

## Territorial Cognitions and Social Climate in Urban Neighborhoods

Ralph B. Taylor, Stephen D. Gottfredson  
*Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research  
The Johns Hopkins University*

Sidney Brower  
*School of Social Work and Community Planning  
University of Maryland at Baltimore*

This report examines relations between territorial cognitions and social climate in urban neighborhoods of varying composition. Three broad dimensions of cognitions including problems related to a lack of control, insider/stranger distinctions, and responsibility were investigated. We hypothesized that perceived consonance of social climate would be associated with less problems, easier insider/stranger distinctions, and increased responsibility. We also anticipated that a stable neighborhood context would be associated in the same fashion, with these three dimensions of cognitions. Results from a survey of respondents living in 12 different neighborhoods supported these hypotheses. Also, territorial cognitions were strongly associated with actual territorial marking behavior, underscoring the reliability of cognitions as indices of territorial functioning. Thus, territorial functioning is enhanced in the presence of a congenial social climate and a stable neighborhood. Future territorial research should avoid a closed, solipsistic perspective and incorporate interpersonal and contextual influences on territorial functioning.

---

This research was supported by grant 78-NI-AX-0134 from the National Institute of Justice. Opinions expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect opinions or policies of the Department of Justice. We are indebted to Whit Drain, Karen A. Franck, Allen C. Goodman, David Haines, Patty O'Brien, Amos Rapoport, and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on earlier drafts. We also acknowledge the assistance of Sgt. Emory Starry of the Baltimore City Police Department and William Smith of the Baltimore City Planning Department for help in gathering data. Portions of this research were presented at the annual meetings of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, September 1980. Request reprints from Ralph B. Taylor, Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218.

Territorial cognitions are a significant and often overlooked component of human territoriality. Labels such as territorial "meanings" (Edney, 1974), or territorial "interpretations" (Bakker & Bakker-Radbau, 1973) have been applied to these cognitions. Territorial cognitions are the attitudes an individual holds about the territories with which he or she is familiar. These cognitions may help predict or interpret various territorial behaviors (Edney, 1974; Taylor, 1978; Taylor & Brooks, 1980), and therein lies their significance.

Admittedly, many factors may influence territorial cognitions. For example, some persons may feel more ownership over or responsibility for territories than others, and this variation may be associated with fear levels (Patterson, 1978). Also, some territories may elicit more feelings of privacy or control than others (Altman, 1975; Taylor & Stough, 1978). Nonetheless, research has focused largely on the intrapersonal determinants, and has ignored the interpersonal determinants.

Interpersonal influences on territoriality have not been totally ignored. Two studies suggest that social structure and territorial functioning may be linked. Sundstrom and Altman (1974) observed a positive relationship between territorial behavior (i.e., frequent use of particular areas) and position in a dominance hierarchy, when group structure was stable. When group composition was invariant, high dominance subjects used desirable areas more frequently than low dominance subjects. Such a territoriality-dominance linkage facilitates smooth group functioning. However, the dominance effect was attenuated when the group's social structure was disrupted, as in times of turnover. Taylor and Ferguson (1980) also linked social climate and territorial functioning, observing that primary territories shared with co-residents were less likely to be used for privacy as interpersonal understandings about the use of those spaces eroded. Thus, territorial functioning may be partially dependent upon the social composition of the group.

Our use of the term "social climate" deserves clarification. By social climate we mean overall perceived homogeneity or perceived similarity to other residents on the same block. This evaluation or assessment is an important element of residents' global evaluation of where they live. Our use of the term should not be confused with Moos' (e.g., 1974) use of social climate. For Moos, social climate is the perceived milieu of a particular therapeutic environment as measured by a particular scale. We defend our use of the term in that perceived similarity is a crucial element of the social atmosphere on urban residential blocks.

