Qs 75 & 85)

How true or false is each of the following statements for you?

I seem to get sick a little easier than other people.

I am as healthy as anybody I know.

I expect my health to get worse.

My health is excellent.

The second measure, called 'perceived health', is also a well-tried measure (Ware and Sherbourne, 1992). It is based on the following question: How would you describe your health? (Excellent, very good, good, fair, poor, don't know, refused).

11.6.10 Education

Respondents' level of education is used as the measure (Q89).

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Primary school or less

Secondary school, but not matriculation/year 12

Secondary school, matriculation/year 12

Non-degree post school

Bachelor's degree

Postgraduate degree

11.7 Analysis

11.7.1 The statistical techniques used to identify the nature of the relationships between housing and the nine socio-cultural factors are multivariate analysis and an analysis of variance (ANOVA). ANOVA identifies statistically significant differences between groups and, in the present case, differences between tenure groups (public housing tenants, low-income private housing tenants receiving government assistance, other private housing tenants, owner occupiers, those buying their dwelling, and those living in other forms of tenure).

11.7.2 A multivariate analysis is used to identify those social forces (the 'independent variables') that have effected the non-housing outcomes: poverty, a high quality of life, and so on. We search, then, for the predictors of these outcomes.

12.0 Conclusion

- 12.1 The main conclusion arising from this review is the need for caution in making any claims about a causal link between housing and non-housing outcomes. A relationship has certainly been shown for a number of outcomes – even a causal link under some circumstances – but in most cases the relationships can be explained by the characteristics of the people living in particular housing, rather than the dwellings themselves. This suggests that improving people’s housing may not, *in itself*, remove a particular negative outcome.
- 12.2 More specifically, the review shows a clear relationship between housing and crime, housing and education, housing and health, housing and social exclusion, and housing and poverty. The relationship between housing and the labour market is not so clearly shown, and the relationship between housing and community – a critical relationship for policy purposes – is vague. In the case of housing and perceived well-being, and housing and anomie, a relationship was not demonstrated because of the absence of data.
- 12.3 Housing has been shown to have a clear negative impact upon residents’ health, and upon the educational attainment of children, but in both cases it occurs under very specific circumstances. They are a product of the poorest quality housing; that which houses the most disadvantage. There is also a clear relationship between crime and public housing, social exclusion and public housing, and homelessness, and poverty and public housing, and homelessness.
- 12.4 Our data analysis will allow us to test those outcomes that have been shown to be significant, as well as testing whether there is a relationship between housing and those outcomes that have not been researched, notably anomie and perceived well-being.
- 12.5 In a general sense, the findings highlight the importance of tackling housing problems in tandem with other social problems. However, it would be wrong to assume that solving the housing problem first would have an important flow-on effect for other areas. Certainly, taking this approach would be a major step for the homeless, but the homeless have a great range of other serious problems that are unrelated to housing, such as mental illness. Equally seriously, while those living in public housing have had their housing needs ‘solved’, they still experience a wide range of other serious problems, from unemployment to ill health. Tackling the housing question, then, must be done in tandem with targeting other problems

