Slum Clearance and Relocation: A Reassessment of Social Outcomes Combining Short- term and Long-term Perspectives.

Abstract

Housing research rarely takes a long-term view of the impacts of short-term housing changes. Thus, in studies of post-war relocation, narratives of 'loss of community' and 'dislocation' have dominated the debate for decades. This paper combines a 're-study' methodology with oral histories to re-examine the experience of relocation into high-rise flats in Glasgow in the 1960s and 70s. We find that both the immediate and longer-term outcomes of relocation varied greatly; while some people failed to settle and felt a loss of social relations, many others did not. People had agency, some chose to get away from tenement life and others chose to move on subsequently as aspirations changed. Furthermore, relocation to high-rise was not always the life-defining event or moment it is often depicted to be.   Outcomes from relocation are mediated by many other events and experiences, questioning its role as an explanatory paradigm in housing studies.

Introduction

Post-war sociology and in particular studies of community and 'slum clearance' have been heavily influenced by Young and Willmott's seminal study in the 1950s of Bethnal Green in East London (Young and Willmott 1957), involving the relocation of people from the Boundary Street estate to a suburban new-build estate, 'Greenleigh', some twenty miles away. From their interviews with Bethnal Green residents, Young and Willmott reported that rather than be relocated, 'the majority wish to stay in the East End' and 'very few people wish to leave' (pp186-7). They offered two main reasons for this: place attachment as a result of long-term residence, such that people had a 'sense of belonging which comes from knowing and being known by so many of their fellow residents'; and 'the local kinship system', wherein adults had a 'disinclination to move' away from the close ties they have with their parents, particularly so for mothers and daughters (pp187-8). Conversely, Young and Willmott's summary of the views of people relocated to Greenleigh was that 'People's relatives are no longer neighbours sharing the intimacies of daily life. Their new neighbours are strangers…' and that 'They frequently complained of the unfriendliness of the place' (p.147). The conclusion to the book was that 'the authorities… should do more…to meet the preference of people…rather than insisting that more thousands should migrate beyond the city', and that this should involve 'saving as many as possible of the existing houses' (pp.197-8).

On the basis of this early post-war study, the 'loss of community' narrative became enduring and influential over the decades, both across geographies and disciplines. In their study of urban renewal in Birmingham, Paris and Blackaby (1979) noted that 'comprehensive development has often been accused of the 'destruction of communities'' and that 'For many, slum clearance came to mean a forcible displacement to an unfamiliar high rise flat – a 'prison in the sky' – without friends or relations nearby' (p.18). In his historical account of urban renewal in the UK, Thomas (1986) cited both Young and Willmott's study and Jennings' (1962) study of the Barton Hill estate in Bristol as providing 'evidence on social dislocation created by clearance programmes…and in particular the disruption of community' that was influential in the shift towards housing improvement works in the 1970s (p.62). Echoes of the same concerns were provided for urban renewal in the USA from the 1950s onwards (e.g. Jacobs 1961; Gans 1962).

The shadow of the past is also evident in critical accounts of 'urban renaissance' policies under New Labour (1997-2010). It was predicted that the flagship New Deal for Communities '…will destroy

existing communities in ways reminiscent of earlier waves of demolition and clearance activity' and that 'lessons from…earlier sweeps' in London and Birmingham provided by Young and Willmott (1957) and Heywood and Naz (1990) 'seem forgotten in a headlong dive to attract back the middle classes, homeowners and economic growth' (Atkinson 2004, p.124). The ignored lessons from history were also highlighted in the contention that 'state-led gentrification' policies had 'parallels with the large urban renewal programmes that led to the destruction of inner-city communities in the 1950s and 1960s'. The explanation lay in the fact that 'planners and policy-makers have undergone some form of amnesia with respect to the massive criticism that these post-war slum clearances engendered concerning the destruction of community networks (for example, Young & Willmott 1957)' (Lees and Ley 2008, p.2381).

There are two main difficulties facing this line of argument about urban renewal and understanding the lessons of the past. Much of the recent commentary on urban regeneration policies in various parts of the UK are founded on little empirical evidence about the social effects of renewal. Often the fact of demolition is used de facto as proof (with little or no evidence presented on the impact on individuals) that communities have been destroyed, and thus that social losses have been incurred by the previous residents. As Ferrari (2012) points out, this approach often confuses procedural with distributional justice. To properly account for both the benefits and harms of regeneration, one cannot treat 'neighbourhoods as fixed containers' and 'fix populations in time', but rather one needs to consider a broader set of residents, including current residents, their descendants, future residents or incomers, and those who cannot be accommodated given the available accommodation in an area. In this wider view, 'the evaluation of the (in)justices involved in demolition become far less clearly defined' (p.275).

The second challenge facing historically-based critiques of contemporary regeneration policies is that what commentators portray as past truth turns out to be not be as clear cut as many would like to think. In his history of state housing in Britain, Merrett (1979) summarises the criticism that slum clearance policy of the 1950s was said to 'tear to shreds a fabric of personal relationships that could take years to replace within new neighbourhoods and brought with it psychological distress and mental illness' (p.124), thus implicitly recognising the possibility that social relationships might be reformed or replaced in time, something not often considered. But he goes on to cite a review of available research at the time by Parker (1973) that showed inconsistent results for the psychological impacts of displacement, and 'evidence…to suggest that the break-up of existing working-class

communities by slum clearance has no more than a minor and short-term effect on most people' (p.268).

The recent findings from a re-analysis of Young and Willmott's interview notes from their totemic study *Family and Kinship in East London* raise further questions about the role this work has played 'in the construction of [the] model of the (disappearing) 'traditional' working-class community' (Lawrence 2016, p.572). *Family and Kinship* is regularly cited in social histories which use a similar 'cataclysmic model of social and cultural change' (p.573) and yet the re-analysis discovered that Young and Willmott failed to give much attention to analysing what their respondents said about their neighbours; rather they focused on family relations, and thus provided an idealised view of community relations in Bethnal Green. This ran counter to the findings of the re-analysis that many people in Bethnal Green were either hostile, wary or uneasy about judgemental neighbours. Indeed, Young and Willmott were said to be 'ignoring strong evidence that many Londoners had *always* lived by the maxim that it was best to 'keep themselves to themselves', in Bethnal Green as much as Debden (Greenleigh)' (p.578). The published version of the original study did not give much attention to the cases where people wanted to 'escape to a new life', nor the fact that few of the relocated residents showed any desire to return to Bethnal Green. In contrast to the original study which depicted Greenleigh as 'unfriendly' the re-analysis revealed 'many cases in which people report explicitly positive experiences of their new neighbours at Debden' (p.588).