This relation between territorial functioning and social climate may also hold in the urban residential environment. In the urban environment, control over access to territories and over the activities that go on there, as well as problems related to a lack of such control (e.g., fear, vandalism), are key concerns of residents. Given that control is a central aspect of human territoriality (Edney,

1975, 1976a, 1976b; Sundstrom, 1977), a territorial perspective may illuminate the processes underlying the concerns and behaviors of urban residents.

Problems may be more intense, and resident-based control weaker, in some parts of the city than in others (Harries, 1974). An understanding of this contextual influence may sharpen our understanding of territorial functioning, and, this influence can be incorporated through an assessment of neighborhood characteristics. Baum, Davis, and Aiello (1978) have also suggested that resident-based control may be mediated by neighborhood characteristics. Given our territorial perspective, we felt that the dimension of stability may be important. In a more stable neighborhood territorial functioning may be more efficient because of clearer insider/stranger distinctions, or because of residents who are more attached to their home, and thus are more involved in managing the local environment. In short, there may be a context effect where the setting characteristics "filter down" to impact individual-level functioning. A recent study of Edney (1972) clarifies the role that stability may play in territorial functioning. Residents who anticipated a longer stay at their present address responded more quickly to a stranger's intrusion. This influence may also emerge from neighborhood characteristics, and territorial functioning may be more efficient in neighborhoods where the population is more stable.

Granted, "neighborhood" has many meanings. It may refer to a home range (Stea, 1970), a polity which advocates for itself (Crenson, 1978), a locale with specific social, historical, and physical characteristics (Keller, 1968), a symbolic area (Hunter, 1974; Rapoport, 1977), or an area within which residents may feel safe (Suttles, 1972). We do not wish to enter the debate concerning the qualities an area must have before it achieves the status of neighborhood. Rather, we simply point out that a neighborhood is a spatial unit; a unitary, bounded area. Further (at least in Baltimore) those areas have accompanying organizations, and are well known to knowledgeable outsiders such as community leaders and district planners. Using the neighborhood concept we can segment the residential context, and, with accompanying data, we can describe that context. By controlling for context we can be sure that the other factors we investigate are not contaminated by context.

The territorial cognitions included 14 statements reflecting various aspects of territorial functioning. A replicated principal components analysis of these statements yielded the following three dimensions: (I) problems related to a lack of control, (II) ease of distinguishing insiders from strangers, and (III) responsibility (Taylor, Gottfredson, Brower, Drain, & Dockett, 1980). Adding up the items to create a scale for each dimension yielded the following correlations between scales:  $-.26$  (I with II),  $-.16$  (I with III), and  $.39$  (II with III). Although these three dimensions do not include all aspects of territorial functioning, they do include a control-related dimension (I), and other aspects of territorial functioning important to residents in the study area (Brower, 1980).

Six outdoor spaces were examined. Residents were likely to continuously associate with these spaces over time and thus the six qualify as territories (Edney, 1976a). We examined two home spaces (front steps or yard, back yard), two near-home spaces (sidewalk in front of your house, alley behind your house), and two off-block spaces (sidewalk in front of a nearby store that you use, nearby park that you use). The latter was included because residents often felt that these were the foci of local problems (Brower, 1979). Off-block spaces such as these are within easy walking distance of all residents. Furthermore, since "pocket" parks and corner groceries are abundant in Baltimore, the layout of the Baltimore residential environment is such that each type of territory is fairly homogeneous, physically, throughout the area.<sup>1</sup>

Our assessment of social climate focused on the perceived consonance (Rosenberg, 1972, 1975) or homogeneity of the on-block social grouping.<sup>2</sup> In the interview each respondent was asked how similar block residents were to him/her on several dimensions: education, household income, age, religion, and marital status. To anchor the homogeneity concept the respondent was asked "In general, considering the kinds of things mentioned in these questions, overall, how similar would you say most adults on this street are to you?"<sup>3</sup>

Two hypotheses were of interest: (1) social climate may be associated with territorial functioning. Specifically, as perceived homogeneity increases, problems may decrease, insider/stranger distinctions may be easier, and responsibility may increase. Underlying this hypothesis is the expectation that consensus increases regarding what given individuals should be doing in particular situations

---

<sup>1</sup>In terms of Altman's (1975) typology, our home spaces would probably be classified as primary territories, near-home spaces as hybrid secondary/public territories, and off-block spaces as public territories. We refrained from classifying our three types of territories into Altman's Typology since such classification is dependent on knowing who the occupant interacts with in the territory, and how much time is spent there.