REFERENCES

- Acheson, D. 1991. "Health and housing: annual lecture." *Royal Society of Health Journal*, 111:236-243.
- Ahlbrandt, Roger S. 1984. *Neighbourhoods, People, and Community*. New York : Plenum Press.
- Allen, John, and Chris Hamnett (Eds.). 1991. *Housing and Labour Markets: building the connections*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Allen, T. 2000. "Housing renewal - Doesn't it make you sick?" *Housing Studies* 15:443-461.
- Amick, Daniel J., and Frederick J. Kviz. 1974. "Density, Building Type, and Social Integration in Public Housing Projects." *Man Environment Systems* 4:187-190.
- Anderson, I; Sim, D (Ed.). 1999. *Social Exclusion and Housing: Context, Critique and Challenges*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing.
- Andreasen, J. 1996. "Urban Tenants and Community Involvement." *Habitat International* 20:359-365.
- Angrist, Shirley S. 1974. "Dimensions of Well-Being in Public Housing Families". *Environment and Behaviour*. 6:4:495-516.
- Ankele, Chad, and Robert Sommer. 1973. "The Cheapest Apartments in Town." *Environment and Behavior* 5:505-513.
- Atkinson, R; Kintrea, K. 2000. "Neighbourhood impacts." *Policy and Politics* 28:93-108.
- Atteslander, P., Gransow, B., Western, J. [Eds.] 1999. Conclusions and implications for development policies. In Atteslander, P., Gransow, B., Western, J. [Eds.] 1999. *Comparative Anomie Research*. Alershot : Ashgate.
- Barlow, James and Mike Savage. 1991. "Housing the workers in Mrs Thatcher's hi-tech Utopia: housing markets and labour markets in Berkshire." In *Housing and labour markets : Building the connections*, Allen, John and Chris Hamnett (Eds). Pp 236-253. London : Unwin Hyman
- Barnett, Larry D. 1970. "Achievement Values and Anomie Among Women in a Low-Income Housing Project." *Social Forces* 49:127-133.
- Bartlett, Sheridan. 1998. "Does Inadequate Housing Perpetuate Children's Poverty?" *Childhood* 5:403-420.
- Baum, S., Mullins, P., Stimson, R, O'Connor, K. forthcoming, Communities of the postindustrial city. *Urban Affairs Review*
- Baum, S., Stimson, R., O'Connor, K., Mullins, P., Davis, R. 1999. *Community Opportunity and Vulnerability in Australia's Cities and Towns*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
- Blackman, Tim, Eileen Evason, Martin Melaugh, and Roberta Woods. 1989. "Housing and Health: A Case Study of Two Areas in West Belfast." *Journal of Social Policy* 18:1-26.
- Boehm, T P , and A M Schlottmann. 1999. "Does Home Ownership by Parents Have an Economic Impact on Their Children?" *Journal of Housing Economics* 8:217-232.
- Bottoms, A E, and Polii Xanthos. 1981. "Housing Policy and Crime in the British Public Sector." Pp. 203-225 in *Environmental Criminology*, edited by Paul J Brantingham and Patricia L Brantingham. London: Sage.
- ___ and P Wiles. 1986. "Housing Tenure and Residential Community Crime in Britain." in *Communities and Crime*, edited by A J Reiss and M Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ___, R. I. Mawby, and Monica A. Walker. 1987. "A Localised Crime Survey in Contrasting Areas of a City." *British Journal of Criminology* 27:125-154.
- Bradbury, Bruce; Chris Rossiter, Joan Vipond. 1987. "Housing and poverty in

- Australia." *Urban Studies* 24:95-102.
- Brantingham, Paul J. and Patricia L. Brantingham. 1981. *Environmental Criminology*. London : Sage Publications.
- Brimblecombe, N, Dorling, D; Shaw, M. 1999. "Where the poor die in a rich city: the case of Oxford." *Health and Place* 5:287-300.
- Bryson, L. and Thompson, F. 1972. *An Australian Newtown*. Harmondworth, Penguin.
- Bryson, L. and Winter, I. 1999, *Social Change and Suburban Lives*. Sydney, Allen and Unwin.
- Burby, Raymond J and William M. Rohe. 1989. "Deconcentration of Public Housing. Effects on Residents' Satisfaction with Their Living Environments and Their Fear of Crime". *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 25:117-141.
- Burke, P. 1998. *The poverty of homelessness*. Carlton South, Vic.: Melbourne University Press.
- Burke, Terry, Linda Hancock, and Peter Newton. 1984. *A roof over their heads, Housing issues and families in Australia*. Melbourne: Globe Press.
- _____. 1998. *Housing and Poverty*. Carlton South, Vic: Melbourne University Press.
- Burnett, J. 1991. "Housing and the decline of mortality." Pp. 158-176 in *The decline of mortality in Europe*, edited by R Schofield, D Reher, and A Bideau. Oxford: OUP.
- Burrows, R, and J Ford. 1998. "Self employment and home ownership after the enterprise culture." *Work Employment and Society* 12:97-119.
- Byrne, D et al. 1985. "Dynamite in a can." *Roof* 10:13-14.
- _____, S Harrison, J Keithley, and P Mccarthy. 1986. *Housing and Health: The Relationship between Housing Conditions and the Health of Council Tenants*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Clark, A. 1996. "Policy and provision for the schooling of children living in temporary accommodation: exploring the difficulties." *Children and Society* 10:293-304.
- Clark, Jill , Alan Dyson, and Alan Millward. 1999? *Housing and schooling: A case-study in joined-up problems*. York: York Publishing Service.
- Cohen, Sheldon, David C. Glass, and Jerome E. Singer. 1973. "Apartment noise, auditory discrimination, and reading ability in children." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 9:407-422.
- Coleman, Alice. 1998. "The Crime Crisis and Preventable Crimino-Genesis." *Journal-of-Contingencies-and-Crisis-Management* 6:102-109.
- Conway, J. 1995. "Housing As an Instrument of Health-Care." *Health & Social Care in the Community* 3:141-150.
- Currie, J, and A Yelowitz. 2000. "Are public housing projects good for kids?" *Journal of public economics* 75:99-124.
- Damer, S. 1990. "Housing and community." Pp. 71-106 in *Glasgow: going for a song*, edited by S Damer. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Davie, Ronald, Neville Butler, and Harvey Goldstein. 1972. "Family Moves and Housing Conditions." Pp. 48-58 in *From Birth to Seven: The second report of the National Child Development Study (1958 Cohort)*, edited by Ronald Davie, Neville Butler, and Harvey Goldstein. London: Longman.
- Ditkovsky, Orit, and Willem Van-Vliet. 1984. "Housing tenure and community participation." *Ekistics* 51:345-8.
- Duncan, S, and J Barlow. "The use and abuse of housing tenure." *Housing Studies* 3:219-231.
- Dunn, J. R. 2000. "Housing and health inequalities: Review and prospects for research." *Housing Studies* 15:3:341-366.
- Easterlow, Donna, Susan J. Smith and Sara Mallinson. 2000. "Housing for Health: The Role of Owner Occupation." *Housing Studies* 15:3:367-386.
- Essen, Juliet, Ken Fogelman, and Jenny Head. 1978. "Childhood housing experiences