Lawrence's explanation for why Young and Willmott exaggerated the differences between community relations in Bethnal Green and Debden has troubling echoes of our earlier comments on the gentrification/regeneration debate, in that 'it undoubtedly provided a devastating critique of urban planners' indifference to the lived environments that their policies promised to obliterate' (p.592). For Lawrence, there was a political motive involved: 'To maximise the political impact of their case, Young and Willmott had to mute the voices of working people who testified to the limits of community and kinship bonds, or to the positive attraction of moving to the suburbs. They also had to draw an exaggerated picture of alienation and anomie among migrants to Debden' (p.593). For others, the limitations of Young and Willmott's study were methodological. They constructed an 'ideal-type Bethnal Green family' that could not explain 'deviant cases' (Platt 1971, cited in Lawrence 2016) and they collected people's public accounts or clichés about community, rather than digging deeper into their private accounts (Cornwell 1984, cited in Lawrence 2016).

The recent interest in the community consequences of urban renewal is very much focused on collective outcomes, although the re-analysis of Young and Willmott's study illustrates how individual experiences may either differ from the grander narrative, or indeed undermine it. Thus, the other area of interest among researchers in recent years has been in a range of individual outcomes from relocation, looking at people in their destination neighbourhoods rather than mainly focusing on life as it existed in their original places of residence. The more recent studies have identified two groups of factors that influence relocation outcomes for individuals.

First, relocation outcomes are influenced by the nature of the move itself. Goetz (2002) identified differences in outcomes between 'voluntary' and 'involuntary' movers, although not always in ways one would expect. Involuntary movers sometimes had higher neighbourhood satisfaction post-move than voluntary movers. However, the distinction between the two types of move on the basis of the characteristics of the relocation programme itself has been questioned because sizeable proportions of those required to move due to restructuring programmes do not necessarily perceive the move as 'forced' (Kearns and Mason 2013). Further, both residents' understanding of the requirement for and process of renewal (van Kempen and Priemus 1999), and any prior intention to move they had, have been shown to be associated with positive post-relocation outcomes (Popp 1976; Kleinhans and van der Laan Bouma-Doff 2008). Moreover, the fact that 'substantial support for clearance can be found from those who view rehousing as providing the fulfilment of their aspirations for better housing' was pointed out some time ago in relation to post-war slum clearance in England and Wales, but largely ignored since (English et al 1976. P.45). The more recent studies have shown that variations in how organisations operate the relocation process affect residents' feelings of control (Allen 2000) and that the degree of choice residents perceive themselves to have had is positively associated with levels of post-move satisfaction (Kearns and Mason 2013). Finally, the distance involved in relocation is important, as implied by the studies in the mid-twentieth century. However, whilst people who reported moving further had lower levels of post-move neighbourhood satisfaction (Kearns and Mason 2013), those who do not move very far and/or who moved to neighbourhoods not very different to the ones they left, might only exhibit 'modest' gains in other outcomes (Goetz 2010). Such moves by relocatees to other disadvantaged neighbourhoods are not uncommon (Kleinhans and Varady 2011) and are often due to a mixture of personal preferences and institutional restrictions (Posthumus et al 2013).

Second, relocation outcomes are influenced by the characteristics of the individuals involved. Most accounts of relocation would contend that outcomes are affected by the individual's prior attitude to moving, including the 'desire for betterment' among some, and the strength of their prior place attachment for others, although in-depth longitudinal research by Goetz (2013) has shown that 'place attachment was not predictive of overall attitude towards redevelopment' (p.249). Whilst the dominant notion has been that those with a strong sense of belonging would be more likely to experience feelings of loss or grieving after relocation (Fried 1963), more recent studies have sometimes found that these negative effects were limited because 'many respondents considered local social ties relatively unimportant' (Kleinhans 2003, p.495). Similarly, whilst Lawson et al (2015) found a close correspondence between prior attitudes to moving and post-relocation outcomes, it was also the case that those who did not want to move reported more gains afterwards than expected. Individual personalities also matter, in at least two respects. Where relocation programmes offer residents a limited degree of choice within the process, some people are more able to use that flexibility to their own benefit so that 'assertive and calculating behaviour pays off' (Posthumus and Kleinhans 2014, p.119); in other words, people are not the same, and some people are more able to exploit opportunities within relocation processes than others. In addition to this assertiveness, some people are said to have greater 'preparedness for change' (Fried 1967) or to be 'dispositional optimists' (Ekstrom 1994), which enables them to adapt more quickly to their post-relocation situation 'to achieve beneficial outcomes' (Kleinhans 2003). Research in the US has also considered how parental characteristics contribute to children's resilience in circumstances of relocation and living in high-poverty neighbourhoods, affecting outcomes such as doing well at school and avoiding behavioural problems (Eiseman et al 2005).

In addition to prior attitudes, place attachment, and personality, Lelevrier (2013) made an innovative contribution by suggesting that personal residential trajectories were also a factor influencing how individuals and households experienced relocation. Based on qualitative research with over a hundred households across seven sites one year after moving, Lelevrier argues that 'forced relocation does not have the same meaning for everyone, and will depend on previous and projected phases within the overall residential trajectory' (p.267). Based on several factors – life cycle stage; economic and family status; and length of residence and reasons for arrival in the previous neighbourhood – three types of residential trajectory are identified: 'ending' and stable trajectories of older households; 'chaotic' trajectories of vulnerable and immigrant households; and 'beginning' trajectories of small, working households. For Lelevrier, 'taking into account the long-term trajectory and not just the relocation stage reduces the importance of the latter, which is temporary in nature' (p.267), although in fact the

research was incapable of establishing what the long-term post-relocation trajectories were for participants as the interviews were conducted soon after moving. However, with regard to the central tenet of post-war studies, the recent French research concluded that 'relocation does not change the previous situation very much and can be more of an opportunity to preserve or improve close neighbourhood ties than a cause of deterioration or loss of social networks' (p.268).

