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This study is concerned with social factors related to neighborhood interaction and disengagement among elderly persons controlling for race. Utilizing a scale of neighborhood cohesion as an index of disengagement, it was hypothesized that racial groups would not differ significantly as to their respective levels of neighborhood cohesiveness and local interest. It was also hypothesized that age groups would not differ significantly as to their respective levels of neighborhood cohesiveness and local interest.

The data for this study were collected at two time periods. Between September and December, 1970, sociology graduate students at North Texas State University conducted a survey of elderly persons living within the city limits of Denton, Texas. A random sample of city blocks was first drawn, then a quota, which matched the census figures for Denton on age and sex, was used on each randomly selected block. For the purposes of this study all non-Whites were dropped, thus leaving 286 elderly Whites in the 1970 survey group. A second survey was conducted among Black senior citizens living within the city limits of Denton between September and December, 1972. This survey was carried out
as a total census of Blacks over the age of sixty in census tract 212, which is predominantly Black. A 94-percent sample (N=153) of respondents from the total population was drawn from this survey for the purposes of comparison and statistical testing.

The interview schedules in both sampling periods were constructed to obtain similar demographic information as well as data concerning the neighborliness of the respondents.

The Chi Square test of significance, the Phi Square measure of association, descriptive percentages, and a unique scale of neighborliness were used to measure the differences between age groupings and racial differences in relation to neighborhood disengagement.

The hypothesis that progressive social withdrawal is not inherent in aging was supported. There was no significant relationship between age and neighborhood cohesion for the total sample or when controlling for race. Chi Square values were 2.35, with one degree of freedom for the combined samples and .0095 and .0017 with one degree of freedom for Blacks and Whites respectively.

The second hypothesis, that there is no significant relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion, was rejected with a Chi Square value of 37.41. This relationship is significant at the .001 level.

The relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion was then tested while controlling for nine dichotomized
variables. These variables are as follows: sex, income, education, marital status, length of residence, age, living arrangements, employment status, and occupation. The results of the analysis show that the relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion was significant when controlling for sixteen out of eighteen variables at the .05 level of significance. Those control variables which did not affect the relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion were white-collar labor, and incomes over $5,000 per year.

The study revealed seventeen respondents who scored lowest on the cohesiveness scale, and might be termed extreme isolates. Interestingly, all seventeen were White, and may be generally characterized as having extremely low incomes and low educational levels in comparison to the remainder of the White sample.

This investigation concludes that racial difference is more valuable as an indicator of social disengagement as measured by neighborhood cohesiveness than are age differences. The findings of this study seem to warrant further investigations of racial and ethnic group differentials in relation to the social aspects of aging.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In virtually all societies, prior to the industrial revolution, the extended family provided security, protection, and a decisive role for all its members regardless of age. These functions, however, have been altered with the increase of modern technology and the shift from an agricultural to an industrial society. Rural-to-urban migration and intense mobility have replaced the permanency of working the land. As the structure of societies changed, the basic conditions of life for young and old have been altered as well. The elderly, it seems, have suffered most from these changes.

It has been alleged that with the weakening of the family unit in industrial societies and the functions it once served, the elderly must increasingly rely upon organizations outside of the family as their primary means of support. Private and governmental agencies have increasingly taken on the responsibility of caring for those who cannot support themselves. As a result, in modern society old persons are less likely to be looked after and cared for in the family setting. More likely than not, they will receive social security benefits, old age assistance, etc.,
and are expected to survive as the responsibility of the state rather than of the family.¹

Other forces within society work to exclude the elderly. Societal abandonment and expulsion of its aged members is exemplified as workers reach retirement age. At this point, the worker's productivity in the labor market is terminated. The once complex work-oriented life is suddenly replaced by an overabundance of leisure time. It is commonly held that this sudden conversion from the role of "contributor" to that of "non-contributor" may result in an increasing sense of uselessness. It is not uncommon for males of retirement age to express the desire to continue work or to seek new jobs after retirement. Beyond the age of sixty, however, new employment is relatively hard to come by and the meaning of the phrase "put out to pasture" may become quite clear.

Havighurst² lists a number of activities which he has found to be of great importance to elderly persons. Among these are: keeping busy, feeling useful, having friends, getting status, retaining self respect, being creative, and being of service. In a culture that utilizes productivity as a criteria for status and respect, the goals


most highly desired by the aged are difficult to achieve.

Social life in old age may be crippled not only by the severance of employment and the breakup of the extended family, but also from the lack of friends due to death and the high rate of geographical mobility. The elderly may become lonely and experience severe depression as a result of the difficulties of maintaining social relationships.\(^3\)

In short, the generally accepted notion of aging states that certain social and economic barriers impair the usefulness and sense of purpose once found by older persons in rural communities and replaced it with a "role-less role." This sense of inadequacy in turn may promote insecurity, fear, loneliness and despair. Progressive withdrawal and disengagement from social interaction thus may often accompany old age.

In contrast to this common view of aging, Cumming and Henry\(^4\) theorized that although it may be true that society, in essence, encourages older people to withdraw from social interaction, this process of disengagement is painless because it is mutual. What has come to be termed "disengagement theory" argues that social withdrawal is part of the natural behavioral process of aging and provides a satisfactory arrangement for both the aging person and society at large.

\(^3\) Burgess, *Aging in Western Societies*, p. 19.

Although Cumming and Henry's theory has been widely challenged, it does indicate a need to study a phenomena allegedly common to the aging process: the gradual lessening of social contact.

The concept of disengagement, for the purpose of social research, has been defined in terms of family contact, involvement with formal and informal organizations, and retirement. In the current study a quantitative measure of neighborhood cohesiveness will serve as an index for social disengagement. Litwack defines neighborhood integration, or cohesion, in terms of the "extensiveness of group contacts within the membership group,"5 in this case, the membership group is the neighborhood structure. By investigating the level of neighborhood interaction of elderly people, knowledge may be derived as to the relative amount of disengagement experienced between Black and White neighborhoods. It is the purpose of this study to test disengagement theory for White neighborhoods and Black neighborhoods, a direction which is virtually unexplored.

It is traditionally held, and popularized by folklore, that Black neighborhoods exhibit a higher level of inter-dependence than is true of White neighborhoods. Minority group members are long time victims of racial discrimination, low incomes, poor education, and housing segregation.

Given this situation, Blacks are often viewed as sharing with one another what little they have while the middle class ethic of individualism is impractical under such conditions. Furthermore, the popular assumption that Blacks sustain a higher level of neighborliness than Whites is supported to some extent by evidence that there exists an inverse relationship between the variable of income level and the variables of local orientation and dependency.  

Several questions may now be posed: Can race be established as a factor in disengagement of the aged? How valid is Cumming and Henry's theory that increasing age is matched by a decrease in social involvement? Are old people from one race less engaged in their neighborhood than old people from another race? If there is a significant difference between race and disengagement what variables can be demonstrated to contribute to or influence this relationship? It is this area of social gerontology dealing with differential disengagement of aged Blacks and Whites, that the current study will investigate.

---

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Although Ernest W. Burgess, a proponent of symbolic interactionism, is considered to be the father of social gerontology, it was not until 1961 that a symbolic interactionist theory appeared in the field of gerontology.

Cumming, in 1960, published an article, which laid the groundwork for a formal statement of disengagement theory a year later in Growing Old: The Process of Disengagement. The theory of disengagement as presented in these two works states that both society and the individual prepare for the permanent disengagement of the elderly (death) by effecting a mutually satisfying process of gradual disengagement in the older years.

In the initial article, Cumming proposed three hypotheses with which to test the theory of disengagement.

I. Rate of interaction and variety of interaction will lessen with age.

II. Changes in the amount and variety of interaction will be accompanied by concomitant changes in perception of the size of the life space.

III. A change in the quality of interaction will

---

accompany a decrease in the social life space, from absorption with others to absorption with self, and from evaluative to carefree.®

These hypotheses were tested against data drawn from a 1955 survey conducted in Kansas City. The survey was carried out as a panel research of two hundred seventy-nine persons between fifty and ninety years of age.® Only the third hypothesis, that the quality of interaction will alter from evaluative to carefree, was not supported.

In their latter work, Cumming and Henry develop these hypotheses into a theory characterizing the process of disengagement. They write:

In our theory, aging is an inevitable mutual withdrawal or disengagement, resulting in decreased interaction between the aging person and others in the social systems he belongs to. The process may be initiated by the individual or by others in the situation. The aging person may withdraw more markedly from some classes of people while remaining relatively close to others. His withdrawal may be accompanied from the outset by an increased preoccupation with himself; certain institutions in society may make this withdrawal easy for him. When the aging process is complete, the equilibrium which existed in middle life between the individual and his society has given way to a new equilibrium by a greater distance and an altered type of relationship.®

---

®Cumming and others, "Disengagement," p. 29.
Cumming and Henry's statement of theory implies not only that change is virtually unavoidable, but that the direction of personality adjustment is highly predictable. It is further suggested that disengagement is a natural behavioral process near the end of the human life cycle which is both acceptable and desirable to the elderly. Because disengagement theory assumed both mutual satisfaction and inevitability, Cumming and Henry's endeavor is in conflict with the prevailing theme of previous works.