- and school attainment." *Child Care, Health and Development* 4:41-58.
- Evans, Gary W., Stephen J. Lepore, and Alex Schroeder. 1996. "The role of interior design elements in human responses to crowding." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70:41-46.
- ___, N. M. Wells, H. Y. E. Chan, and H. Saltzman. 2000. "Housing quality and mental health." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 68:526-530.
- Evans, J, S Hyndman, S Stewart-Brown, S Petersen, and D Smith. 2000. "An epidemiological study of the relative importance of damp housing in relation to adult health." *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 54:677-686.
- Farley, John E. 1982. "Has Public Housing Gotten a Bum Rap? The Incidence of Crime in St. Louis." *Environment and Behavior* 14:443-477.
- Farr, Nick, and Cushing N. Dolbeare. 1996. "Childhood Lead Poisoning: Solving a Health and Housing Problem." *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 2:167-81.
- Festinger, L., S. Schachter and K. Back. 1963. *Social Pressures in Informal Groups*. London: Tavistock.
- Fischer, C. 1976. *The Urban Experience*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Forrest, Ray and Alan Murie. 1991. "Housing markets, labour markets and housing histories." In *Housing and labour markets : Building the connections*, Allen, John and Chris Hamnett (Eds). Pp 63-93. London : Unwin Hyman.
- ___ and A Kearns. 1999. "Joined-up places? Social cohesion and neighbourhood regeneration.". York: York Publishing Service.
- Foster, Janet, and Timothy Hope. 1993. "Crime Prevention and the 'Problem' Estate." in *Housing, Community and Crime: The Impact of the Priority Estates Project*, edited by Janet Foster and Timothy Hope. London: HMSO.
- Fried, Marc. 1982. "Residential attachment: Sources of residential and community satisfaction." *Journal of Social Issues* 38:107-119.
- Funder, Kathleen, and Christine Millward. n.d. "The workforce attachment of sole parents and ILO Convention 156." Pp. 97. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Gans, H. 1968. *People and Plans*. New York : Free Press.
- Giddens, A. 1998. *The Third Way*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gillis, A. R. 1977. "High-Rise Housing and Psychological Strain." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 18:418-431.
- . 1983. "Strangers Next Door: An Analysis of Density, Diversity, and Scale in Public Housing Projects." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 8:1-20.
- Gingles, Jenny, Siobhan McErlaine, John McPeake, and Lynn Reavie. No date. "Health and Housing.". Belfast: Northern Ireland Housing Executive.
- Gleeson, Brendan. n.d. *Spatial Citizenship and Spatial Planning in Australia*. Unpublished paper.
- Glennester, Howard; Lupton, Ruth; Noden, Philip; Power, Anne. 1999. "Poverty, Social Exclusion and Neighbourhood: Studying the area bases of social exclusion.". London: Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE.
- Goodchild, B, O Chamberlain, K Dalglish, and B Lawrence. 1997. "Crime and the Home Front: The Impact on Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour of Housing People in Town and City Centres.". York: York Publishing Services.
- Goodlad, Robina. 1999. "Challenges for Social Housing in the 21st century: Access and Exclusion.". Canberra: ANU/University of Glasgow.
- Gove, Walter, R., Michael Hughes and Omer R. Galle. 1979. "Overcrowding in the Home : An Empirical Investigation of Its Possible Pathological Consequences". *American Sociological Review* 59-80.
- Granovetter, M. 1974. *Getting a Job*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Green, Richard K, and Michelle J White. 1997. "Measuring the Benefits of