Clearance and Relocation in Glasgow

Like other major UK cities, Glasgow enacted a large-scale slum clearance programme in the post-war period in order to solve what were seen as housing and health crises. This involved relocating inner city slum residents to three types of alternative location. First, the new towns of East Kilbride (designated in 1947) and later also Cumbernauld (1955), formed part of a regional economic development strategy wherein Glasgow would supply skilled labour via 'overspill' (McCrone 1991; Levitt 1997). Second, the council built four large peripheral housing estates in the 1950s on the edge of the city, a policy eventually halted by criticism of a lack of amenities (Johnston 1957) and restrictions on further development of greenbelt land around the conurbation. Third, Glasgow was a keen participant in the high-rise housing movement of the 1960s and 70s, building high-rise blocks on many gap sites and in slum redevelopment areas in the inner city in order to prevent further loss of population to places like the new towns (Horsey 1990). Glasgow built proportionately more high-rise blocks than any other major city in the UK (Glendinning and Muthesius 1994). These high-rise blocks were located all over the city, so that relocation distances varied among intra-city rehoused slum dwellers.

At this time, Glasgow was very much at the forefront of the development of high-rise, with its housing committee said to have had a 'pervasive influence' on national government policy (Horsey 1988). But the city was also leading the way with regard to social research on high-rise living. One of the largest studies ever undertaken of slum clearance dwellers relocated to high-rise blocks in the UK (involving a 5% sample of all 14,600 high-rise flats in occupation at the time) was undertaken in 1967-8 by researchers at the University of Glasgow and published as *Homes in High Flats* (Jephcott & Robinson 1971). Regarding social outcomes, although the report stated early on that tenants' views of 'the alleged loneliness of multi-storey life' were 'divergent' (p.27-8), one of its headline findings was that 'A striking aspect of this new form of housing is the way it isolates people from each other' (p.142) and goes on to discuss how the authorities might counter social isolation in the future.

Glasgow's original phase of clearance and relocation was followed by a second wave some forty years later. By the 1980s, Glasgow had 33,000 high-rise and deck-access flats, a third of which suffered dampness and condensation, with over 40% needing essential repairs (GCC 1990). The struggle of trying to maintain its modernist housing continued and in 2003 the city council transferred its entire housing stock to an independent housing association (Gibb 2003). The housing stock transfer facilitated a housing improvement and regeneration programme which entailed the demolition of 19,000 social housing flats, the majority of which were in high-rise blocks: over half the 200 or so high-rise blocks in the city were planned for demolition over the next decade (GHA 2009). This latest urban renewal programme raises questions about the long-term experience of those people who were relocated from inner-city tenement slums and then lived in the city's high-rise blocks in the second half of the twentieth century, especially given what is known about the city's poor health and excess mortality and the possible contribution of poor environments (Taulbut et al 2016).

Research Aims and Objectives

Our aim is to reconsider social outcomes from the post-war relocation process in Glasgow, looking at those people who moved within the city itself, which included to both inner-city and peripheral locations. This is important for a number of reasons pertaining to developing the evidence base around relocation. There are not many studies of relocation outcomes in the UK, certainly compared with the number in Europe and the USA. Many of the studies that do exist have been carried out over short periods of time, typically with follow-up periods of around a year; even Young and Willmott's study was only over two years. There is also a need to re-examine and follow-up past studies that are often used as core evidence on the effects of relocation, or which are used as rhetorical devices in debates about relocation. In this way, supposedly well-known findings from key studies acquire the status of conventional wisdom without critical appraisal. We have already seen this questioned in the case of Young and Willmott's study, but the same reappraisal of what we think we know should be undertaken in respect of other studies when the opportunity arises.

Our approach is to focus mainly on social outcomes in destination neighbourhoods for those relocated rather than to examine social relations in the places which were cleared, although there will be some references to conditions in origin neighbourhoods as people make comparative evaluations of their post-move situation. We will also conduct re-analysis of a short-term study, as per Lawrence (2016),

but combine this with primary research comprising long-term, retrospective interviews (see below). Our objectives include addressing the question of whether the dominant narrative of social dislocation and community loss from relocation is supported in the short- or long-term. A second objective is to identify some of the key factors that have affected social outcomes over time by analysing the old and the new evidence in the light of knowledge acquired from the more recent research findings. With regard to relocation, our interest is in both what it was like at the time for individuals and their families, and what happened next. By combining the short- and long-term perspectives, we should be better able to assess social outcomes, and to consider the consequences for the next generation, not only for the relocating householder.

Methods

Our study of relocation outcomes from mid-twentieth century slum clearance in Glasgow comprises two parts: a re-analysis of a sample of the survey forms from the Jephcott study of the 1960s; plus oral-history interviews with people who lived either their childhood or early adulthood as members of relocated households in some of the high-rise flats studied by Jephcott. Re-analysis has been carried out on several studies from the mid-twentieth century (Savage 2005), including being combined with primary data collection (O'Connor and Goodwin 2010). It is recognised that a 'subtler and more nuanced tale' can be told using today's techniques (Bechhofer 2004), with the contemporary relevance of archived data better enabling subsequent research to be cumulative (Fielding 2004).

Reanalysis of 'Homes in High Flats'

The Jephcott study comprised the administration of 1,067 questionnaires to residents across 30 locations in the city (see Figure 1). The original completed survey forms and other documents from the study still exist today and are held in the University of Glasgow archive. Most people were interviewed within a few years (typically around 3-4 years) of moving into the high-rise flats. The majority of the questionnaire consisted of closed questions, such as factual information about their household, employment, the move to the flat, their rooms and rent, and housing satisfaction. Simple frequency tables derived from these questions can be found in the book from the study but with very few quotations from participants, similar to the affluent worker study discussed above. But the questionnaires also included a final section called 'Broad Social Issues' which carried the instruction

to the interviewers to 'Please talk informally and get as much comment as you possibly can.' Here, several open questions were asked including: what people's likes and dislikes about the house, block and scheme were; and whether and in what way people's social life had changed since they moved. Our re-study has involved the transcription and analysis of these qualitative open question responses from four of Jephcott's study sides.