---

<sup>2</sup>Throughout, the block refers to the houses facing each other across the street, i.e., the streetface. Prior studies in this locale have suggested that it is the streetface which is the natural social unit.

---

<sup>3</sup>Internal analysis indicated that the anchoring procedure was successful. As subjects' overall perceived similarity increased, they were also likely to see themselves as more similar to co-residents on each of the specific questions asked (all  $p$ 's < .001). Perceived similarity was also related to other, more behavioral aspects of social interaction patterns. As overall perceived similarity increased, respondents were more likely to belong to a local organization along with co-residents on the block, were more likely to have a higher ratio of friends-to-acquaintances on the block, and were more likely to have the majority of their friends living in the neighborhood (all  $p$ 's < .001). And, perceived homogeneity was related to objective homogeneity. As the block mean on overall perceived similarity increased, the block standard deviation (i.e., block variation) on a social class factor, and on a marital status/household size factor, decreased ( $r$ 's respectively = -.23, -.24).

and places as perceived homogeneity increases, resulting in smoother, clearer functioning in the local ecology; (2) neighborhood stability may be associated with territorial functioning. Specifically, in more stable neighborhoods problems may be fewer, insider/stranger distinctions may be easier and responsibility may be greater.

Questions may still arise regarding the reliability of these territorial attitudes. Past research has suggested that territorial cognitions covary with territorial behaviors such as marking (e.g., Patterson, 1978). We wished to determine if this was the case in the present situation. At every surveyed site, pictures were taken of the front and rear of the household and yard. These pictures were then coded for territorial markers. If our territorial cognitions are reliable, they should allow us to significantly predict territorial behaviors such as marking.

In sum, we seek evidence that territorial functioning stabilizes as perceived consonance of the social climate increases and as neighborhood context becomes more stable. Attaining such evidence with a residential population would result in a significant enhancement of our understanding of human territoriality.

## METHOD

### Neighborhood Definition and Selection

One hundred ninety-two neighborhoods in Baltimore City were defined in a manner which would allow an interpretation of these geographic areas as socially-ecologically valid (see Taylor et al., 1980; and Taylor, Brower, & Drain, (1979) for a complete discussion). The neighborhoods developed have meaning for Baltimore residents, are clearly geographically bounded and differ for a number of socioeconomic factors.

A stratified, probability-proportional-to-size sample of 12 neighborhoods was drawn. The stratifications were with respect to income and tenure.<sup>4</sup>

### Block Sampling, Field Procedures and Respondents

In each sampled neighborhood we contacted the neighborhood leader. We asked him/her to nominate two types of blocks for us: blocks where people watched out for each other and helped each other out; and blocks where people went their

---

<sup>4</sup>Data from the subsequent interviews corroborated our characterization of these three types of neighborhoods. One-way analyses of variance confirmed that the three neighborhood types differed as expected on income ( $F(2,389) = 19.51, p < .001$ ) and owner/renter status ( $F(2,442) = 47.04, p < .001$ ). One way ANOVA's also indicated that respondents in the different neighborhoods differed as expected on length of residence at present address ( $F(2,442) = 5.13, p < .01$ ). This information supports our description of the neighborhoods as varying in stability.

own way. From a pool of nominated blocks we selected a final sample of 32 blocks. The final blocks selected were largely similar to each other in terms of physical characteristics of outdoor territories. Also, in each neighborhood the selected blocks were physically similar to other blocks in the neighborhood.

The total number of occupied households was determined by conducting a census of each block. Designated households were randomly selected on each block. At each designated household we sought to interview the head of the household, or the head's spouse. If there were multiple heads in a household, one was randomly selected. If we could not obtain an interview at a designated household an alternate site was selected.