- Homeowning: Effects on Children." *Journal of Urban Economics* 41:441-461.
- Gruber, Kenneth J., and Gladys G. Shelton. 1987. "Assessment of Neighborhood Satisfaction by Residents of Three Housing Types." *Social Indicators Research* 19:303-315.
- Hamnett, C, and B Randolph. 1988. "Labour and housing market change in London: a longitudinal analysis, 1971-1981." *Urban Studies* 25:380-398.
- Harding, A. and Szukalska. 2000. *Financial Disadvantage in Australia: 1999*. Canberra, NATSEM.
- Heady, F. and A. Wearing. 1992. *Understanding Happiness*. Melbourne: Longman.
- Hillier, M. 1995. "Ambridge, Albert Square and Coronation Street." *Voluntary Housing* Feb 1995:11-16.
- Hogarth, Terence, Peter Elias, and Janet Ford. 1994. "Unemployment and housing tenure." *Housing Research* 134.
- Holley, H., Jubber, K., Zapotoczky, K. 1999. "Post-apartheid and double anomie in South Africa" In Atteslander, P., Gransow, B., Western, J. 1999. *Comparative Anomie Research*. Aldershot : Ashgate.
- Holzman, Harold R. 1996. "Criminological Research on Public Housing: Toward a Better Understanding of People, Places, and Spaces." *Crime & delinquency* 42:361.
- ___, Tarl Roger Kudrick, and Kenneth P. Voyteck. 1996. "Revisiting the Relationship Between Crime and Architectural Design: An Analysis of Data from HUD's 1994 Survey of Public Housing Residents." *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 2:107-126.
- Hooton, S. 1995. "A point to prove: why housing matters." Pp. 15. London: Chartered Institute of Housing.
- Hope, Tim 1986. "Council tenants and crime." *Home Off Res Bull* 21:46-51.
- ___ . 1987. "Crime prevention, housing policy and research in England." *Home Off Res Bull (Special European Edition)* 24:20-26.
- ___ and Janet Foster. 1992. "Conflicting forces; changing the dynamics of crime and community on a 'problem estate'." *British Journal of Criminology* 32:488-504.
- ___ and J Foster. 1993. "Housing, community and crime: the impact of the Priority Estates Project." Pp. 109. London: HMSO.
- Hopton, J., and S. Hunt. 1996. "The health effects of improvements to housing: A longitudinal study." *Housing Studies* 11:271-286.
- Hornburg, Steven P, and Robert E Lang. 1997. "Editor's introduction bringing neighborhood back in: Housing in a community context." *Housing Policy Debate* 8:697-701.
- Howden-Chapman, P., G. Pene, J. Crane, R. Green, L. Iupati, I. Prior, and I. Teao. 2000. "Open houses and closed rooms: Tokelau housing in New Zealand." *Health Education & Behavior* 27:351-362.
- Hunt, Sonja M., and Stephen P. McKenna. n.d. "The impact of housing quality on mental and physical health". *Housing Review* 41:3:47-49.
- James, Steve. 1993. "Crime prevention and public housing." *Socio-Legal Bulletin* 9:18-22.
- . 1997. "Crime Prevention and Public Housing: The Dynamics of Control." in *Crime prevention in Australia : issues in policy and research*, edited by Pat O'Malley and Adam Sutton. Leichhardt, N.S.W.: Federation Press.
- Kamien, M. 1978. "Housing and health." Pp. 174-190 in *The dark people of Bourke : a study of planned social change*, edited by Max Kamien. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Kearns, Robin A., C J Smith, and M W Abbott. 1992. "The stress of incipient homelessness." *Housing Studies* 7:280-298.
- Kleinman, Mark; Whitehead, Christine. 1999. "Housing and Regeneration: The