Two of Jephcott's original study locations are selected here for analysis, thus enabling us to see if the findings differed between contrasting parts of the city. Kearns and Mason (2013) argued that relocation outcomes are likely to be context-specific, though they were mainly talking about contextual differences between eras and regions, whereas we have taken the opportunity to see if intra-city context also matters to relocation outcomes. In the inner city, we chose Jephcott's study site of Hutchesontown C/Queen Elizabeth Square in The Gorbals. This was the 'jewel in the crown' of Glasgow's first Comprehensive Redevelopment Area designated in 1957 and was designed by Sir Basil Spence, a leading light of Britain's post-war modernist architectural movement. It took the form of three inter-linked, long, slab blocks of over twelve storeys in height, inspired by Le Corbusier's Unité d'habitation in Marseille (Figure 1). These were the most unusual modernist buildings in the city, standing on wedge-shaped concrete stilts to free up social space underneath the building, with shared verandas to encourage socialising at height, and described as 'powerful' and 'brutal' (Williamson et al 1990). As can be seen from the map from Jephcott's study (Figure 2), most people moved only short distances to be rehoused in The Gorbals; our analysis of the survey forms confirmed that four-in-five people moved between 1-2 miles.

Fig 1. Hutcheson Town C: Queen Elizabeth Square.
Left Image: Source: P. Jephcott and H. Robinson, *Homes in High Flats*, (Oliver & Boyd: Edinburgh), 1971, Plate 16. Right Image: Source: http://urbanglasgow.co.uk/archive/o_t_t_1654_start_0_index.html

Figure 2. Distance moved by residents in Queen Elizabeth Square.
Original map scale 4inches: 1 mile. Block A= purple; Block B= yellow; Block C=pink.

As a contrast, we also selected Castlemilk six miles from the city centre on the southern boundary of the city. Castlemilk is an example of one of Glasgow's deprived peripheral housing estates, which form an interesting contrast with the declining inner urban neighbourhoods studied in American cities by Wilson (1987). In both cases, economic restructuring and class-based out-migration combined to

produce areas of high unemployment and concentrated poverty, resulting in what Wilson calls 'social dislocations' (e.g. marital breakdown, teenage pregnancies, high crime rates). At about the same time as Wilson's analysis, Castlemilk was similarly described in the late 1980s as requiring 'economic improvement' and 'comprehensive regeneration' to tackle the 'deep-rooted nature of deprivation' on the estate and was included in a government programme for regenerating some of Scotland's peripheral estates during the 1990s (Cambridge Policy Consultants 1999, p.v).

Jephcott administered questionnaires at Bogany Terrace and Mitchelhill in Castlemilk, consisting of six twenty-five storey, system-built point blocks constructed by Wimpey, more standard in design than the Gorbals flats (Figure 3).   As shown in the map at Figure 4, people relocated a much wider range of distances to live in Castlemilk, with our reanalysis confirming that only one-in-four people moved 1-2 miles, contrasting with The Gorbals. Despite different locations and different designs, both sets of flats no longer exist: the Bogany and Hutchesontown C flats were demolished in 1993 and the Mitchelhill flats in 2005. A total of 91 questionnaires were examined, 34 from Queen Elizabeth Square and 57 from Bogany-Mitchelhill.

Fig 3. Mitchelhill Flats, Castlemilk.
Source: University of Glasgow Archive, DC 127 *Homes in High Flats* collection

Figure 4. Distance moved by residents in Castlemilk (original map scale 4inches: 1 mile)

Oral History Interviews

Our aim was to interview people who had lived in the two sets of flats in the 1960s to 1980s, when the estates were at their peak. We recruited through a web-site, blog, social media (twitter) and via public engagement events in the study locations. Putting information about the study 'out there' allowed people with memories of living in The Gorbals and Castlemilk to approach us to offer to participate. Only three of our interviewees were the original tenants who relocated to the flats, as few of this generation are still alive, the majority comprised people who moved to the flats with their parents as children, teenagers or young adults. There were twelve participants (5 for Queen Elizabeth Square and 7 for Bogany/Mitchelhill) who had all relocated between 1964 and 1974 (plus one relocated in 1981), and lived in the flats for 7 to 29 years. Nine of the twelve still lived elsewhere in Glasgow.

The interviews were conducted using a life history methodology (Abrams 2016), allowing participants to relate their memories of relocation and life in the flats to other events in their lives, especially their family histories, and to societal discourses about the estates and flats. Whilst respondents were asked to recollect their actions and their feelings about relocation experiences which took place some decades earlier, the accounts offered both data on material changes in their lives and the accompanying emotions, indicating that the move to a high flat retained significance in their life narrative. Although we developed an interview topic guide based loosely on questions asked in Jephcott's original survey, in practice the interviews were far less structured with the interviewee taking the lead to convey their life narrative and reflecting on life in the flats and on the estates from a temporal and sometimes geographical distance.

Findings from Re-analysis: Experience of Relocation in the Short-Term

Adapting to Life in the High-Rise

It is evident from Jephcott's survey forms that many people had difficulty adjusting to the change from tenement life, particularly older residents in Queen Elizabeth Square, holding the view that the new estate was less friendly than life in their previous community, which for most of them was also in The Gorbals. Typical views included:

> 'The house is good, it's far superior to the house we left, but I miss the tenement and the friendliness you get there' (married man, aged 75, Gorbals)

'Only thing is that it's too quiet, don't get to know people...I wish I was back in my wee room and kitchen where you were able to meet people and you knew everybody round about.' (widow, aged 82, Gorbals)

'There is no community life here' (married woman with children, aged 42, Gorbals)

These regretful remarks, looking back on tenement life, were far less common among younger adults, and less common among Castlemilk residents, possibly because they came from a wider range of locations across the city, and not all from the same community. Comparisons with tenement communities may well have been in mind, however, when people made comments on the social deficiencies of Castlemilk, such as:

'It's not a place to get to know people. I'm lucky, I have quite a lot of friends here and I visit my mother three times a week and that takes me out a lot' (married woman with children, aged 23, Castlemilk)

However, in both locations there were reports of feeling lonely, such as:

'I find it too lonely. You never see a neighbour' (widow, aged 54, Gorbals)

In Castlemilk though, references were more often to the fact that the estate was quiet, which may reflect its scale (see later):

'I like it really...although it's very quiet here' (married woman with children, aged 23, Castlemilk)

Site-Specific Factors Affecting Social Outcomes

Examination of the questionnaire transcripts revealed different factors reaching prominence in each location. In Queen Elizabeth Square, the obvious influence on social and psychological outcomes was the design and appearance of the blocks. The 'huge blocks' on 'sharply angled stilts' were so unusual that one former resident described the development as 'like a flying saucer taking you to Mars' (Grindrod 2013, p.165) – see Figure 1. Spence himself had intended for the buildings to look like a 'great ship in full sail' on washdays, with the communal balconies or 'garden slabs' to provide 'a perpetuation of the green' (Glendinning and Malthesius, 1994, p.170; Glendinning 1992).