A total of 448 respondents completed the interview. The sample included 164 males and 284 females. Average education level was 11th grade. The sample was almost evenly split between owners and renters with slightly less than half the sample employed at the time of the survey.

Over 65% of all attempted households yielded a completed interview. On most blocks response rates exceeded 80%.

### Survey Procedures

Details of survey procedures can be found in Taylor et al. (1980) and Taylor, Gottfredson, and Brower (1981).

The survey itself included several sections. A demographic section included items concerned with residential, educational, employment and economic background. A social ties section included several items concerned with the respondents' perception of other people on the block, and his/her social interactions with them. Other sections probed issues such as fear and perception of crime in the neighborhood.<sup>5</sup>

We asked about territorial cognitions that previous experience indicated were important to residents in the area. The fourteen statements appear in Table 1. They are grouped into the three dimensions indicated by principal components analysis (Taylor et al., 1980). For each of the six outdoor territories of interest to us, each respondent indicated his/her amount of agreement with each of the 14 territorial cognitions. For each cognition, he/she used a six point Likert scale bounded "agree strongly" and "disagree strongly." The six territories were presented in randomized order.

The entire survey took about an hour to complete. Fully informed consent was obtained from all respondents, and they were paid \$3.00 for their participation.

### The Assessment of Residents' Territorial Behaviors

One aspect of territorial behavior is the use of markers, i.e., the distribution of

---

<sup>5</sup>Copies of the complete survey are available, upon request, from the first author.

TABLE 1  
Territorial Cognitions

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Statements</i>
I. Problems related to a lack of control	Troublemakers hang around I would be somewhat nervous or concerned if I was alone at night. People who use this space abuse it. It's hard to keep out people if I don't want them to be there. I'm likely to be bothered by undesirables. There's a lot of vandalism. There's a lot of littering.
II. Insider/stranger distinction	I can tell people who belong there from outsiders. I there's a suspicious person hanging around, someone's bound to call the police. I see mostly people I know there. I am likely to chat with friends and neighbors.
III. Responsibility	I feel some responsibility as a member of the neighborhood for what goes on. I feel personally responsible for what goes on. I have more say than others about what happens.

objects to indicate that a space is used, owned, or cared for. To assess territorial markers slides were taken of each house where a resident had completed a survey. A slide was taken of the front of the house and of the back.

All slides were rated on two territorial dimensions: ornamentation and gardening. Using a five category scale all slides showing backs of houses were rated on level and extent of gardening.<sup>6</sup> Two raters independently rated each slide. Inter-rater reliability as assessed by the intraclass correlation was .83. Reliability of the mean ratings estimated using the Spearman-Brown formula was .91, and these were used in remaining analyses.

## RESULTS

First, ANOVA results are examined. (A fully between ANOVA approach has several advantages over a regression procedure: (1) factors can be orthogonalized;

<sup>6</sup>Due to the restricted range of ornamentation which was observed, and the restricted range of gardening in front, we focused attention on gardening in back.

(2) bias due to within-subject distortions are avoided; and (3) by random assignment we are assured of examining individual-level and not block-level outcomes.) Then we turn attention to the covariation of territorial cognitions and territorial markers.

### ANOVA Design

In each of three types of neighborhood (low-income, predominantly rental; mixed; medium-income, predominantly homeowned) a median split on the social climate variable was carried out. Subjects in the high group perceived on-block residents as more similar to themselves than subjects in the low group. The high/low cut point was essentially the same in each of the three types of neighborhood.

We felt it would be best to analyze the data using an ANOVA design in which all variables were between-subjects factors. In order to insure a reasonable number of subjects in each cell of the analysis, the following steps were taken. First, the six territories were collapsed into three types of territories: home, near-home, and off-block. Inspection of the territories  $\times$  territories ( $6 \times 6$ ) correlation matrix for each territorial cognition indicated that this step was justified empirically as well as conceptually. Second, for each dimension scales were created by summing up the relevant variables across the two places within a type of territory. Third, in order not to "lose" respondents who failed to answer all items on a scale, mean scores for items on a scale were used instead of total scale scores. Thus, all subjects who answered the majority of items on a scale were included. (This step did not appear to inflate correlations between the three dimensions.)