**Activity Theory**

Activity theory, although not developed as a formal statement of aging, has nevertheless been widely implied in earlier works and possesses all the earmarks of a theoretical framework. This theory assumes that successful aging is accomplished through the maintenance of a level of activity comparable to that of pre-retirement. As one becomes older there often occurs a deterioration of morale, which may be directly attributed to both the cumulative effects of biological aging and the perpetuation of a youth-oriented social structure. This framework reflects the need for new activities and interests to replace those which must be left behind with middle age. More importantly, this outlook is based upon an emphasis on individualism of the aged, that is, a belief in the capacity of the older person to adjust to new forms of
activity. Society withdraws from the older person, and the responsibility for successful aging rests predominantly upon the capabilities of the individual to adapt. An excellent example of the application of activity theory may be found in Havighurst's article "Successful Aging."¹¹

**Disengagement Theory**

The contrast between disengagement theory and the standard assumptions of the aging process are relatively clear. Disengagement theory operates both on a level of social behavior and individual behavior. Withdrawal is a structural aspect of the social structure and is agreeable to individuals as they grow old. It functions to gradually sever the ties which will ultimately be severed by death. In this way it is postulated that death is easier to accept, for most of the ties are already broken. Since disengagement is agreeable to older persons, it is argued, disengagement may be used as a definition for successful aging.

Disengagement theory was later modified by Neugarten¹² and again by Williams and Wirths¹³ in terms of more


psychological measures such as ego energy and ego style as related to successful aging. Williams and Wirths state that

This theory can be converted to a view of successful or optimal, aging by holding that to age successfully, a person must be prepared to cope with disengagement and, hence maintain a better balance in relation to an ultimately inevitable process.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite the later modifications, disengagement theory still retained its basic premise that the process of disengagement is not simply a result of external social pressures, rather it is a developmental mechanism inherent in aging.

One weakness of disengagement theory as presented in \textit{Growing Old} is the lack of adequate empirical evidence. The study group utilized by Cumming and Henry, and upon which they based their conclusions, was unrepresentative of the United States as a whole, as it is a study of a White, middle income, and regional population.\textsuperscript{15} A second weakness is the failure of disengagement theory to account for older persons such as college faculty and Congressmen, for example, who neither withdraw from social activity nor are disenfranchised by the social structure.\textsuperscript{16} Finally, although disengagement theory has developed from research

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 3.
\textsuperscript{15}Cumming and Henry, \textit{Growing Old}, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{16}Havighurst, "Successful Aging," p. 311.
within industrialized nations it is alleged to be universal. Damianopoulos writes that disengagement "is a culture-free concept, but the form it takes will always be culture-bound."17

The Debate Over Disengagement and Related Studies

Shortly after the publication of Growing Old, a reaction developed to Cumming and Henry's basic assumptions. Works by Kutner18 and Rose and Peterson19 maintain that disengagement need not be inevitable, that it may not be as desirable for the individual as the theory assumes, and that withdrawal in later life may be a continuation of life-long patterns of social participation. Kutner redefines social aging as

a process of re-differentiation and re-integration of social roles and functions, occurring as the individual ages chronologically, . . . brought about by role and status changes imposed upon him either by society, misfortune or deliberately self accepted.20

It is evident that Kutner's "re-differentiation" and "re-integration" once more assume the characteristics of the

activity theory argument.

As a result of this debate, researchers became more and more interested in investigating situations of social withdrawal among aging populations. Reference group affiliations, family interaction, and neighborhood cohesiveness rapidly developed as possible directions for quantitative research. Measures of neighborhood cohesion have long been used outside the field of gerontology as an index of social interaction and have been utilized to test the effects of such variables as religious affiliation, social and geographical mobility, education, income, sex, marital status, bureaucracy, occupation, and social class. It was inevitable that researchers in the field of gerontology should recognize the value of neighborliness scales and utilize them in their efforts to describe and analyze the context of aging.

Literature on friendships and the community interest of older persons is scarce in comparison to the number of studies concerned with their family relationships. Yet most studies seem to indicate that friendships and neighborhood participation diminish along with family

21Smith, Form, and Stone, "Local Intimacy."
Fellin and Litwack, "Neighborhood Cohesion."
interaction and social activity in general as one gets older. Cavan and Burgess\textsuperscript{22} published one of the first studies to formalize and legitimize the long standing notion that both companionship and social participation decrease with old age. Studies conducted in other industrial nations have produced evidence that to some degree social withdrawal of the aged occurs as an inherent product of technological expansion.\textsuperscript{23} Rosen and Neugarten\textsuperscript{24} have further shown that increase in age is accompanied by sharp changes in social perception. Their findings show that with increased age "the ego has less energy available for maintaining former levels of responsiveness to outer events."\textsuperscript{25}

In contrast to the assumption of disengagement theory that non-participation is both psychologically healthy and satisfying for old persons, studies have appeared which have found a positive correlation between life-satisfaction

\textsuperscript{22}Ruth Cavan and others, \textit{Personal Adjustment in Old Age} (Chicago, 1949).


\textsuperscript{24}Bertram Hutchinson, \textit{Old People in a Modern Australian Community} (Victoria, Australia, 1954).


\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., p. 63.
and high participation. These studies consistently find a relationship between a high level of social participation and high morale and a healthy adjustment to old age.26

An abundance of literature has appeared over the years with reference to elderly persons from different social classes and the process of making friends. The preoccupation in the 1950's by social researchers establishing social class distinctions is apparent in the literature. In 1949, Fried noted that working class people have fewer personal resources and interests than their middle class counterparts and are more dependent upon their immediate surroundings for social interaction and support.27 Fried's conclusions were supported by Smith, Form, and Stone28 and by Shuval29 who maintained that middle class persons have both a higher number of friends and a higher dispersion of friends than do working class persons.


Bernard Kutner, 500 Over 60 (New York, 1956).


28Smith, Form, and Stone, "Local Intimacy."

These findings were further supported by Hutchinson, whose Australian sample showed that stress, frustration and loneliness "are an accompaniment of poverty" and again by Rosow's American study of social class and disengagement in 1967.

In England, Townsend focused his investigation upon the isolation that may result from the lack of neighborhood friends. He argued that since working class persons hold a higher level of local dependency than do middle class persons, they may suffer more severely from a shortage of local friends. The implication of this study is that working class people are more likely than middle class persons to become extreme isolates when they have no neighborhood friends. Interestingly, Townsend's findings indicate that those with the fewest social contacts were not necessarily the loneliest. Rather, the more lonely were to be found among those whom had suffered the greatest relative decline in their previous level of interaction. Townsend concludes that the "underlying reason for loneliness in old age is desolation rather than isolation."

---

30 Hutchinson, Old People and Their Social World, p. 77.
33 Ibid., p. 182.
Bell and Meir\textsuperscript{34} studied the effects of various factors on social integration and anomie. They challenged the essential element of age in disengagement theory. They found that social class was more predictive of anomie than age. Among the most significant variables in the determination of anomie as shown in their study are occupation, education, income, age, class identification, participation in formal organizations and in informal groups, social mobility, marital status, and religious preference.

**Challenging the Theory of Disengagement**

There appears to be some consensus among the opponents of disengagement theory that chronological age is not the sole determinant of the response to old age. They maintain that an individual's life history plays a most important role in his adaptation to retirement and the break-up of long held lifestyles. Maddox, for example, argues this point when he states that "the disengaged pattern is not simply a function of old age."\textsuperscript{35} This conclusion is supported by the findings of Videbeck and Knox\textsuperscript{36} which


suggest that participation does not necessarily decline with age. Ninety percent of the low participants had rarely been active throughout their entire lives. Much the same was true for high level participants who had rarely been low or non-participants in their younger years.

Blau's study of the effects of widowhood on friendship maintenance\(^3\) not only suggests that changes in status may regulate the limits of friendship groups but also poses a serious challenge to the position of disengagement theory. This study of five hundred senior citizens in Elmira, New York found that upon the death of the husband, the wife may be gradually rejected by a close circle of married friends. Conversely, a woman whose spouse is still alive may find it difficult to enter a small clique bound together by the common bond of widowhood. One's values and status characteristics must thus be consistent with those of the other members of the friendship group before total acceptance is assured. Blau's study is, on the whole, a restatement of an assumption found applicable to all social classes and ages, that people are drawn together through similarities of interest and status.