For residents at the time, however, a mixture of both the internal and external design of the scheme proved detrimental to their social relations and exacerbated their feelings of loneliness and isolation,

i.e. how they psychologically responded to a reduction in social contact (Kearns et al 2015). Internally, the issue was the use of long, central corridors, which overburdened people with too many potential neighbours and reduced the probability of meaningful casual interaction. This effect of long corridors causing social withdrawal and hostility was demonstrated in experimental research in student blocks in the 1970s (Baum and Valins 1977) and seems to have relevance here:

> 'The corridors are awfully long. I think they would have been better if they had been smaller and more square. You could have got to know your neighbours better' (married woman with children, aged 30, Gorbals)

> 'I find it very impersonal. You see hundreds of people but you don't know them. It is like a hostel or hospital with the long corridors.' (single woman, aged 20, Gorbals)

Externally, both the length and scale of the facades and the presentation of shuttered concrete surfaces gave the blocks an institutional appearance that for some people was alienating:

> 'I hate the long corridors, it's like a prison. The outside is horrible…' (married woman with children, aged 51, Gorbals)

In Castlemilk, the design of the blocks, which was very different to that of Queen Elizabeth Square (see Fig 3), was not mentioned, but respondents did remark negatively on several other features of the estate, including its location, scale, amenities and reputation. As shown in Figures 2 and 4, people relocated to Castlemilk generally moved much larger distances than was the case for Queen Elizabeth Square. The negative effects of the former and the positive effects of the latter were mentioned in the transcripts:

> 'Being so far out, we don't see as much of our relatives as we used to' (married man with children, aged 23, Castlemilk)

> 'We never see them [friends], they never come here and we don't go there…can't afford to' (married woman, aged 57, Castlemilk)

> 'I am still in the district I was brought up in so I haven't lost contact with my friends and neighbours' (married woman with children, aged 33, Gorbals)

Comments about the distance moved, however, were far less common than remarks about the location and amenities of the estates. Settling in to the new estates was not so much an issue of how far people had come as a matter of how easy or difficult it was to develop meaningful relationships and activities in the new locations.

In the case of the Gorbals, the big advantage was that it was 'very handy and central':

> 'I like the handiness of the place, you can walk into town from here. It is not like some schemes where you are miles from everybody' (married woman with children, aged 42, Gorbals)

In contrast, Castlemilk was too far out for many people who had no car and could not afford bus fares (there is no convenient train or underground service to this day), and this distance exacerbated feelings of isolation for those who had recently moved:

> 'In my case it's the distance. If I want to go to the city, it's not walkable distance and the two fares are heavy' (married man, aged 59, Castlemilk)

> 'Don't like it at all. Too far away from everything' (married woman with children, aged 30, Castlemilk)

> 'I like Castlemilk…but it's too far out for me' (widow, aged 59, Castlemilk)

The distance also had a direct effect on family relations, particularly for young mothers:

> 'Kind of far for them to come out; it seems that far away from them. If my mother comes here, it is costing her 5/- in bus fares and me the same to go to her' (married woman with children, aged 30, Castlemilk)

The location of the two estates was interlinked with the issue of available shops and other amenities. For residents in Queen Elizabeth Square, social life was supported to some degree by the fact of having nearby shops, even if these were far less numerous than the number of corner shops that had existed in the tenemental Gorbals (Grindrod 2013; Johnston, 1957):

> 'The shops are very handy. We have shops all around the scheme' (married woman with adult children, aged 63, Gorbals)

> 'Plenty of shops nearby' (widow, aged 77, Gorbals)

Castlemilk, on the other hand was in the wrong place for shops:

> 'If it was nearer town I could take my time and go…to some shops' (widow, aged 56, Castlemilk)

As well as commenting on how far out Castlemilk was from the city centre and shops, residents also remarked on the lack of amenities on the estate, which curtailed social life:

> 'It's just boring and I cannot stand it. There's nothing for men here – except a bowling green for old men. My man likes a few pubs and betting shops' (married woman with children, aged 30, Castlemilk)

Thirty years later, studies still found a restricted choice of shops in the main shopping centre and reported the neighbourhood situation as 'bleak'. Indeed, 'the lack of adequate facilities in Castlemilk prevented the area from becoming a 'well functioning suburb' (O'Toole et al 1995, p.33).

The other aspects of Castlemilk which caused some residents to be negative about life there was its scale and reputation, something people were well aware of:

> 'Don't like the scheme. It's got a bad name for a start, and sometimes deserves it' (married man with children, aged 23, Castlemilk)

Others, however, conceded that 'it's not really as bad as the reputation it has' (married man, aged 25, Castlemilk). Nonetheless, there were complaints about antisocial behaviour on the estate and damage caused by children:

> 'They're making a slum of the place….We're paying a heavy rent to live respectable and that's what they do. It's the parents who let the young ones run wild here' (married woman, aged 64, Castlemilk)

The size of the estate, as well as causing the area to be 'boring' without sufficient amenities, was also considered to weaken these forces of informal social control:

> 'The scheme is too large. It maddens me when you get nice houses and the children are allowed to make a mess of them' (married woman, aged 57, Castlemilk)

Personal Experiences and Preferences

Not everyone had a negative view of the shift from tenement life to living in modernist blocks and estates, and the early testimony of residents identifies some of the factors that helped people adapt or be resilient to the change and the reduction in social contact. Personal preferences play a significant role for this group, in that some people would rather not socialise with their neighbours, as in:

'I like the quietness and the view. I was never one to bother with the neighbours' (widow, aged 77, Gorbals)

'The wife and I keep to ourselves' (married man, aged 59, Castlemilk)

This could also be due to personal experience:

'I've had so much upset and noise in my life that maybe the peace and quiet is what I'm looking for' (widow, aged 64, Castlemilk)

In some cases, the contrast with their previous life in the tenements was perceived as a positive one:

'I'm satisfied there is no-one coming chapping the doors – I like a certain amount of privacy' (married woman with children, aged 26, Castlemilk)

'You've got a lot of privacy here if you wish it. You don't need to bother the neighbours unless you wish to' (widow, aged 50, Castlemilk)

This notion of privacy was a very current idea at the time (Langhamer, 2005), and one used to sell the idea of high-rise living to people, alongside the comforts of a modern flat (Jephcott and Robinson 1971). There were some people who valued privacy as a personal advancement and a distinction from tenement life:

'The average man does not have it within his scope to choose where he will live and what sort of neighbours he is obliged to live with, whereas in a multistorey flat in the normal course of events one only sees whom one chooses to see…I particularly asked for this, prime reason for a multistorey. It gives you superiority that you would never otherwise have unless you owned your own house' (married man with children, aged 24, Castlemilk)

Some people seemed to report a disposition to develop social connections, describing themselves for example, thus:

 'I'm quite friendly with lots of people up here' (married woman with children, aged 23, Castlemilk).

There was evidence of gender differences at an early stage, something studied in depth on peripheral estates many years later (Tulle-Winton 1997), with men tending to remark that they thought their wives were lonely, whilst others, usually but not exclusively men in employment, were less affected by local social relations:

'You very seldom meet any people here. My wife finds it a very lonely life' (married man with children, aged 30, Castlemilk)

'Doesn't bother me because I'm never here' (married man with children, aged 30, Castlemilk)

Oral History Testimony: Experience of Relocation in the Long-Term

The oral history life narratives provide more nuanced perspectives on how households came to relocate to the new high-rise developments in the first place, what social life was like in the new blocks and on the new estates, and why people subsequently left and, in some cases, later returned.

Relocating to the High-Rise

Two themes recur in the accounts of moving to high-rise: the role of family dynamics and the attractions of modernity for some. This reveals that relocation was not as simple or straightforward as the council demanding or offering that people move due to slum clearance. John moved to the Mitchelhill flats in Castlemilk after persuading his parents to move nearer to his friends, particularly after his sisters had left home and he felt on his own at home:

> '…my two sisters had moved out so we moved to Mitchelhill to less room […]: Like a year before I moved up cause I started secondary late '79 and then ended up as I say I was going about with those boys and I really loved the flats when we moved up there it was absolutely brilliant, I am not kidding you it was like coming from the city…and moving to the country. People were collecting eggs, ferrets and greyhounds and lurchers and going hunting, air rifles and fishing and all that …' (John, resident, Castlemilk)

Whilst this was a positive experience for John, Isabelle moved to Mitchelhill after her elder brother got married and left home. According to Isabella, her father made the relocation decision for the family after having convinced her mother of the modern attributes of the flat, and yet Isabella's account implies that her mother was not keen and found the experience isolating:

> 'My dad had gone to see it first of all and then, I know he did take my Mum to see it, and as I say, the way he swayed it to my Mum was, you know all these mod cons, you had a lovely bathroom, you had under floor heating, you had this lovely veranda with views all over the city, you know. So that was kind of how it was sold to my mother. […] There was only like my mum basically there, and then in the far end and…… they were big landings….was the other house, the other two neighbours were through swing doors, you had the two. And from that day to this I couldn't tell you who lived at the far side of our landing' (Isabella, former resident, Castlemilk)

Sometimes, relocation could itself fracture the family. Brian's parents moved to the Gorbals into a small, one-room tenement flat to begin with, before subsequently relocating into Queen Elizabeth Square. But Brian did not want to leave his grandmother, so continued to live with her elsewhere in a post-war peripheral estate; eventually, when he did move in with his parents in The Gorbals, he continued to stay sometimes with his gran.

Several participants attested to the attractions of a modern flat and modern living for their parents. Tricia and Lorraine describe how their parents thought the move to Mitchelhill was a move up socially, with all the modern facilities and that they had 'gone up in the world' and that

> 'They thought they'd, thought they'd died an' gone to heaven' (Tricia, former resident, Castlemilk).

In fact, their parents had sold a small flat in inner Glasgow to move to a council rented flat at Mitchelhill, seeing no distinction between owning and renting. However, Lorraine also suggested that her mother had been persuaded to move by her grandmother, who already lived in Castlemilk, and thus aspiration was mixed with the pull of family relations as motivations to relocate. Paul's grandmother was also reported to have been influential on his mother, this time not to move to a suburban estate but to stay in the Gorbals and take one of the modern new flats. This was echoed in Helen's account that her mother had relocated from a tenement flat in the Gorbals to Queen Elizabeth Square because she wanted a modern, larger flat.

> 'My mum and dad bought their flat in Rutherglen Road; they were canvassed by the Council to move to the new flats in Queen Elizabeth Square. At the time they were also offered another Council house in 'the Shaws' in the posher south side and it was my granny, my mum's mum, who was quite a modernist you know, she sort of persuaded my mum to take the offer of Queen Elizabeth Square as opposed to this semi-detached somewhere in the Shaws in the south side. So the Council bought their, it wasn't a single end, apartment type thing. I know that happened to her and maybe a couple of her friends.' (Paul, former resident, Gorbals)

Social Life in the High-Rise

Whilst, in accord with the predominant historical account, there were some reports of a loss of community after the move from the tenement flats, these were not very common, although many of

the oral history participants were young at the time of the move so their memories were mostly of life in the high-rise. Echoing our findings from the reanalysis of Jephcott's survey, the dislocation narrative was most evident in the inner city, such as in Helen's account, who talked about the Corporation having 'tore the heart out of the Gorbals', and the isolation of life in the replacement flats where shutting your door to keep safe was 'not a way to live'. Helen's sense of loss was clear:

> 'When we moved into Queen Elizabeth Square we left something behind and that was the community spirit. The availability to see your neighbours as they were passing, just to wave. We didn't have that in Queen Elizabeth Square.' (Helen, former resident, Gorbals)