Respondents were randomly assigned to a type of territory. For each dimension of territorial cognition a  $3 \times 2 \times 3$  (Neighborhood  $\times$  Social Climate  $\times$  Territory) fully between, factorial ANOVA was carried out. There were 8 subjects in each cell. For post-hoc tests the Scheffé procedure (Hays, 1973) was used.

### Problems

The analysis of problems related to a lack of control yielded support for our hypothesis. A main effect for social climate revealed that respondents who perceived themselves as living in a more homogeneous social climate experienced fewer problems ( $F(1,126) = 9.92; p < .01$ ). This main effect was qualified by a Social Climate  $\times$  Territory interaction ( $F(4,126) = 3.09, p < .05$ ). The relevant means appear in Table 2. The significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) between the two near-home means is particularly instructive. It suggests that as a local social climate worsens, the bulk of increasing problems are experienced in near-home territories. Note that since the three way interaction was not significant, this



TABLE 2  
Social Climate  $\times$  Territory Interaction on Problems Factor (I)

<i>Perceived Homogeneity</i>	<i>Territory</i>		
	Home	Near-Home	Off-Block
Low	4.93 <sub>c</sub>	7.40 <sub>a</sub>	7.97 <sub>abd</sub>
High	4.91 <sub>bc</sub>	5.61 <sub>b</sub>	7.03 <sub>d</sub>

*Note.* For any row, means not sharing a common subscript preceding a slash (/) are significantly different from each other; for any column, means not sharing a common subscript following a slash (/) are significantly different from each other ( $p < .05$ ). A higher score means *more* problems.

effect of social climate on problems in near-home territories is invariant across different types of neighborhoods. That is, it is independent of neighborhood context.

Further, this analysis yielded support for our hypothesis about neighborhood effects with a significant Neighborhood  $\times$  Territory interaction ( $F(4,126) = 3.08, p < .05$ ). Post-hoc tests revealed that in near-home territories, respondents in low-income, rental neighborhoods experienced a higher level of problems than respondents in medium-income, homeowned neighborhoods, ( $p < .05$ ). Thus, neighborhood stability appears associated with more territorial control in near home spaces.

### Insider/Stranger Distinction

No results which supported our hypotheses about social climate or neighborhood influences relative to the insider/stranger dimension were observed. An intriguing Social Climate  $\times$  Territory interaction ( $F(2,126) = 3.88, p < .05$ ), however, did appear. Post-hoc tests indicated that respondents who perceived themselves as living in a more homogeneous social group had a harder time distinguishing insiders from strangers in off-block territories, than did residents who perceived themselves as living in a less homogeneous social context, ( $p < .05$ ).

### Responsibility

The analysis of the responsibility dimension yielded a main effect for neighborhood ( $F(2,126) = 6.08, p < .01$ ) and post-hoc tests indicated that residents in middle-income, homeowned neighborhoods felt more responsibility towards local territories than residents in low-income, predominantly rental neighborhoods, ( $p < .05$ ). Thus, increasing responsibility was associated with increased stability.

The analysis also yielded a three-way interaction, ( $F(4,216) = 2.96, p < .05$ ). Post-hoc tests indicated that for residents in a homogeneous social climate, neighborhood stability was associated with more responsibility toward near-home

territories. Specifically, respondents in a social climate perceived as consonant, felt more responsibility toward near home spaces if they were living in a middle-income, predominantly homeowned neighborhood than if they were living in a low-income, predominantly rental neighborhood, ( $p < .05$ ). Thus social climate and neighborhood characteristics reveal a conjoint association with territorial responsibility.