This study is noteworthy for pointing out that aging is a major change in status, as is widowhood, and thus affects group admittance and maintenance of membership. The

implications of this study are significant in the debate over disengagement theory. Blau's findings show that the older widows in the sample were less isolated than the younger ones, as they were less likely to be the only widow on the block. Thus, according to Blau, social withdrawal does occur, but it is not necessarily subject to age grading. It appears that the postulate from disengagement theory that a direct relationship exists between age and disengagement is inadequate in light of Blau's research.

Two other recent studies challenge disengagement theory. The first is Rosow's study of neighborhood interaction. Mentioned earlier under the discussion of social class, Rosow's study is both an excellent and important investigation. Twelve hundred residents eligible for social security and living in the Cleveland Metropolitan area were studied to investigate disengagement theory. The sample was divided into three age-density groupings: those residents who lived in areas of mixed ages ("normal"), those residents who lived in areas with quite a few old people ("age concentrated"), and those who lived in areas inhabited predominantly by elderly people ("dense"). Each respondent was asked a number of questions regarding the number and sources of their friends. Those persons living in the "dense" areas had the most friends. Furthermore, those who lived in the "normal" and "concentrated"
areas were more likely to choose their friends from among their more elderly neighbors. From the Cleveland data, Rosow confirmed his basic hypothesis that the "number of old people's local friends does vary with the proportion of old neighbors, and these friends are basically drawn from those older neighbors." Rosow's study provides rather impressive empirical evidence that fails to support disengagement theory. It shows that older persons may disengage under certain conditions but not under others, and that there are alternatives to isolation, abandonment, and social withdrawal.

One of the alternatives to isolation and loneliness of aging is discussed in The Unexpected Community by Hochschild. Virtually by accident Hochschild stumbled upon a group of forty-three old people living as a community within a small apartment building in the San Francisco area. Thrown together by housing regulations stipulating old age and modest incomes, this group suffered very little from the social ailments of loneliness and isolation which are constant companions to so many in old age. Characterized as "rural born, working class, white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant widowed females in their late

38Rosow, Social Integration of the Aged, p. 294.
sixties," forty the group showed a remarkable amount of co-
hesiveness, activity, and community involvement. Hochschild
points out that

Like adolescence, old age is the minority
group almost everyone joins. But it is a for-
gotten minority group from which many old people
dissociate themselves. A community such as Merrill
Court counters this disaffiliation. In the wake
of the declining family, it fosters a "we" feeling,
and a nascent "old age consciousness." In the
long run, this may be the most important contri-
bution an old age community makes. forty

Conclusion

It is evident from this review of the existing
literature that disengagement theory has in recent years
come under well directed fire. It seems that disengagement
theory cannot support its original premises in the light
of ever increasing evidence, yet a great deal of the
research efforts in the past two decades has been initiated
by those seeking to confirm or deny it. Thus, right or
wrong, the theory of disengagement has provided a direction
for further research and has contributed to the advancement
of social knowledge.

It is also evident that racial differences have been
excluded from the major studies of disengagement of older
people. In the present study it is proposed that by
considering race as a factor in the withdrawal process

forty _Ibid._, p. 10.
forty _Ibid._, p. 142.
and by controlling for certain variables an important gap in the literature will be closed and a vital contribution can be made to the field of social gerontology.

Statement of Hypotheses

The present study focuses upon social factors related to neighborhood disengagement and withdrawal among Black and White elderly persons. This investigation is designed to test the importance of the variables of race and age as factors in disengagement. A quantitative measure of neighborhood cohesion among two aged samples serves as an index for social disengagement. First, the sample populations will be tested to ascertain if progressive disengagement does increase with age. Secondly, the significance of race as a factor in disengagement will be tested and finally, the relationship between race and disengagement will be tested for its strength by controlling for various social and demographic variables.

Hypothesis I

A. There will be no significant relationship between age and neighborhood cohesion.

B. There will be no significant relationship between age and neighborhood cohesion when controlling for race.
Hypothesis II
A. There will be no significant relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion.
B. There will not be a higher level of neighborhood cohesion among the White aged than among the Black aged.

Hypothesis III
A. There will be no significant relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion when controlling for the following variables:
   1. sex
   2. income
   3. education
   4. marital status
   5. length of residence
   6. age
   7. living arrangements
   8. employment status
   9. occupational differentials

Significance of the Problem

Social action, prodded on by the great humanitarian motivation now in vogue in the United States, is frequently implemented to alleviate social hardships and deprivations. Social action and planned intervention is generally regarded as the most direct and effective route in achieving the goal of social reform. Social policy is often directed toward a behavioral change more in tune with the mainstream of popular expectation that the awareness and perception of individuals never become stagnant. The burden of change is
thus being forced upon the aged in the form of behavioral change rather than upon cultural values which are often to blame for the misplaced role of aging persons.

Programs of intervention, without the aid of adequate research, are being challenged. Both the effectiveness and the motives behind interventionist policies are being closely scrutinized. Looft suggests that the intervention should be directed at the middle aged "opinion makers and governors of society" to redirect their efforts along the guidelines provided by current social research. Labouvie states that our most serious intentions at this stage of the game should be "related not to social action but to research programs."

Although the current study might serve as the basis for future social policy in the field of gerontology, its primary purpose is to provide information of an analytical and descriptive nature in an area that has not previously been investigated.

The significance of this study to gerontology is twofold. First, disengagement theory is investigated in terms of neighborhood cohesion and measured by an unique


scale of neighborliness. Second, this study looks at the differences of two racial groups in one geographical setting to determine under what contingencies disengagement might hold and where it might not. Finally, analysis is also made of the extreme "isolates" in the sample populations; i.e., those respondents who rank lowest on the continuum of neighborhood cohesiveness. These isolates are characterized in terms of those variables which have played a significant role in their behavioral reticence.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The Setting - Denton, Texas

The respondents utilized in this study were elderly residents living within the city limits of Denton, Texas. Denton is a city of 39,000 situated thirty-five miles northwest of Dallas. Originally a small farming and ranching community, Denton was altered by the addition of two universities at the turn of the century. Denton may currently be described as a "college town," although its proximity to both Fort Worth and Dallas draws a considerable number of commuters, thus lessening the number of student residents. Over the years Denton has increasingly become a suburb of Dallas, relying on the dominance of Dallas resources and jobs. Despite Denton's relationship to Dallas it remains a small college town with its roots deeply entrenched in a heritage of farming and ranching.

Denton has a clearly defined low-income Black residential area. This area comprises about one-eighth of the land space, constituting a wedge on the lower southeast section of the city. The area is roughly isolated by Highway 35 to Dallas as its southern border, small industries and the railroad tracks running northeast to
southwest which serve to demarcate its western border, and a fringe of low-income racially mixed residences on the north. White residential areas are prominent throughout the remainder of Denton. According to the 1970 U.S. Census data, almost ten percent of Denton's total population is Black.  

Although most of Denton's Black area is in visible disrepair, some improvements may be noted. Streets are under repair, a low-income housing project has appeared, and there are some brick homes replacing the previous frame ones.

Collection of Data

The data on which this study is based were collected at two separate time periods. Between September and December, 1970, graduate students in sociology at North Texas State University prepared and administered an interview schedule to a sample of the aged population of Denton.  

The 1970 sampling procedure consisted of two stages. First, a random sample of city blocks was drawn. After the blocks were selected, a quota was constructed which matched the 1960 census figures on

---


age and sex. A quota was then assigned to each interviewer to be used on each random sample block. In this way, representation as presented in the census data for the total elderly population was assured. For the purposes of this study all Mexican-American and Black respondents were dropped. Two hundred eighty-six White respondents over the age of sixty make up the 1970 sample. Each interview was conducted in the place of residence of the respondent.

From September to December, 1972, a second survey was conducted among the aged population of Denton. The 1972 sample was, however, drawn exclusively from the Black community. The interviewing team for this survey was also comprised of graduate students at North Texas State University. Again, all respondents were sixty years of age and older. This survey was conducted as a total census of U.S. Census Tract 212 which is predominantly Black and comprises most of the Black residential area described earlier. One hundred sixty-three interviews were obtained in this survey. To assure the legitimate comparison of the two study groups, a sample was drawn

---


from the Black respondents. This was necessary to lessen the probability of extreme cases within the total census appearing in the sample utilized for testing and thus skewing the results. Six percent of the residents were randomly removed leaving one hundred fifty-three respondents to comprise the 1972 sample.

Certain questions from the first schedule were duplicated in the second, thus enabling the statistical analysis and comparison of the two samples. (See Appendix for relevant questions from each schedule.)

Description of the Sample Population

Both samples were asked similar or identical questions to collect basic demographic information on each respondent. Since this study is concerned with race as an independent variable, the following description is concerned with the two racial groups throughout.