- Problem or the Solution." *National Institute Economic Review*:78-86.
- Lang, R E, and S P Hornburg. 1998. "What is social capital and why is it important to public policy? Editors' introduction." *Housing Policy Debate* 9:1-16.
- Larson, Calvin J. 1974. "Alienation and public housing for the elderly." *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 5:217-230.
- Latham, m. 1998, *Civilizing Global Capital: New Thinking for Australian Labor*. Sydney, Allen and Unwin.
- Lee, Trevor R. 1985. "Urban planning for crime prevention : some social consequences of public housing programs." *Australian Crime Prevention Council Journal* 7:31-39.
- Lee, P. 1994. "Housing and spatial deprivation: relocating the underclass and the new urban poor." *Urban Studies* 31:1191-1209.
- ___ and Murie, A. 1997. *Poverty, social exclusion and housing tenure*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- ___ and A Murie. 1998. "Targeting Social Exclusion; Targeting Deprivation Through Housing Tenure is Flawed." *New Economy* 5:89-93.
- ___ . 1999. "Where are the socially excluded? Continuing debates in the identification of poor neighborhoods." *Regional Studies* 33:483.
- Madanipour, Ali and G. Cars and J. Allen Eds. 1998. *Social Exclusion in European Cities*. London : Jessica Kingsley.
- Maher, C. 1999. "Locational disadvantage and concentrations : a review and evaluation of the findings". In O'Connor, K. (ed) *Houses and Jobs in Cities and Regions*. Brisbane : University of Queensland Press.
- Manderson, L, M Kelaher, C McLaughlin, and M Sandberg. 1998. "Security and Safe Havens: Health Issues Among Women in Mobile Homes." *Women and Health* 28:83-96.
- Marcuse, Peter. 1975. "Residential Alienation, Home Ownership and the Limits of Shelter Policy." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 3:181-203.
- . 1989. "Gentrification, Homelessness, and the Work Process: Housing Markets and Labour Markets in the Quartered City." *Housing Studies* 4:211-220.
- Marsh, Alex; Mullins, David. 1998. "The Social Exclusion Perspective and Housing Studies: Origins, Applications and Limitations." *Housing Studies* 13:749-759.
- ___, David Gordon, Christina Pantazis, and Pauline Heslop. 1999. *Home Sweet Home? The Impact of Poor Housing on Health*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Massey, Douglas S; Kanaiaupuni, Shawn M. 1993. "Public housing and the concentration of poverty." *Social Science Quarterly* 74:109-122.
- Matka, Elizabeth. 1997. "Public housing and crime in Sydney." Pp. 29. Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.
- Mawby, R. I. 1977. "Defensible Space: A Theoretical and Empirical Appraisal." *Urban-Studies* 14:169-179.
- Mayes, David. 1980. "The Economic Rationale for Government Intervention in Housing: A Comment." *Social Policy and Administration* 14:54-58.
- McCarthy, P., D. Byrne, S. Harrison, and J. Keithley. 1985. "Housing type, housing location and mental health." *Social Psychiatry* 20:125-130.
- McGregor, Alan, and Margaret McConnachie. 1995. "Social Exclusion, Urban Regeneration and Economic Reintegration." *Urban Studies* 32:1587-1600.
- Merton, Robert K., Patricia Salter West, Marie Jahoda, and Hanan C. Selvin. 1951. "Social policy and social research in housing." *Journal of Social Issues*.
- Mitchelson, W. 1976. *Man in his Urban Environment*. Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley.
- Mullins, P. and Robb, J.H. 1977. "Residents' assessment of a New Zealand public housing scheme". *Environment and Behavior* 9, 4, 573-624.

- Mullins, P. 1987. "Community and urban movements". *Sociological Review* 35, 2, 347-369.
- ___ . 1988. "Is Australian urbanization different?" In Najman, J. and Western, J. (eds). *A Sociology of Australian Development*. Melbourne : Macmillan.
- ___ . 1995. "Households, consumerism, and metropolitan development". In Troy, P. N. (ed) *Australian Cities*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- ___, Natalier, K., Smith, P., Smeaton, B. 1999. "Cities and consumption spaces". *Urban Affairs Review*. 35, 1, 44-71.
- ___ and Kynaston, C. 2000. "The household production of subsistence goods: the urban peasant thesis reassessed". In Troy, P. (ed) *European Housing in Australia*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Munro, M, A McGregor, P Symon, and M Heafey. 1993. "Labour immobility in Britain: is council housing to blame?" *Housing Review* 42:1-5.
- Murie, Alan. 1983. *Housing inequality and deprivation*. London: Heinemann Educational.
- ___ . 1997. "Linking housing changes to crime." *Social Policy and Administration* 31:22-36.
- Murphy, M., and Oriel Sullivan. 1986. "Unemployment, Housing and Household Structure among Young Adults." *Journal of Social Policy* 15:205-222.
- Neil, C. C. 1990. "Social Integration and Shared Living Space: Psychiatric Impairment among Single Men." *Housing Studies* 5:24-35.
- Neild, Jill, and Ian Paylor. 1996. "A case study investigating the criminal activity among residents in an urban area." *Environment and Behavior* 28:748-63.
- Newman, Oscar . 1972. *Defensible Space*. New York : Macmillan.
- ___ and Karen A. Franck. 1981. "The Effects of Building Size on Personal Crime and Fear of Crime." in *American Sociological Association (ASA). 1981*.
- Newman, Sandra J; Struyk, Raymond J. 1983. "Housing and poverty." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 65:243-253.
- Nichols, J.S., A. Ellaway, and S. Macintyre. 1998. "Does housing tenure predict health in the UK because it exposes people to different levels of housing related hazards in the home or its surroundings?" *Health and Place* 4:141-150.
- Ong, Paul. 1998. "Subsidized housing and work among welfare recipients." *Housing Policy Debate* 9:775-794.
- Packer, C. N., S. Stewart-Brown, and S. E. Fowle. 1994. "Damp Housing and Adult Health - Results From a Life-Style Study in Worcester, England." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 48:555-559.
- Phibbs, Peter. 1999? "The Social and Economic Impacts of Unmet Housing Needs". Housing Queensland Occasional Paper 4.
- Pleace, N. 1998. "Single Homelessness as Social Exclusion: The Unique and the Extreme." *Social Policy and Administration* 32:46-59.
- Power, Anne and Wilson, William Julius. 2000. "Social Exclusion and the future of cities.". London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion.
- Pratt, Andy C. 1996. "Coordinating Employment, Transport and Housing in Cities: An Institutional Perspective." *Urban Studies* 33:1357-1375.
- Putnam, R.D. 1995. "Bowling alone: America's declining social capital". *Journal of Democracy*. 6, 1, 65-78.
- ___ . 1998. "Social capital: Its importance to housing and community development - Foreword." *Housing Policy Debate* 9:v-viii.
- Pyle, Gerald F. 1976. "Spatial and Temporal Aspects of Crime in Cleveland, Ohio." *American Behavioral Scientist* 20:175-198.
- Queensland Department of Housing, 2000, *The Challenge to Lead and the Opportunity to Learn through Community Renewal*. Housing Policy and Research Occasional Paper 6, Queensland Department of Housing.