### Other Cognition Results

Each ANOVA yielded a main effect for type of territory (all  $p$ 's  $< .001$ ). Moving from home to off-block territories, problems increased, insider/stranger distinctions were less easily made, and responsibility decreased. Such variation in cognitions across territories has been noted in other studies (Altman, 1975; Taylor & Stough, 1978).

A summary table of findings on territorial cognitions appears in Table 3.

### Territorial Cognitions and Territorial Markers

Past work has indicated that territorial cognitions covary with territorial behaviors. Thus, if our present territorial cognition data is reliable, it should help us predict territorial behaviors of residents. The behavior examined was gardening. Stepwise regression (Cohen & Cohen, 1975) was used to predict this form of marking. To control for neighborhood context, a neighborhood covariate was entered on the first step. On the subsequent steps the territorial cognitions were entered in the following order: attitudes about yard behind home, attitudes about the alley, attitudes about property and sidewalk in front of the house, and attitudes about off-block spaces. This sequence allows variables to enter in the order of their relevance, or proximity to, the territorial behavior in question. Only cognitions with a significant zero order correlation were entered. On the last step, we tested the assumption of homogeneity of regression by entering the covariate  $\times$  cognition interactions as a set.

Results revealed a clear tie between territorial cognitions and gardening in back. The cognitions, entered after the neighborhood covariate, accounted for an additional 13% of the outcome variance, and this increment was significant ( $F(14,431) = 10.64, p < .001$ ). More specifically, increased gardening was associated with lower levels of territorial problems and with easier distinctions between insiders and strangers. The cluster of variables which included the covariate  $\times$  cognition vectors failed to add a subsequent significant increment in explained variance, thereby supporting the assumption of homogeneity of regression. In sum, the territorial cognitions assessed revealed a sturdy linkage with territorial behavior.

TABLE 3  
Summary of Territorial Cognition Results

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Dimension of Territorial Cognition</i>		
	<i>Problems</i>	<i>Insider/Stranger Distinction</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
Neighborhood (N)	NS	NS	$p < .01$
Social Climate (S)	$p < .01$	NS	NS
Type of Territory (T)	$p < .001$	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
N × S	NS	NS	NS
N × T	$p < .05$	NS	NS
S × T	$p < .05$	$p < .05$	NS
N × S × T	NS	NS	$p < .05$

## External Validity of Territorial Cognitions

Subsequent analyses confirmed that the territorial cognitions assessed here were tied to behavioral, control-related outcomes. For example, blocks where residents perceived high levels of problems in home and near-home territories were also blocks where residents called police more often about social nuisances ( $r$ 's, respectively, = .40 and .36,  $p$ 's < .05). Furthermore, in subsequent path analyses (see Taylor et al, 1981), territorial cognitions remained significantly associated with external measures of problems, such as police activity, even when neighborhood, social climate, and other factors were partialled out.

## DISCUSSION

The clearest and perhaps the most important finding in the present study is that as perceived homogeneity decreases, problems which are related to a lack of control intensify in near-home territories (Table 2). Underlying this relation are probably socio-spatial agreements on who, doing what behaviors, can be where. These agreements may be more widely shared among residents who perceive themselves as similar to one another. Of course this awaits confirmation through future research. Nonetheless, this bond between social composition and territorial cognitions concerns issues related to control and lack of control and thus addresses core issues of territorial functioning (Edney, 1975). And, this bond is independent of neighborhood context.

Further, the site of this linkage—near home territories—is significant. Altman (1975) and Newman (1972) have suggested that resident-based control over nearby, semi-public territories is critical for residential satisfaction. They point out that such control may be achieved through design strategies, or through territorial markers. Our results point toward the utility of social factors, as well, in achieving control.<sup>7</sup> It is also important that this link has been found in the general population. Prior studies assessing territorial functioning and social climate have, in contrast, been conducted only with very limited populations in very specific settings (Sundstrom & Altman, 1974; Taylor & Ferguson, 1980).