Age

The sample consisted of 439 people sixty years of age and older, 153 Blacks and 286 Whites. Their ages ranged from sixty to the mid-nineties. The age distribution for both groups was approximately the same, although the Black sample was slightly younger than the White sample. On the whole, about four out of every ten from each sample were between the minimum age of sixty years and the usual retirement age of sixty-five. Fewer than one-fifth of the
TABLE I
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BLACK AND WHITE SAMPLE POPULATIONS BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>71-75</td>
<td>76+</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>63 (41%)</td>
<td>41 (27%)</td>
<td>26 (17%)</td>
<td>23 (15%)</td>
<td>153 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>105 (37%)</td>
<td>69 (24%)</td>
<td>58 (20%)</td>
<td>54 (19%)</td>
<td>286 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168 (38%)</td>
<td>110 (25%)</td>
<td>84 (19%)</td>
<td>77 (18%)</td>
<td>439 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respondents in the groups were over seventy-five years of age.

Sex

A breakdown of sex distribution is shown on Table II. The results indicate that there were more females in the White sample than in the Black sample, with 62 percent females and 56 percent females respectively. Verification of these results come from figures from the U.S. Census data for 1970 which indicate that 55.6 percent of the Black population of Denton sixty years of age and older.
TABLE II
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BLACK AND WHITE SAMPLE POPULATIONS BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>67 (44%)</td>
<td>86 (56%)</td>
<td>153 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>107 (38%)</td>
<td>179 (62%)</td>
<td>286 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>174 (40%)</td>
<td>265 (60%)</td>
<td>439 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were female. It appears that the distribution of the Black sample matches that of the universe. Data on the White sample were gathered in proportion to the 1960 census data, thus it may be assumed that both samples were representative of the sex distribution of aged persons in Denton.

Educational Level

As expected, the levels of educational achievement were considerably higher among the White population than among the Black population. Over half of the Black

TABLE III
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BLACK AND WHITE SAMPLE POPULATIONS BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>&lt;H.S.</th>
<th>H.S.</th>
<th>H.S.+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(54%)</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>(49%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36%)</td>
<td>(26%)</td>
<td>(38%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respondents indicated that they had not completed high school as compared to only one in four of the White respondents. Consequently, almost one-half of the White sample had attained some education beyond high school, whereas fewer than one in six Blacks had attained higher educational levels.

Income levels show a similar pattern for both samples. About one-third of each group was in the $2,000 to $4,999 bracket. Distinct differences appear, however, in the upper and lower income levels. Almost half of the Black
sample, as opposed to barely a quarter of the White, made less than $2,000 per year. The percentage of each sample making $10,000 per year or more was twice as high among Whites as among Blacks. These results along with the results for educational levels lead us to conclude that the White sample has obvious socio-economic advantages over the Black sample.

**Marital Status**

The two samples differed little on the variable of marital status. Approximately two-fifths of each group...
were married and two-fifths were widowed. Although they differed only slightly, the modal category for Blacks was the widowed category while for Whites it was the married category. The only appreciable difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>63 (41%)</td>
<td>17 (11%)</td>
<td>68 (45%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>153 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>130 (45%)</td>
<td>13 (5%)</td>
<td>127 (44%)</td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>286 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193 (44%)</td>
<td>30 (7%)</td>
<td>195 (44%)</td>
<td>19 (4%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>439 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

appeared in the category of separated/divorced containing 7 percent of the respondents where twice as much marital instability was evident in the Black sample.

**Length of Residence**

White respondents were relatively more mobile than the Blacks. One-fifth of the Black sample had lived in Denton for less than twenty years, with more than four-
TABLE VI
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BLACK AND WHITE SAMPLE POPULATIONS BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Length of Residence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;20 Years</td>
<td>20 Years +</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td>(81%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>(67%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28%)</td>
<td>(72%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

fifths having lived in Denton for twenty years or more. In the White sample only two-thirds had made Denton their home for more than twenty years, with one-third having been there less than twenty years. Responses of "all my life" were more consistently found among the Black respondents.

Employment Status

Perhaps the two most outstanding differences between the two samples concerns the labor force participation of older people in general and women in particular. Almost twice as large a proportion of the total Black
sample told interviewers that they were working and not yet retired. Furthermore, only 2 percent of the Black sample compared to 18 percent of the White sample considered themselves to be housewives. This very high labor force participation of Black women supports the commonly held view of the economic importance of the Black female and the availability of service occupations in college communities.

**Occupation of Respondent at Age Forty-Five**

The previous occupational level of the respondents at age forty-five show that five times as many Whites as Blacks had white-collar occupations. In fact, almost nine out of
every ten Blacks had been blue-collar workers. One interesting fact emerged in that at age forty-five a higher percentage of White females were housewives and not in the labor force (34 percent) than at present (18 percent). This suggests a pattern of re-entry into the labor force, perhaps after widowhood for many White elderly females.

**TABLE VIII**

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BLACK AND WHITE SAMPLE POPULATIONS BY OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT AT AGE 45**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Occupation of Respondent at Age 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White-Collar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>96 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105 (24%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupation of the Respondents' Fathers at Age Forty-Five**

Table IX shows the occupational classification of the respondents' fathers at forty-five years of age. A high percentage of Black respondents could not recollect, or
TABLE IX
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BLACK AND WHITE SAMPLE POPULATIONS BY OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENTS' FATHERS AT AGE 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Occupation of Respondents' Fathers at Age 45</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>Blue-Collar</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>107 (70%)</td>
<td>42 (27%)</td>
<td>153 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>70 (25%)</td>
<td>202 (70%)</td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
<td>286 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74 (17%)</td>
<td>309 (70%)</td>
<td>56 (13%)</td>
<td>439 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

more probably, did not know their fathers' occupation at age forty-five. Although 70 percent of both samples stated that their fathers' occupation was blue-collar work, one-fourth of the White respondents indicated that their fathers' occupation was professional or white-collar, as compared to only 3 percent of the Black respondents.

Living Arrangements

Black respondents in this study were less likely to be living alone and more likely to be living in a dwelling with other persons than the White respondents. This is
particularly interesting, for this occurs despite the fact that a higher percentage of White respondents were married. This finding indicates that the White family unit is somewhat less responsive to the needs of an elderly member than is the Black family or may, on the other hand, simply reflect greater economic need among Black aged. Low incomes often make it difficult for aged Blacks to support themselves, thus the family must frequently assume this responsibility. This same economic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Living Arrangements</th>
<th></th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lives Alone</td>
<td>Does Not Live Alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>42 (27%)</td>
<td>111 (73%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>153 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>102 (36%)</td>
<td>173 (60%)</td>
<td>11 (4%)</td>
<td>286 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144 (33%)</td>
<td>284 (65%)</td>
<td>11 (2%)</td>
<td>439 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE X
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BLACK AND WHITE SAMPLE POPULATIONS BY LIVING ARRANGEMENTS
situation tends to encourage the family to support the aged within the home thus perhaps explaining the low incidence of elderly Blacks living alone.

Social Security Benefits

The data from the study population show that in both samples a high percentage of the respondents were receiving social security benefits. A greater proportion of Whites than Blacks, however, were classified as

TABLE XI
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR BLACK AND WHITE SAMPLE POPULATIONS BY SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Social Security Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>103 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>222 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325 (74%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

recipients. This may be due, in part, to the fact that a higher percentage of the Black elderly were still working
Summary of Characteristics of Samples

In summary, the Black elderly were relatively younger than the White sample and predominantly female. About half of the Blacks had not finished high school and received yearly incomes of less than $2,000. Although most often married or widowed, a significant proportion were separated or divorced. Most of the respondents had lived in Denton at least twenty years. The responses of Blacks indicated that there were very few housewives in the sample and overall there was little employment after retirement. Blue-collar work was common among the respondents as well as among their fathers at age forty-five. Only a small proportion lived by themselves. Two-thirds stated that they received social security benefits.

The White elderly were somewhat older than the Black, but more than a third were no older than sixty-five. Females outnumbered the males almost two to one. Almost half

49 Examination of the data showed that 19 percent of the Black elderly who considered themselves to be retired received no social security benefits. With regard to the high employment rates of aged Blacks it was assumed that Blacks are able to retire only when and if they have social security income support and that many continue working if their jobs are not covered by social security. It was thought that this might explain the high percentage of Blacks still working compared to that of the Whites. However, figures from the White sample show only a slightly lower percentage (16 percent) of those retiring without social security benefits.
of the Whites had completed some education beyond high school. Incomes, though primarily moderate, were higher for White respondents than Black respondents. Few Whites were separated or divorced. About one-third had moved to Denton within the past twenty years. Compared to the Black elderly, the White elderly had a high proportion of housewives as well as a high proportion of persons re-employed after retirement. Almost a third had been or were employed at white-collar jobs. A fourth of their fathers had been white-collar workers at the age of forty-five. There was also a greater tendency among the White elderly to live alone and to receive social security benefits.