Many others though talked about positive, strong community relations in the flats, often echoing practices that are more commonly associated with tenement living, and this was evident in both Gorbals and Castlemilk. Paul described Queen Elizabeth Square as very sociable, and Brian reported people continuing the practice of taking turns to clean their stairs and landings, just as they had in the tenements:

> 'An' then ye get these immaculate really shiny, ye could smell it, the, the really shiny corridor [...] 'cause ye took a turn, em, an' they used tae hiv like a big, the, the caretaker hid made up this kind of a lump of wood an' ye put it through each other's door tae tell ye it wis your turn.' (Brian, former resident, Gorbals)

Lorraine talked of people knowing their neighbours and looking after pensioners who were living in the single flats. Her descriptions of children's play, and John's account of popping into neighbours' flats were also reminiscent of tenement life:

> 'You know the whole point ae it, ah always thought it wis quite, well when ah think aboot it noo, ah mean you knew theym an' if they needed anything you always knew who stayed in your landin. Ah dae remember getting sent tae see wee Mrs So-and-so is awright, or if she needs anything. So that wis a whole community thing an' everybody as far as ah know, mah friends as well, you always knew who yer, who the wee man wis, who the wee wummin wis that stayed in yer landin'. (Lorraine, resident, Castlemilk)

> 'Everybody's door was open and you could go in and get a piece [sandwich]' (John, former resident, Gorbals)

Lying behind many of these positive accounts of social life in the high-rise flats were two elements. Some participants had many members of their extended family in the area, a result of the fact that relocation sometimes kept people from the same area together. John and Cath each said they had not wanted to leave The Gorbals: Cath still lives in the area and John said he would go back if he could.

John's extended family of cousins still live in the Gorbals, and Cath said many of her family members had lived in the flats, 'like a family close', and also recalled parties with the neighbours who were friends. Somewhat nostalgically, Cath wanted to go back to a time when 'everyone looked after each other'.

The second element supporting the existence of positive social relations was the advantage for some of having parents who had good social networks through their work. Paul's mother had a 'great social circle' through her work which was useful for nights out and day trips, and he described Queen Elizabeth Square as very sociable and safe. Tricia said her parents were sociable and had a lot of friends in and around the blocks in Mitchelhill because her father worked with some of the men in the area:

> 'He'd worked in the GPO an' a lot ae the people he met there, like three or four o' them lived up the flats. Ah don't know, ah, it was just a coincidence. [...] Em, an' my dad, he joined there an' he had a fantastic social life in there, but they were there Friday, Saturday, Sunday. An' it was a new club an' my dad seemed to be popular there and they were there all the time […] An' they enjoyed that, well ah don't think my mum so much but she went along, but my dad absolutely loved it.' (Tricia, former resident, Castlemilk)

For other participants, negative family experiences coloured their recollections of social life in the high-rise. Helen's experience was affected by her mother's inability to cope. Helen was very negative about Queen Elizabeth Square, and she described her mother as isolated and depressed, something described as 'demolition melancholia' among older women, particularly widows, relocated under slum clearance of the 1930s (Thorpe, 1939) or 'psychological strain' for women living in high flats in the 1970s (Gillis 1977) :

> 'Sometimes she would say 'I hate this place, I just want to get away from it because it's such a closed feeling'. She got a bit depressed there as well I think' (Helen, former resident, Gorbals)

For some, the family experience was such that their social outcomes were not solely, or even mainly, the product of relocation. Brian's father was often out socialising and his mother was working, so he was left looking after his younger siblings, a responsibility he did not welcome. Isabelle in Castlemilk, like Helen in Gorbals, had a very negative perception of the high-rise flats, but she recognised that this partly reflected her experience of her mother's breakdown at the time:

'Obviously it's how you … it's how you felt when you lived there. I mean a lot of people will have really happy memories living at Mitchellhill, obviously, you know, maybe their first house when they get married, a lot of people will have really happy memories and so it will be an ending for them as well. Again a kind of … you know I had a really nice time in there; for me it just so happened it was the opposite. I was glad to … I am glad to see all these flats come down, I think it's an unhealthy way to live, I don't think it's healthy for people being stacked on top of one another all that height up, because of the isolation.' (Isabelle, former resident, Castlemilk)

Decline and Departure

Several participants gave accounts of decline on the estates dating from around the late 1970s and early 1980s, ascribing this either to 'good families' moving away, or 'drugs and gangs' moving in, and a growth in antisocial behaviour. These social changes were described alongside a decline in maintenance standards and a cut-back in caretakers, plus changes in housing allocation policies. These things did not cause everyone to move; some people stayed despite recognising decline, or left and then returned:

'I just sat it out. I said I am not moving till I get a decent house. I've been in my house 11 year, brand new house, back and front garden, up and down stairs, two toilets. I like to rub that bit in' (John, resident, Castlemilk)

However, others' accounts of why either their parents or they themselves moved away convey a mixture of social, family and aspirational reasons. Social decline played a large role for Paul's family. He described his mother being fearful over drugs in the area , so she applied for a transfer:

'At that point my mum just went at it hammer and tongs I am not saying she bullied her way into it but she got there anyway. The timing of that was something as well because at the time that was the beginning of the end for a lot of people - the drugs all that'. (Paul, former resident, Gorbals)

Paul decided to leave, despite earlier positive experiences, once he witnessed his mother give someone the kiss of life after a heroin overdose. Brian similarly explained that 'getting out' was his way of avoiding drugs in the Gorbals.

But motivations for leaving were not entirely social; Paul also said his mother was looking for a larger house, and Marjorie cited both a desire for a larger flat and to avoid antisocial behaviour as reasons

for leaving. In some cases, social life on the estate resulted in a negative event that directly impacted someone and caused them to leave; for example, Tricia said her Mum moved after having been the victim of a burglary. Yet again, some of those who cited social reasons for moving, also reported the effects of family relations on them as motivations for leaving. Isabella recognised that her account of 'escaping' the flats in Castlemilk masked her wish to get away from her family. Brian wanted to escape the responsibility of being the oldest sibling in the family and having to play a parental role. Tricia said she had brought up her younger sister and couldn't wait to leave home due to her relationship with her mother.

> 'Em, but her and I were increasingly buttin heads as I was getting older an' it was becoming an impossible situation. An' so therefore that took priority over everything. […] Ah had tae, ah had tae get out' (Tricia, former resident, Castlemilk).