Although the relation between social composition and territorial functioning suggests several practical implications, it also invites further conceptual development between theories of group functioning and structure, and of human territoriality. By and large, the main dimension of social structure examined by territorial researchers has been dominance (e.g., Sundstrom & Altman, 1974; Esser, Chamberlain, Chapple, & Kline, 1964). Only minimal attention has been given to other aspects of group functioning (e.g., Altman, Taylor, & Wheeler,

---

<sup>7</sup>In his most recent work, Newman (1979) has also paid attention to the role of social composition in fostering residential dominance over local spaces.

1971), in relation to territoriality. Our evidence invites a broader consideration of group structural properties in examinations of territorial functioning. Elements of group composition such as friendship and interaction patterns clearly deserve attention in further research. Broader cross-theoretical ties may not only further clarify territorial functioning, they may also help solve substantial problems in the area of group functioning. For example, the present results hint that informal social control in the residential environment or group self-regulation, may operate indirectly through an enhancement of resident territorial attitudes. This is only a glimpse, however, which awaits verification in future empirical investigation. Nonetheless, the main point is clear: a broader conceptual merger between human territoriality and group structure will result in a stronger attack on the problems of interest to each area.<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, such a melding will help to "open up" territorial research. Recently, Altman, Vinsel, and Brown (1979) have suggested that the ethos underlying territorial research has been "closed"—focusing on privacy or exclusion—rather than "open." In our view, territorial functioning has elements of *both* openness and seclusion. And, by focusing on ties between interpersonal context and territorial functioning, the permeable nature of human territoriality becomes apparent.

Turning attention to our second predictor of interest, neighborhood context, we see that it also was associated with territorial cognitions. In more stable neighborhoods fewer problems were perceived in near-home territories. Also, across territories, more stable neighborhoods were associated with feelings of more responsibility. Admittedly, neighborhood stability (i.e., length of residence and homeownership) is related to other aspects of neighborhood composition such as income, especially at the aggregate level. Thus it is impossible to attribute the effects of the neighborhood factor to stability per se. Still, the length of residence pattern and homeownership pattern did differ as expected across the three types of neighborhoods. And neither of these correlated extravagantly, at the individual level, with income ( $r$ 's respectively—.08 and .27). In addition, blocks typical of the area were selected for the study, resulting in each type of territory being largely homogenous within and across neighborhood types. We leave the job of disentangling the influences of components of neighborhood composition to future studies with appropriately stratified samples. In general this point is clear from the present study: neighborhood context does affect territorial functioning, and the important element of context appears to be stability.

We should mention that our study is limited in that the data is cross-sectional.

---

<sup>8</sup>Recent work by Baum, Shapiro, Murray, and Wideman (1979) has already proved the fruitfulness of such a merger for crowding research. They found that the aversiveness of living in crowded, tripled dorm rooms could be blamed on the instability of triads and the main person who suffered in the triad was the one who was left out of the two-person coalition that emerged.

Thus we cannot, strictly speaking, attribute causal relations between our independent and dependent variables.

To summarize, territorial cognitions are influenced by social climate and neighborhood context. Neighborhood context and social climate have *independent* influences on perception of territorial problems. A more stable neighborhood and perceived consonance are associated with less problems. Neighborhood and social climate have a *conjoint* influence on perceived territorial responsibility. Cognitions are reliable indices of territorial functioning since they are strongly associated with territorial marking behaviors. Cognitions are externally valid since they are associated with behavioral, control-related outcomes such as levels of police activity. This study has expanded our understanding of the social and situational determinants of territorial functioning in the urban residential environment.