- Radin, Norma, and David P. Weikart. 1967. "A Home Teaching Program For Disadvantaged Preschool Children." *Journal of Special Education* 1:183-190.
- Randolph, Bill. 1991. "Housing markets, labour markets and discontinuity theory". In *Housing and labour markets : Building the connections*, Allen, John and Chris Hamnett (Eds). Pp 17-51. London : Unwin Hyman.
- Ranson, R. 1987. "Relating housing standards to health hazards." *Royal Society Health Journal* 107:231-238.
- Ratcliffe, Peter. 1998. "'Race', Housing and Social Exclusion." *Housing Studies* 13:6:761-779.
- Reference Group on Welfare Reform. 2000. "Participation Support for a more Equitable Society". Canberra : Department of Family and Community Services.
- Reingold, David A. 1995. "Public Housing, Home Ownership, and Community Participation in Chicago's Inner City." *Housing Studies* 10:445-469.
- _____. 1997. "Does Inner City Public Housing Exacerbate the Employment Problems of Its Tenants?" *Journal of Urban Affairs* 19:469-86.
- Reiss, Albert J, Jr., Michael Tonry, and Eds. 1986. *Communities and Crime, A Review of Research*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1986. "Why are communities important in understanding crime." *Crime and Justice - A Review of Research* 71:33.
- Rent, George S., and Clyda S. Rent. 1978. "Low-Income Housing: Factors Related to Residential Satisfaction." *Environment and Behavior* 10:459-488.
- Roncek, Dennis , Ralph Bell, and Jeffrey Francik. 1981. "Housing Projects and Crime: Testing a Proximity Hypothesis." *Social Problems* 2:151-166.
- Rost, Detlef H., and Helfried T. Albrecht. 1985. "Expensive homes; clever children? On the relationship between giftedness and housing quality." *School Psychology International* 6:5-12.
- Rubin, David H. , Candace J. Erickson, Mutya San Agustin, Sean D. Cleary, Janet K. Allen, and Patricia Cohen. 1996. "Cognitive and academic functioning of homeless children compared with housed children." *Pediatrics* 97:289.
- Saegert, S, and G Winkel. 1998. "Social capital and the revitalization of New York city's distressed inner-city housing." *Housing Policy Debate* 9:17-60.
- Sagy, Shifra, Eliahu Stern, and Shaul Krakover. 1996. "Macro- and Microlevel Factors Related to Sense of Community: The Case of Temporary Neighborhoods in Israel." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 24:657-676.
- Saunders, P. 1990. *A Nation of Homeowners*. London: Unwin Hyman
- Schorr, Alvin L. 1964. "Housing and its Effects." Pp. 1-21 in *Slums and Social Insecurity*, edited by Alvin L Schorr. London: Nelson.
- Shinn, Marybeth; Gillespie, Colleen. 1994. "The role of housing and poverty in the origins of homelessness." *The American Behavioral Scientist* 37:505-521.
- Skogan, W.G. 1990, *Disorder and Decline*. New York, Free Press.
- Smith, Susan J. 1986. "Crime and housing: managing the risks." *Housing Studies*:11-13.
- Social Exclusion Unit. 1998. "Bringing Britain together: a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal.". London: Social Exclusion Unit, UK Home Office.
- Somerville, Peter. 1998. "Explanations of Social Exclusion: Where Does Housing Fit In?" *Housing Studies* 13:6:761-780.
- Spiers, F. (Ed.). 1999. *Housing and social exclusion*. London; Philadelphia, Pa: J. Kingsley Publishers.
- Stein, M. 1960. *The Eclipse of Community*. Princeton : Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, Marilyn. 1998. "Combating the Social Exclusion of Housing Estates." *Housing Studies* 13:6:819-832.
- Travis, R. 1993. "The MOS alienation scale: an alternative to Srole's anomia scale". *Social Indicators Research*. 28:71-91.