Definition of Terms and Variables

To assure clarity and understanding of the current study, terms used throughout will be substantively and operationally defined.

Old Age

Substantive definition.—Definitions of what constitutes old age vary from culture to culture. Cavan and Burgess loosely define old age as "the last period of a normal span of life, the period which terminates with death."50 However, in terms of number of years, definitions fluctuate.

50Ruth Cavan and others, Personal Adjustment in Old Age, p. 1.
Old age cannot be expressed in the same age groupings used in industrialized societies by primitive tribes where the life span is relatively short. In the United States, old age remained only vaguely defined until the Social Security Administration established sixty-five as the age at which social security benefits might be secured. This act was later amended to provide benefits at age sixty-two. As sixty-five developed into the standard age for recommended and often mandatory retirement, this year in life was equated with that point at which one "became old," implying an almost overnight transformation. As a result of this attitude, the older age brackets in this country are often spoken of as though they were a homogeneous group. Despite the fact that those sixty-five and over are often lumped together, this group is nonetheless highly heterogeneous, encompassing a wide range of age, health, education, incomes, attitudes and values.

Operational definition.—For the purposes of this study, old age is operationalized as being sixty years of age and older. Even though old age is often defined as beginning at age sixty-five it is assumed that the effects of old age, both social and physical, are felt by the age of sixty. The various ages of the respondents are classified into four progressive categories for descriptive analysis (60-65; 66-70; 71-75; and 76+), and two categories for statistical
analysis (60-70; and 71+). This dichotomy may be justified in that a certain stigma accompanies old age particularly past the seventieth birthday. The ten years before this age may still be the tail-end of a transitional period between middle and old age. By age seventy, however, society no longer doubts that old age has been reached.

**Cohesion**

**Substantive definition.**—Cohesion has been used by sociologists to describe the unitary quality of groups of varying sizes. Although of little significance for Durkheim, he utilized the term, along with integration and equilibrium, to signify the product of social differentiation and social homogeneity.\(^1\) The notion of cohesion as a product of these two opposing forces has been adapted as an approach to the study of group dynamics in the field of social psychology.

Another use of the term cohesion has also been used as a concept in relation to the motivation of individuals to remain within a membership group. Cartwright and Zander speak of it in terms of "attraction to the group."\(^2\)

Cohesion is defined by Festinger, Schacter, and Back as

---


"the total field of forces which act on members to remain in the group,"\(^3\) and by Zadrozny as "the desire (and the habit) of the group to continue to participate in the group action."\(^4\)

This study utilizes Litwack's definition of neighborhood cohesion as the "extensiveness of group contacts."\(^5\) In this study the membership group is the neighborhood. Concern is thus placed on the interaction and involvement of residents in their immediate surroundings.

**Operational definition.**—A scale of neighborliness and neighborhood interaction is utilized to develop a continuum of neighborhood cohesion. This scale is intended to measure neighborliness which Zadrozny defines as

the friendly, personal relations among people who live close together wherein each person is concerned about the personal lives of the others, shares his feelings with them, lends to and borrows from them, and gives and accepts favors from them.\(^6\)

This neighborhood cohesion scale is operationally defined by five questions administered to all respondents from both samples, the answers of which reflect high (H.C.), moderate


A. How well do you think people in this neighborhood know each other?

1. Quite well (H.C.)
2. Not very well (L.C.)
3. No response (M.C.)

B. About how many of these do you spend an afternoon or evening with now and then?

1. 2 or more (H.C.)
2. 1 or none (L.C.)
3. No response (M.C.)

C. About how many of them would you say you know by name?

1. 2 or more (H.C.)
2. 1 or more (L.C.)
3. No response (M.C.)

D. If you had your choice would you continue living in this neighborhood?

1. Yes (H.C.)
2. No (L.C.)
3. No response (M.C.)

E. Do you think this neighborhood is getting better or worse?

1. Better (H.C.)
2. Worse (L.C.)
3. No change (M.C.)
4. No response (M.C.)

The answers to these questions were coded so that an answer expressing high cohesion received a score of two (2), an answer reflecting low cohesion received a score of zero (0), and a non-committal answer or no response received a score of one (1). The continuum of neighborhood cohesiveness thus runs from a low score of zero (0), or extreme isolation, to a high score of ten (10), reflecting extensive interest.
in the neighborhood. It should be noted in the interpretation of scores that although all five questions may reflect moderate cohesion, question E is doubly weighted in this respect. It not only offers two alternatives expressing moderate cohesion, but also, because of the very nature of the question, may tend to solicit a high response rate of "no change." Because the probability of scoring at least one point from the questions was high, the continuum was divided as follows giving extra weight to the boundary of lower cohesion (see Table XXIV):

(A) 0-5 expresses lower cohesiveness
(B) 6-10 expresses higher cohesiveness.

**Isolates**

**Substantive definition.**—In each neighborhood there are relative degrees of participation. Isolates are those individuals within the neighborhood who have the lowest level of participation and interest. By withdrawing from their immediate residential surroundings, they may be considered alienated and isolated. The isolates in this study are those who lack contact with neighbors, expressed dissatisfaction with their neighborhood, and who expressed a willingness to leave the neighborhood if circumstances allowed.

**Operational definition.**—Extreme isolates as determined in this study may be defined as those scoring lowest (0-2)
on the neighborhood cohesiveness scale.

**Income**

**Substantive definition.**—Income refers to all gains and benefits which proceed as the result of labor, business or property agreements.

**Operational definition.**—Respondents were asked to estimate their income for the last year (see Appendix, Question H). Income is reflected in two categories: less than $5,000 annual income (low to moderate incomes), and $5,000 and more (moderate to high incomes).

**Education**

**Substantive definition.**—This study defines education as the achieved levels of systematic formal training and instruction. Of principle concern was whether or not respondents finished high school.

**Operational definition.**—All respondents were asked what grade they had last completed in school (see Appendix, Question I). Education is operationally defined as having completed high school or not having completed high school.

**Length of Residence**

**Substantive definition.**—Length of residence is the number of years the respondent has lived within the city
Operational definition.--Each respondent was asked to estimate the number of years they had been residents of Denton, Texas (see Appendix, Question K). Responses were divided into nineteen years or less, reflecting the more mobile elements who have moved since late middle age, and twenty years and more to represent the less mobile community elements.

Marital Status

Substantive definition.--Marital status reflects a variety of conjugal situations: married, divorced, widowed, single, and separated.

Operational definition.--The interview schedules were designed to derive response of marital status (see Appendix, Question J). This study is concerned with whether or not each respondent was married or not. Thus, the categories of divorced, widowed, single, and separated were combined as all being void of a marital companion.

Occupation of Respondent at Age Forty-Five and Respondents' Fathers at Age Forty-Five

Substantive definition.--The type of work done by the respondents at age forty-five may be considered to be the peak of occupational performance and production. Of
primary importance is whether the respondent performed blue-collar or white-collar labor.

**Operational definition.**—Responses to the questions relating to the occupations of the respondents at age forty-five and that of their fathers at age forty-five (see Appendix, Questions 0 and P) were coded as to whether these occupations could be classified as blue-collar or white-collar work as determined by Hollingshead's *Two Factor Index of Social Position*. The index was used only to classify occupational positions and was not utilized to determine social position.

The question concerning the respondents' fathers' occupations at age forty-five was simply administered to the Whites as "What was your father's main occupation?" with no mention of any specific age as in the questionnaire administered to the Black sample (see Appendix, Question P).

**Living Arrangements**

**Substantive definition.**—Living arrangements refers to the number of people sharing the same living space with the respondent.

**Operational definition.**—Respondents were asked how many people, including themselves lived at their place of

---

residence (see Appendix, Question M). Living arrangements is dichotomized to determine whether or not the respondent lives alone.

Statistical Procedures

The data from each interview were coded, transferred to IBM cards, compiled, and then analysed with the assistance of computerized automatic data processing devices. Frequency distributions were obtained in tabular format and used to test the research hypotheses.

Statistical techniques of a descriptive and analytical nature were used in relating the implications of a number of variables to social disengagement. Chi Square, which is an appropriate test of significance for nominal data was used to determine whether or not the observations occurred by chance alone. A level of significance of .05 was used to test the relationships. Phi Square, a measure of association was used to measure the intensity of the relationships.

In order to reduce the magnitude of Chi Square in those tables with a cell containing an expected frequency of less than 5, Yates's correction factor was used.58

The strength of each relationship was measured by Phi Square. Phi Square is an accepted measure of

---

association based on Chi Square. Phi Square was utilized in this study because of its usefulness in comparing the strength of association between 2X2 tables. Phi Square values range from the perfect association of 1.0 to the total lack of association reflected in the value of 0.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Hypothesis I: Age and Neighborhood Cohesion

Hypothesis I states that there will be no significant relationship between age and neighborhood cohesion. Responses for the young old and the older old to the neighborhood cohesiveness scale are shown in Table XII.