## REFERENCES

- Altman, I. *The environment and social behavior*. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1975.
- Altman, I., Taylor, D. A., & Wheeler, L. Ecological aspects of group behavior in social isolation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1971, 1, 76-100.
- Altman, I., Vinsel, A., & Brown, B. B. *Social penetration and privacy regulation: a dialectic analysis*. Presidential Address to the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, American Psychological Association, New York City, September 1979.
- Bakker, C., & Bakker-Radbau. *No trespassing! Explorations in human territoriality*. San Francisco: Chandler and Sharp, 1973.
- Baum, A., Davis, G. E., & Aiello, J. R. Crowding and neighborhood mediation of urban density. *Journal of Population*, 1978, 1, 266-279.
- Baum, A., Shapiro, A., Murray, D., & Wideman, M. V. Interpersonal mediation of perceived crowding and control in residential dyads and triads. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1979, 9, 491-507.
- Brower, S. The design of neighborhood parks. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 1979, 9, 29, MS. 1843.
- Brower, S. Territory in urban settings. In I. Altman, A. Rapoport, & J. Wohlwill (Eds.), *Human behavior and environment*, 4, New York: Plenum, 1980.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1975.
- Crenson, M. A. Social networks and political processes in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Political Science*, 1978, 22, 578-594.
- Edney, J. J. Property, possession, and permanence: A field study of human territoriality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1972, 2, 275-282.
- Edney, J. J. Human territoriality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1974, 81, 959-975.
- Edney, J. J. Territoriality and control: A field experiment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1975, 31, 1108-1115.
- Edney, J. J. Human territoriality: Comment on functional properties. *Environment and Behavior*, 1976a, 8, 31-47.
- Edney, J. D. The psychological role of property rights in human behavior. *Environment and Planning A*, 1976b, 8, 811-822.
- Harries, K. D. *The geography of crime and justice*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

- Hunter, A. *Symbolic communities: the persistence and change of Chicago's local communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Keller, S. *The urban neighborhood: a sociological perspective*. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Moos, R. H. *Evaluating treatment environments: a social ecological approach*. New York: Wiley, 1974.
- Newman, O. *Defensible space: Crime prevention through urban design*. New York: MacMillan, 1973.
- Newman, O. *Community of interest*. New York: Doubleday, 1979.
- Patterson, A. H. Territorial behavior and fear of crime in the elderly. *Environmental Psychology and Nonverbal Behavior*, 1978, 2, 131-144.
- Rapoport, A. *Human aspects of urban form*. New York: Pergamon, 1977.
- Rosenberg, M. *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Rosenberg, M. The dissonant context and the adolescent self-image concept. In S.E. Dragastin & G.H. Elder (Eds.), *Adolescence in the life cycle: Psychological change and the social context*. New York: Halsted, 1975.
- Stea, D. Home range and use of space. In L.A. Pastalan & D.H. Carson (Eds.), *Spatial behavior and older people*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1970.
- Sudman, S. *Applied sampling*. New York: Academia Press, 1976.
- Sundstrom, E. Interpersonal behavior and the physical environment. In L. Wrightsman (Ed.), *Social psychology*. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks-Cole, 1977.
- Sundstrom, E., & Altman, I. Field study of dominance and territorial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1974, 30, 115-125.
- Suttles, G. D. *The social order of the slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Suttles, G. D. *The social construction of communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Taylor, R. B. Human territoriality: A review and a model for future research. *Cornell Journal of Social Relations*, 1978, 13, 125-151.
- Taylor, R. B., & Brooks, D. K. Temporary territories: responses to intrusions in a public setting. *Population and Environment*, 1980, 3, 135-145.
- Taylor, R. B., Brower, S., & Drain, W. *Toward a neighborhood-based data file*. Occasional paper. Baltimore: Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research, Johns Hopkins University, 1979.
- Taylor, R. B., Gottfredson, S., Brower, S., Drain, W., & Dockett, K. Toward a resident-based model of community crime prevention: Urban territoriality, social networks, and design. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 1980, 10, 39, Ms. 2044.
- Taylor, R. B., Gottfredson, S. D., Brower, S. *Informal control in the urban residential environment*. Unpublished final report (78-NI-AX-0134). Baltimore: Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research, Johns Hopkins University, 1981.
- Taylor, R. B., & Ferguson, G. Solitude and intimacy: Linking territoriality and privacy experiences. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 1980, 4, 227-239.
- Taylor, R. B., & Stough, R. R. Territorial cognition: Assessing Altman's typology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1978, 36, 418-423.