- US Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2001, *Strategies for Success: Reinventing Cities for the 21st Century*. Washington, DC. US Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- University of Glasgow. 1998. "Reconnecting Excluded Communities: The Neighbourhood Impacts of Owner Occupation." Glasgow: University of Glasgow/Scottish Homes.
- Varady, David P., Wolfgang F. E. Preiser. 1998. "Scattered-site public housing and housing satisfaction: Implications for the new public housing program". *Journal of the American Planning Association* 64:189-208.
- Ware, J.E. and C.D. Sherbourne. 1992. "The MOS 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36), 1. Conceptual framework and item selection". *Medical Care*. 30 (6), 473-483.
- Warner, B. and P. Rountree. 1997. *The Eclipse of Community*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1997. "Local social tie in a community and crime model: questioning the systematic nature of informal social control". *Social Problems* 44, 4, 520-37.
- Wearing, Michael J, Leanne Dowse, and Neil Orr. 1998. "Redressing Stressors with Resources? A Study of Public Housing, Mental Illness and Service Delivery on Waterloo Housing Estate, Sydney." in *International Sociological Association*.
- Weatherburn, Don, Bronwyn Lind, and Simon Ku. 1999. "'Hotbeds of crime?': crime and public housing in urban Sydney." *Crime and Delinquency* 45:256.
- Wellman, B. and Berkowitz, S. 1988, *Social Structures*. Greenwich, CT, JAI.
- Western, J. et. al. 1999. *National Evaluation of the Supported Accommodation Program (SAAP III) - Main Report*. Canberra : Department of Family and Community Services.
- Wikstroem, Per-Olof- H. 1991. "Housing tenure, social class and offending: The individual-level relationship in childhood and youth." *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health* 1:69-89.
- Wilkinson, Diana. 1999. "Poor Housing and Ill Health: A Summary of the Research Evidence.". Edinburgh: Housing Research Branch, The Scottish Office Central Research Unit.
- Wilner, Daniel M., Rosabelle Price Walkley, Thomas C Pinkerton, and Matthew Tayback. 1962. "School Performance of Children." in *The Housing Environment and Family Life: A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Housing on Morbidity and Mental Health*, edited by Daniel M Wilner, Rosabelle Price Walkley, Thomas C Pinkerton, and Matthew Tayback. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press.
- . 1962. "Summary and Conclusions." in *The Housing Environment and Family Life: A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Housing on Morbidity and Mental Health*, edited by Daniel M Wilner, Rosabelle Price Walkley, Thomas C Pinkerton, and Matthew Tayback. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press.
- . 1962. "School Performance of Children" in *The Housing Environment and Family Life: A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Housing on Morbidity and Mental Health*, edited by Daniel M Wilner, Rosabelle Price Walkley, Thomas C Pinkerton, and Matthew Tayback. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press.
- , and Rosabelle Price Walkley. 1963. "Effects of Housing on Health and Performance." Pp. 215-228 in *The Urban Condition: People and Policy in the Metropolis*, edited by Leonard J Duhl and John Powell. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wilson, W. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- Winter, I. 1990, Home ownership and political activism: an interpretative approach. *Housing Studies*. 5, 4, 273-285.
- Winter, I. 1994, *The Radical Homeowner*. Basel, Gordon and Breach.
- Winter, I., and Stone, W., 1999. "Social polarization and housing careers: exploring the

- interrelationships between labour and housing markets in Australia". In O'Connor, K. (ed). *Houses and Jobs in Cities and Regions*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.
- _____. Ed. 2000. *Social capital and public policy in Australia*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Wright, Bradley R. Entner, Avshalom Caspi, Terrie E. Moffitt, and Phil A. Silva. 1998. "Factors Associated with Doubled-Up Housing-A Common Precursor to Homelessness." *Social Service Review* 72:92-111.
- Wulff, M; Burke, T. 1993. "Public housing and poverty traps." *People and Place* 1:23-26.
- Yates, J, and J Vipond. 1991. "Housing and urban inequalities." Pp. 234-257 in *Inequality in Australia: slicing the cake*, edited by J O'Leary and R Sharp. Port Melbourne, Vic: Heineman.

APPENDIX

SOURCES CONSULTED

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATABASES (VIA LIBRARY)

ABI/Inform Global Edition
APAIS
AustHealth
Australian Education Index
Australian Family Resources
Bibliography of Asian Studies
BIDS – International Bibliography for the Social Sciences
Boston Spa Conferences
Boston Spa Serials
CHID
CINCH
CINCH-Health
Current Contents
EBSCO Host
EconLit
ERIC (US Department of Education)
FAMILY (Australian Family and Society abstracts)
Geobase
Health and Society
Health-ROM
Humanities Index
InfoTrac (Expanded Academic ASAP Int'l Ed, Health Reference Center – Academic)
Medline
PAIS International
PAIS Periodicals
Project MUSE
ProQuest
PsycINFO
Social Sciences Citation Index
Social Sciences Index
Social Work Abstracts Plus
Sociological Abstracts (Sociofile)
UnCover web
Urbadisc
Worklit