TABLE XII

NEIGHBORHOOD COHESIVENESS BY AGE FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Neighborhood Cohesion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>77 (28%)</td>
<td>200 (72%)</td>
<td>277 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71+</td>
<td>56 (35%)</td>
<td>105 (65%)</td>
<td>161 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133 (30%)</td>
<td>305 (70%)</td>
<td>438 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.3478 \]
\[ p = .20 \]
\[ \varphi^2 = .0054 \]
The younger old ranged in age from sixty to seventy years and the older old consisted of individuals seventy-one years of age and over. Contrary to the results expected from disengagement theory, the older old were only slightly less cohesive than the younger old (35 percent and 28 percent respectively), i.e., they displayed a higher level of disengagement.

A Chi Square value of 2.3478, significant at the .20 level, was obtained and shows that the observations for age and neighborhood cohesiveness are not significantly different from those expected by chance. The Phi Square test to measure the extent of association resulted in a low value of .0054 which further confirms a weak association between the two variables.

Part B of Hypothesis I asserts that there will be no significant relationship between age and neighborhood cohesion when controlling for race. The results on Table XIII show that among the Black sample the older old were proportionally more disengaged than the younger old by 6 percent. The difference between the two age groups in the White sample was 4 percent.

The Chi Square value for the Black sample \((x^2 = 1.4519)\) is only significant at the .30 level. The Phi Square value was very weak \((\phi^2 = .0095)\). The relationship among Whites was even less significant with a Chi Square value of .4825 (.50 level of significance) and the Phi Square
TABLE XIII
NEIGHBORHOOD COHESIVENESSS BY AGE
CONTROLLING FOR RACE

<p>| Age | Black | | | | | White | | | | |
|-----|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|----------|----------|----------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Cohesion</th>
<th>High Cohesion</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Low Cohesion</th>
<th>High Cohesion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>94 (90%)</td>
<td>104 (100%)</td>
<td>67 (39%)</td>
<td>106 (61%)</td>
<td>173 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71+</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>41 (84%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
<td>48 (43%)</td>
<td>64 (57%)</td>
<td>112 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 (12%)</td>
<td>135 (88%)</td>
<td>153 (100%)</td>
<td>115 (40%)</td>
<td>112 (60%)</td>
<td>285 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>$\phi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.4519</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.0095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.4825</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.0017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

value at .0017.

The null hypotheses that there is no significant relationship between age and neighborhood cohesion for the combined samples and for the samples controlling for race cannot be rejected. Furthermore, disengagement theory,
which asserts that such a relationship should exist, is not substantiated.

Hypothesis II: Race and Neighborhood Cohesion

Hypothesis II was formulated to determine first of all if a significant relationship exists between race and neighborhood cohesion and secondly to test the hypothesis that Black elderly will have greater cohesiveness than White elderly.

It was hypothesized that older Blacks would exhibit

TABLE XIV
NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION BY RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Neighborhood Cohesion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(88%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 37.4067 \]
\[ p^2 = .001 \]
\[ \phi^2 = .0852 \]
a higher rate of neighborhood cohesion than elderly Whites. As shown in Table XIV, only 12 percent of the Black sample received scores expressing low cohesion as opposed to 30 percent of the White sample.

A Chi Square value of 37.14067 was obtained which is significant at the .001 level. This allows us to reject the null hypothesis and to conclude that the Black and White elderly differ significantly from each other as to their degree of neighborhood cohesion. The Phi Square test was utilized to measure the extent of the relationship. A relatively low value of .0852 resulted. Despite the low association, the hypothesis that a statistically significant difference between the neighborhood cohesiveness levels of elderly Blacks and Whites does exist is supported.

Hypothesis III: Intervening Variables

To further refine the relationship between race and cohesion a number variables were tested which might intervene. Hypothesis III states that there will be no significant relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion when controlling for certain variables which include: sex, income, education, marital status, length of residence, age, living arrangements, employment status, and occupation.
Sex

Among males only 7 percent of the Blacks as compared to 43 percent of the Whites were in the low cohesion category. Among females, 15 percent of the Blacks scored in the low cohesiveness category compared to 38 percent of

TABLE XV
NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION BY RACE CONTROLLING FOR SEX

| Race | Male | | Female | | |
|------|------|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|
| | Low Cohesion | High Cohesion | Total | Low Cohesion | High Cohesion | Total |
| Black | 5 (7%) | 62 (93%) | 67 (100%) | 13 (15%) | 73 (85%) | 86 (100%) |
| White | 46 (43%) | 61 (57%) | 107 (100%) | 68 (38%) | 110 (62%) | 178 (100%) |
| Total | 51 (29%) | 123 (71%) | 174 (100%) | 81 (31%) | 183 (69%) | 264 (100%) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>$\phi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.1063</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.5377</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.0551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relationship between race and neighborhood cohesiveness proved to be significant for both males and females at the .001 level. Although it may be surmised that sex is a significant factor in this relationship, the Phi Square values for both males and females were relatively low. The association between race and cohesion was somewhat less for females than for males, thus suggesting a stronger relationship between race and neighborhood cohesiveness among males than females.

**Income**

The relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion was tested controlling for income. The samples were divided into lower and upper income levels. A considerable difference in proportions is evident in the less than $5,000 annual income group. Whereas only 10 percent of the Blacks under this heading had low cohesion, 42 percent of Whites making less than $5,000 fell into the low cohesion classification. This difference was minimized among the $5,000 and above groups, 23 percent and 33 percent respectively.

The relationship was significant for those making less than $5,000 at the .001 level ($x^2 = 35.592$) but only at the .50 level ($x^2 = .4757$) for the $5,000 and above group. These findings are buttressed by the Phi Square values of .1244 for the lower income group and .0064 for the upper
TABLE XVI
NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION BY RACE CONTROLLING FOR INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>&lt;$5,000</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$5,000 +</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11 (10%)</td>
<td>103 (90%)</td>
<td>114 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>10 (77%)</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>73 (42%)</td>
<td>99 (58%)</td>
<td>172 (100%)</td>
<td>21 (33%)</td>
<td>43 (67%)</td>
<td>64 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84 (29%)</td>
<td>202 (71%)</td>
<td>286 (100%)</td>
<td>24 (31%)</td>
<td>53 (69%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>$^2</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>$^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$5,000</td>
<td>35.592</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 +</td>
<td>.4757</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.0064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

income group. The relationship between race and cohesion is stronger among the lower income group.

Education

As shown in Table XVII there were only slight differences in the percentage distributions for those with less
TABLE XVII

NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION BY RACE CONTROLLING FOR EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>&lt; High School</th>
<th></th>
<th>High School +</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11 (13%)</td>
<td>72 (87%)</td>
<td>83 (100%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>27 (36%)</td>
<td>49 (64%)</td>
<td>76 (100%)</td>
<td>76 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38 (24%)</td>
<td>121 (76%)</td>
<td>159 (100%)</td>
<td>83 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>φ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; High School</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.0681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School +</td>
<td>19.8508</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.0813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than high school educations and those with at least a high school education. Low cohesion was reflected by 13 percent of the Blacks and 36 percent of the Whites who had less than a high school diploma. This compares with 11 percent of the Blacks and 42 percent of the Whites in the higher
educational levels in the low cohesion group.

The Chi Square values obtained for both groups, 10.83 for lower educational attainment and 19.8508 for higher educational attainment, were significant at .001 levels. This indicates that the observations differed quite significantly from chance. The Phi Square scores, .0681 for less than high school and .0813 for high school plus, were low. The relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion is significant under both contingencies.

**Marital Status**

Hypothesis III is also concerned with what affects living with the spouse had upon the relationship of race and neighborhood cohesion. Nine-tenths of the Blacks living with spouses fell into the high cohesiveness group as opposed to only six-tenths of the Whites. This same percentage distribution is closely duplicated by those not living with spouses.

Table XVIII shows the distribution of marital status in relation to race and levels of cohesiveness. The Chi Square values of 17.4342 and 21.3059 are both significant at the .001 level. Phi Square values of .0903 for living with spouse and .0873 for not living with spouse indicate equally weak relationships between the two variables.
TABLE XVIII
NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION BY RACE CONTROLLING FOR MARITAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Living With Spouse</th>
<th>Not Living With Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>56 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53 (41%)</td>
<td>77 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 (31%)</td>
<td>133 (69%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>$\phi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Spouse</td>
<td>17.4342</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.0903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not With Spouse</td>
<td>21.3059</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.0873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of Residence

The affects of length of residence on the relationship between race and cohesion is shown on Table XIX. Analysis of the data shows that although Whites in both classifications of length of residence were relatively consistent
TABLE XIX
NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION BY RACE CONTROLLING
FOR LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>0 to 19 Years</th>
<th>20+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>23 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>37 (39%)</td>
<td>58 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 (34%)</td>
<td>81 (66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Residence</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>$\phi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 19 Years</td>
<td>4.2759</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.0348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ Years</td>
<td>33.1936</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Black sample was not. The incidence of low cohesion was found to be twice as high for Blacks living in Denton less than twenty years compared to those living in Denton for at least twenty years.

The Chi Square value for residence of nineteen years
or less in Denton was significant at the .05 level as opposed to the twenty years or more grouping with a Chi Square value of 33.1936 which is significant at the .001 level. These results are supported by the Phi Square values of .0348 and .105 which show a stronger degree of association in the group residing in Denton the longest. The implications of these figures are that the relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion becomes stronger the longer one remains in one location. Cohesion among Whites remains high and relatively consistent regardless of the length of residence.

Age

Another important factor common to all problems of statistical analysis is age. Age was dichotomized into one group between sixty and seventy years and another group consisting of individuals seventy-one years of age and older. The relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion was tested within this framework. Low cohesion Whites in both age groups were quite compatible, 40 percent of group totals. Blacks were somewhat less congruent. Low cohesion Blacks in the younger group consisted of 9 percent of the age group total as opposed to 16 percent in the older group.

The Chi Square values for the group between the ages of sixty and seventy was 27.429. This was significant at the
### TABLE XX

**NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION BY RACE CONTROLLING FOR AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>60-70 Years</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>71+ Years</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>94 (91%)</td>
<td>104 (100%)</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>41 (84%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>67 (39%)</td>
<td>106 (61%)</td>
<td>173 (100%)</td>
<td>48 (43%)</td>
<td>64 (57%)</td>
<td>112 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77 (28%)</td>
<td>200 (72%)</td>
<td>277 (100%)</td>
<td>56 (35%)</td>
<td>105 (65%)</td>
<td>161 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>$\phi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-70 Years</td>
<td>27.429</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71+ Years</td>
<td>10.569</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.0656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.001 level. The relationship was somewhat less significant in the older grouping. The Chi Square value was 10.569 which was significant at the .01 level. Phi Square values were .099 for the younger age group and .0656 for the older.
Living Arrangements

Once again, the percentage distribution of the White sample is similar under a control situation. The percentage of low cohesive Whites living alone was about the same as for those low cohesive Whites not living alone.

**TABLE XXI**

NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION BY RACE CONTROLLING FOR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Lives Alone</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Does Not Live Alone</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>39 (93%)</td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
<td>15 (14%)</td>
<td>96 (86%)</td>
<td>111 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41 (40%)</td>
<td>61 (60%)</td>
<td>102 (100%)</td>
<td>68 (40%)</td>
<td>103 (60%)</td>
<td>171 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44 (31%)</td>
<td>100 (69%)</td>
<td>144 (100%)</td>
<td>83 (29%)</td>
<td>199 (71%)</td>
<td>282 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Arrangements</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>$\phi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lives Alone</td>
<td>15.3082</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Live Alone</td>
<td>22.334</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.0792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Low cohesion decreased among Blacks who lived alone.

Statistical analysis shows that both groups were significant at the .001 level. Chi Square scores were 15.3082 for those living alone and 22.334 for those not living alone. Phi Square values, show a low degree of relationship in both cases but the relationship among those living alone is greater. This seems to suggest that living alone may actually motivate increased neighborhood participation and interest for elderly Blacks.

**Employment Status**

Certain categories under employment status were combined to create two distinct groups. The first consisted of the categories of retired and retired but working part-time. The second was comprised of three classifications: working and not yet retired, retired but working full-time, and housewives. Common to the first group is the fact that it has undergone a considerable change of roles and status due to retirement. This upheaval of roles has either not yet occurred or has been averted in the second group.

The Chi Square value for the major change category was 25.4439 which differs from the observations of chance at the .001 level of significance. The second category, little or no change, also reached the significance level of .001 with a Chi Square value of 11.7468. Phi Square
TABLE XXII
NEIGHBORHOOD COHESION BY RACE CONTROLLING FOR EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Major Change in Employment Status</th>
<th>Little or No Change in Employment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>94 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64 (37%)</td>
<td>107 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74 (27%)</td>
<td>201 (73%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>$\phi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Change</td>
<td>25.4439</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.0925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or No Change</td>
<td>11.7468</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.0739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

values were quite low. The category of major change had a Phi Square score of .0925 while the category of little or no change had a score of .0739. Race and neighborhood cohesion are thus significantly related under both contingencies.
Occupation

For the purposes of evaluating blue-collar and white-collar occupational differentials all responses which did not reflect participation in the labor force were dropped from the analysis. Thus, a large proportion of the White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White-Collar</th>
<th></th>
<th>Blue-Collar</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
<td>High Cohesion</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Low Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>8 (89%)</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>16 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>36 (38%)</td>
<td>59 (62%)</td>
<td>95 (100%)</td>
<td>33 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 (36%)</td>
<td>67 (64%)</td>
<td>104 (100%)</td>
<td>49 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>$\phi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>1.534</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-Collar</td>
<td>22.354</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.1011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
females classified as housewives are not included. Percentage distributions for both blue-collar and white-collar workers are quite similar.

The Chi Square value obtained for white-collar workers was 1.534 which is not significant (.20 level). On the other hand, the Chi Square value for blue-collar workers was 22.354, which is significant at the .001 level. The Phi Square scores of .0147 and .1011, respectively, reflect the difference in the extent of the relationship observed in each case. Thus, the relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion is evident only for the blue-collar workers. When controlling for white-collar workers, the original relationship breaks down.

General Findings

Parts A and B of Hypothesis I, which were designed to test disengagement theory, were not rejected at the .05 level of significance. There is no evidence of the existence of a significant relationship between age and neighborhood cohesion.

Hypothesis II was rejected by statistical analysis. A relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion among the elderly samples was established with the Black sample exhibiting greater cohesion than the White sample.

In Hypothesis III, the relationship between race and neighborhood cohesion was found to be significant when
controlling for sex, lower incomes, education, marital status, residence of at least twenty years, age, and living arrangements, as well as in employment status and blue-collar occupations.

The Extreme Isolates

The extreme isolates from the study are easily distinguishable. None of the Black elderly scored lower than a three (3) on the neighborhood cohesiveness scale. However, seventeen Whites (6 percent of the total White sample) scored below this point (see Table XXIV). All seventeen were Caucasian, five were males and twelve were females. This is a rather high proportion of females in comparison to the entire sample population. Three-quarters of the isolates' incomes were less than $5,000 per year. The bi-modal distribution of income was less than $1,000 and $4,000-4,999. Only one respondent stated that his income was greater than $5,000 per year.

The educational level of this group was quite low. Less than one-fourth had completed high school. Distribution of marital status was similar to the remainder of the White sample, with "no spouse" being the modal category. The isolates' length of residence differs somewhat from the sample as a whole. Seven of the isolates (40 percent) had lived in Denton for less than twenty years as compared to 33 percent of the total White sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
<td>12 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (7%)</td>
<td>24 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
<td>19 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>64 (22%)</td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (9%)</td>
<td>40 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>63 (22%)</td>
<td>107 (24%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 (11%)</td>
<td>57 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 (12%)</td>
<td>67 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (6%)</td>
<td>36 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153 (100%)</td>
<td>286 (100%)</td>
<td>439 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twelve of the isolates were between the ages of sixty and seventy. Five lived alone. Nine reported that they were retired and not employed full-time. The proportion of housewives among these isolates was equal to the proportion of housewives in the White sample as a whole. However, blue-collar labor was over-represented among the isolates. Blue-collar labor was also the primary occupation of eleven of the respondents' fathers at forty-five years of age.

This descriptive analysis suggests that severe neighborhood disengagement is most common among White elderly with low education in low socio-economic conditions.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS 
AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

Based upon the statistical analysis in the preceding
chapter, disengagement theory as measured by neighborhood
cohesion has not been supported. No significant relation-
ship was found between age and neighborhood cohesion for the
group as a whole or the races considered separately. On the
other hand, neighborhood cohesiveness was found to be related
to Black and White senior citizens in sixteen out of eighteen
tests (at the .05 level of significance) in which selected
variables were controlled. The data suggest that older
Black people in this study are more involved at the local
neighborhood level than are elderly Whites. It may be
assumed that they are generally more conscious of develop-
ments in their immediate vicinity and more desirous of and
dependent on interaction at this level. The findings of
this study substantiate those of Rosow and others discussed
earlier, which indicate a relationship between social class
and neighborhood dependency.