JOURNAL/PUBLISHER DATABASES

Blackwell Science
Catchword
Ideal (Academic Press)
Ingenta
JSTOR
ScienceDirect
SwetsNet
Web of Science

WEBSITES CONSULTED

AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT

AGIP – Australian Government Index of Publications (webpac.ausinfo.gov.au/)
Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services (www.facs.gov.au)
Dept of Housing, NSW (www.search.nsw.gov.au/housing.asp)
Ministry of Housing, WA (www.housing.wa.gov.au/)
Dept of Human Services, VIC (www.dhs.vic.gov.au/)
Dept of Health and Human Services, TAS (www.dchs.tas.gov.au/home.html)
Dept of Housing, QLD (www.public-housing.qld.gov.au/)
Dept of Housing, SA (www.sa.gov.au/information/housing/)
NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/bocsar/)

UK GOVERNMENT

UK Government – Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions, Housing (www.detr.gov.uk/housing) - Housing Signpost good source of information.
Housing Corporation (www.housingcorp.gov.uk)
Northern Ireland Housing Executive (www.nihe.gov.uk)
Scottish Homes (www.scot-homes.gov.uk)
Scottish Executive – Central Research Unit (www.scotland.gov.uk/cru)
House of Commons Library Research Papers (www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/rpintro.htm)
National Assembly for Wales (www.wales.gov.uk)
London Research Centre (www.london-research.gov.uk)

US GOVERNMENT

US Government – Housing and Urban Development Dept (including journals) (www.hud.gov)

ORGANISATIONS/NGOs

AUSTRALIA

ACOSS (www.acoss.org.au)
Australian Institute of Welfare and Housing
Australian Institute of Family Studies (www.aifs.org.au)
National Youth Coalition for Housing (www.nychonline.org.au/Top.htm)
Community Housing Council of SA (www.chcsa.org.au)
SA Community Housing Authority
Community Housing Coalition of WA (www.houser.com.au)
NSW Shelter/National Shelter
Shelter Victoria (www.metro.net.au/sheltermvic)
Brotherhood of St Laurence (www.bsl.org.au)
The Info Exchange (<http://www.infoxchange.net.au/>)
Social Housing Information Network (www.infoxchange.net.au/shin/)

UK

Housing Centre Trust
London Housing Unit (www.lhu.org.uk)
Chartered Institute of Housing (www.cih.org.uk)
Joseph Rowntree Foundation – good research summaries (www.jrf.org.uk)
Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (www.rics.org.uk)
National Housing Federation (www.housing.org.uk)
Child Poverty Action Group (www.cpag.org.uk)
Shelter (www.shelter.org.au)

US

Fannie Mae Foundation (including journals, Housing Policy Debate)
(www.fanniemaefoundation.org)
National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (www.nahro.org)
Housing Research Foundation (www.housingresearch.org)
Habitat for Humanity International

UNIVERSITIES/RESEARCH INSTITUTES

AUSTRALIA

Australian National University (www.anu.edu.au)
Social Policy Research Centre, NSW University (www.sprc.unsw.edu.au/)
Institute for Social Research, Swinburne University (www.hed.swin.edu.au/isr/)
I B Fell Housing Research Institute, University of Sydney
(www.arch.usyd.edu.au/ibfellrc/)

UK

Economic and Social Research Council (www.esrc.ac.uk)
Dept of Urban Studies, Glasgow University – good links page
(<http://www.gla.ac.uk/departments/urbanstudies/hsglinks.html>)
Dept of Land Economy, Aberdeen University
School of Town and Regional Planning, Dundee University
School of Planning and Housing, Edinburgh College of Art
Housing Policy and Practice Unit, Stirling University
Centre for Housing Policy, York University – key housing institute in UK
Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, Birmingham University
CURDS, Newcastle University
Institute for Fiscal Studies – good links
Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE
Policy Studies Institute, UK
Institute for Public and Policy Research

USA

Center for Urban Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo,
(<http://wings.buffalo.edu/academic/departments/apas/>)
Joint Centre for Housing Studies, JFK School of Government, Harvard University
(<http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/jcenter/>)
Dept of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Center for Housing and Urban Development, Texas A&M University
(<http://chud.tamu.edu/>)

Virginia Center for Housing Research, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University (<http://www.arch.vt.edu/CAUS/RESEARCH/vchr/VCHR.html>)

Housing Information Gateway, University of Colorado
(www.colorado.edu/plan/housing-info/menu0.html)

National Housing Institute (www.nhi.org)

OTHER

UQ library catalogue

Cambridge University catalogue

ANU library catalogue

British library catalogue