The highest incidence of neighborhood cohesion was
consistently found among Blacks. Among the Black elderly
cohesion was greater among males, among those who had
moderate or lower incomes (less than $5,000 per year), who had lived in Denton at least twenty years, and who were between the ages of sixty and seventy years. High cohesion was also more likely to occur among Blacks living alone, those who were retired, and those whose primary occupations throughout life had been at the blue-collar level. Educational levels and marital status do not differentiate between high and low cohesion.

Contrary to the expected, disengagement was quite low among the retired of both races. It is often held that the severing of social ties brought about by retirement enhances the probability of increasing unhappiness and disengagement. Disengagement was actually lower among both racial groups under conditions of major employment changes, such as total retirement. Furthermore, it is often assumed that the lack of a spouse or someone else to live with would lead to disengagement. However, this study shows that such conditions as isolation from the family in the Black community may actually intensify the desire for social interaction rather than contributing to further withdrawal. In conclusion, the Black community, despite its overall level of low incomes and low education, is a more cohesive unit than the White community. This might be due to the fact that:

(A) Blacks live in one census tract, and proximity is a factor in interaction;

(B) the Black community is economically as well as
(3) the result of racial discrimination in America may have created a sense of togetherness and group identity which is absent from the dominant White experience;

(4) lower incomes common the Black community hinder interaction and visitation outside of the immediate vicinity, thus strengthening the local dependency;

(5) economic deprivation has more generally stifled the ethos of individualism yet from necessity encouraged a higher degree of dependency in the Black community.

Limitations

This study could perhaps have been improved if the interviews had not been conducted with an interval of two years. It would be best if such studies in the future are conducted simultaneously or within a much shorter time period. As the cohesiveness scale was based upon respondents reflections of their neighborhoods, their answers were thus subject to any improvements in their local vicinities. There has been some degree of city road repair in the Black neighborhood since 1970 and it is quite possible that this may have influenced the cohesiveness scores of the Black sample. In addition, it should be remembered that the
samples were drawn using different methods. It is not, however, possible to measure what effects, if any, resulted from these procedures.

Also, it is uncertain as to what effect the race of the interviewers had on the respondents since the interviewing teams were almost totally White.

It might possibly be argued that neighborhood cohesiveness is not the most efficient measures of disengagement. Indeed, the literature abounds with material utilizing familial contact, club membership and others to express relative levels of disengagement. However, these measures can only help to explain disengagement where the possibility of family contact exists or in the presence and availability of organized social activities. This deletes those who are too poor or sick to wander far from home. Neighborhood cohesion, on the other hand, is a versatile measure applicable in virtually all cases in which the close proximity of a number of dwellings form neighborhoods.

The major limitation of a study such as this one is that it is a narrowly defined sample. The findings of such a study cannot be construed to be predictive of behavior on a wider scale, but is only indicative of behavior found in Denton, Texas. Such studies can only possess the powers of suggestion and implication outside of the local setting.
Implications

With respect to theoretical implications, this study has failed to support disengagement theory. There is no evidence of a significant relationship between aging and disengagement. The findings of this study seem to support Kutner's viewpoint that participation in old age may be a continuation of life-long patterns of social activity.

Amidst the lack of bi-racial analysis, this study has revealed that distinct differences may be observed in the aging processes of people of different races. It has been demonstrated in this sample at the neighborhood level that growing old is more lonely for Whites than for Blacks in Denton. This pilot study has shown that Black aged are less isolated from their neighborhoods, are more involved with their neighbors on a personal basis and are more satisfied with their present location than are White aged. Blacks appear to be more active in the process of neighborhood interaction and local dependency.

The findings of this study appear to justify further research in this area of racial differentials in aging. It is assumed that other studies utilizing similar methodology will reveal other significant differences and relationships which will support the findings and validity of the current research. As most of the research in the field of gerontology consider only Whites, it is suggested that in future
studies other racial and ethnic groups should be tested to determine cultural distinctions.

This study holds a number of implications for programs in aging and urban renewal, particularly where large numbers of elderly persons are involved. First, this study has shown the importance of neighborhood cohesion in the lives of elderly Blacks. Secondly, it has shown that despite similar income levels, the aged cannot be handled as a homogeneous group. Distinct differences along racial lines are discernable. Finally, it has suggested that adjustment in old age is perhaps less difficult in the Black community. If this is indeed true, then perhaps by investigating the Black community more closely, insight may be gained into ways of alleviating the harsh burden of aging.
APPENDIX

Relevant Questions from the 1970 Survey

A. How well do you think the people in this neighborhood know each other?
   1. Quite well or very well
   2. Not at all or not so well

B. About how many of them would you say you know by name?
   1. Two or more
   2. None or one

C. About how many of these do you spend a whole afternoon or evening with every now and then?
   1. Two or more
   2. None or one

D. If you had your choice, would you continue living in this neighborhood?
   1. Yes
   2. No

E. Do you think this neighborhood is getting better or getting worse?
   1. Getting better
   2. Getting worse
   3. Neither
F. Racial/Ethnic Background:
   1. White
   2. Negro
   3. Mexican-American
   4. Other

G. Sex:
   1. Male
   2. Female

H. What would you estimate that your income was for last year?
   1. Less than $1000
   2. $1000 - 1999
   3. $2000 - 2999
   4. $3000 - 3999
   5. $4000 - 4999
   6. $5000 - 9999
   7. Above $10,000

I. What was the last grade you completed in school?
   1. No school
   2. 1 - 4
   3. 5 - 7
   4. Some high school
   5. Completed high school
   6. Some college
7. Completed college
8. Trade school
9. Professional school or beyond four years of college

J. First, we need to know if you are
   1. Married living with spouse
   2. Married not living with spouse
   3. Widowed
   4. Single

K. About how long have you lived in Denton?
   1. Less than 1 year
   2. 1 - 4 years
   3. 5 - 9 years
   4. 10 - 19 years
   5. 20 years - but not all my life
   6. All my life

L. What is your age?
   1. 60 - 65
   2. 66 - 70
   3. 71 - 75
   4. 76 +

M. How many people, including yourself, live at this address?
   1. 1
   2. 2
   3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. More than 6

N. Are you retired:
   1. Yes
   2. No

   Are you working now? Full or part-time?

O. What kind of job did you have when you were 45 years old?

P. What was your father's main occupation?

Relevant Questions from the 1972 Survey

A. How well do you think the people in this neighborhood know each other?
   1. Quite well or very well
   2. Not at all or not very well

B. About how many of them would you say you know by name?
   1. 0
   2. 1
   3. 2
   4. 3
   5. 4
   6. 5+
C. About how many of these do you spend a whole afternoon or evening with every now and then?

1. 0
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4
6. 5 +

D. If you had your choice, would you continue living in this neighborhood?

1. Yes
2. No

E. Do you think this neighborhood is getting better or worse?

1. Getting better
2. Getting worse
3. Not changing

F. Race:

1. Black
2. White

G. Sex:

1. Male
2. Female
H. Would you tell me which of the figures on this card come closest to your family income last year?

1. Less than $1000
2. $1000 - 1999
3. $2000 - 2999
4. $3000 - 3999
5. $4000 - 4999
6. $5000 - 5999
7. $6000 - 9999
8. $10,000 and over

I. What was the last grade you completed in school?

1. No school
2. 1 - 4
3. 5 - 7
4. Some high school
5. Completed high school or GED
6. Some college
7. Completed college
8. Trade school
9. Professional or beyond four years college

J. Now I'd like to ask some questions about your family: are you

1. Married and living with spouse
2. Married and not living with spouse
3. Divorced
4. Widowed
5. Single

K. About how long have you lived in Denton?
   1. Less than 1 year
   2. 1 - 4 years
   3. 5 - 9 years
   4. 10 - 19 years
   5. 20 years or more but not all my life
   6. All my life

L. Age

M. Do you live alone?
   1. Yes
   2. No

N. How we'd like to ask some questions about your occupation--what do you do for a living?
   1. 
   2. Never employed

If the respondent is EMPLOYED

   What kind of job do you have?
   Do you do anything else?
   How many hours a week do you work?
   Irregular or part-time work? Yes
   No
If the respondent is UNEMPLOYED

How long have you been out of work?

Are you looking for work?

Why do you think you have not been able to find a job?

What kind of job are you looking for?

If the respondent is RETIRED

When did you retire?

What was your last job?

Why did you retire?

O. What kind of job did you have when you were 45?

P. What did your father do at age 45?
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Hutchinson, Bertram, Old People in a Modern Australian Community, Victoria, Australia, Melbourne University Press, 1954.


Neugarten, Bernice and others, Personality in Middle and Late Life, New York, Atherton Press, 1964.


Articles


Smith, Joel, William Form, and Gregory Stone, "Local Intimacy in a Middle Sized City," American Journal of Sociology, LX (November, 1951), 276-284.


Encyclopedia Articles


Public Documents


Unpublished Material


Monographs