Aspirations 'to do well' in ways that did not seem possible whilst living on the estates also played a part in several departures. For Helen and her sister, moving away was about pursuing employment goals, becoming a policewoman and midwife respectively. Despite leaving school early she said:

> 'We had enough intelligence to know it's been up to us and if we wanted a better life we had to move away from that [living in poverty] and I am so glad we did' (Helen, former resident, Gorbals)

Others described the housing aspirations of their mothers to get a house, as tastes changed and high-rise flats were no longer seen as 'modern'. Paul talked of people moving on in the 1970s and both his Mum and her friends looking for a house as they had aspirations for more than 'living in the sky'.

> I think that was a big thing, living up in the air, in the sky sort of thing. Yeah there were certain people as well I think just felt themselves above what these flats could do for them. I think you are always struck by that whatever it is you know that superiority or false sense of superiority' .' (Paul, former resident, Gorbals)

Lorraine said that her Mum was not alone in wanting to move to a house in the 1980s:

> 'By that time ah wid think that ye wanted yer ane door, that you obviously then didn't want tae stay up a block of flats any mair' (Lorraine, resident, Castlemilk)

But departure is not a simple or single outcome. As well as those who were glad to leave and never come back, there were others who left and returned, or stayed nearby, or would like to return today.

John said he always returned to Mitchehill and lives in Castlemilk today and has connections with the 'Mitchelhill punters' from the past. John and Carol have also remained close by Castlemilk. Both John and Cath from Gorbals have remaining family connections in the area and John said he would 'go back tomorrow'. Cath never wanted to leave Queen Elizabeth Square and has lived ever since in other parts of the Gorbals. In these cases, physical departure happened to various degrees in a number of stages, but psychological departure never occurred.

Discussion

The reanalysis of 1960s social survey data and the recording of oral history life narratives with former and current residents in two areas of Glasgow highlight the potential of a long-term historical approach to studies of relocation. This article also illustrates the value of using historical data alongside current qualitative oral history methodology, as each method revealed different factors at play as social outcomes changed and evolved over time. In both instances it is the residents' and former residents' opinions on relocation that carries importance. This historical approach is useful in helping us to understand the long term implications of relocation and, crucially, the agency of the individual within such processes. The decisions made by individuals and families in the late 1960s as evidenced in the 'Homes in High Flats' questionnaire responses and later perspectives as discussed in the oral history narratives are not formulaic but, rather, nuanced, varied and subjective. Residents in the Gorbals and Castlemilk were not merely victims of circumstance as traditional interpretations of slum clearance would suggest, nor were residents 'scattered to the four winds' (Gans 1962). The reality was far more complex and while many individuals undoubtedly had little choice in where they moved to, others had far more of a say in where and when they moved to both in the late 1960s and subsequently throughout their housing journey. This re-analysis of a well-cited historical study, just as in the case of *Family and Kinship in East London* (Lawrence 2016), has raised questions about the original analysis, which in the case of Jephcott's study of high-rise occupants concerns the under-representation of the variety and complexity of tenants' experiences (see also: reference removed), and the over-emphasis and simplistic representation of a narrative of social dislocation and isolation.

Short-term evidence derived from secondary data analysis highlighted the role of design, location and context, and personal preferences. In the late 1960s social outcomes in both the inner city Gorbals and peripheral Castlemilk were influenced by the ways in which individuals and their families were able to adjust to life in high-rise and on new estates. While some missed tenement life and their 'old districts', others very much welcomed their change in circumstances. The way in which individuals

were able to 'settle in' to their new homes and neighbourhoods had a lot to do with where they were relocated geographically, and with the facilities provided in or near their new estates. Distance moved was important (Kearns and Mason 2013), though more for its effects on means of access to shops and other amenities as for its impacts on social and family relations. Whilst the modernist architecture of Queen Elizabeth Square was a cause of complaint for some residents, most liked the proximity to the city centre and appreciated the availability of nearby shops within the estate. In Castlemilk the opposite was true; the estate was too far from the city centre and crucially had far fewer amenities, which impinged on daily and social life. Residents in Queen Elizabeth Square also had the advantage of knowing their neighbours from before and of feeling like they had moved together, which was the initial objective behind high rise construction in the area. On the other hand some individuals appreciated the privacy afforded to them by relocation, and liked moving away from the sociability of the tenements. Thus an individual's experiences and preferences also played a significant role in the objective 'success' of relocation in the 1960s, all of which challenges and complicates traditional interpretations of 'forced' relocation in this historical period.

The oral history interviews allowed former residents and individuals who were relocated and had grown up in high rise flats to reflect across several decades, review past decisions and experiences, and re-evaluate their parents' actions through the prism of the intervening period and their present circumstances. The life narratives provide rich and complex perspectives on the social outcomes of relocation, and highlight the role of parental attitudes and experiences, and of family dynamics which could be positive (through social networks) or negative (through responsibilities). Again it is clear that not all individuals had been 'forced' to move into high rise flats. For many moving to high rise had been an active choice by their parents to achieve better housing conditions and for aspirational reasons around 'modernity' and to 'escape' the slums. Individuals' subsequent experience of living in high rise in both the Gorbals and Castlemilk continued to be affected by parental and family factors. This was particularly influential for those who had grown up in high rise in both locations, with their parents' sociability and social networks influencing their own memories of their childhood. Where parents were well integrated, childhoods were considered to be happy, and where this was not the case narratives had tropes relating to isolation and were more associated with 'decline' in each area. Family dynamics were also particularly important, with responsibility for housework and the care of younger siblings influencing perceptions of life in high rise. Similarly, mental health and addiction issues among parents were a key factor in the way individuals remembered high rise as representative of their childhoods with the housing becoming synonymous with life events which may or may not have been causally linked.

Where the retrospective memories of life in high rise and thus the long term implications of relocation to the Gorbals and Castlemilk were particularly illuminating is in relation to the reasons for subsequently choosing to leave high rise, and here we extend the relevance of residential trajectories to the consideration of relocation (Lelevrier 2013). Most people across the sample spoke of decline in relation to their own departure from the high flats. This was attributed by participants to lack of maintenance, council allocations policy and the increasing societal unpopularity of high rise and flat life more generally. Like Wilson's (1987) exposition of inner city American neighbourhoods, cultural explanations for decline are eschewed even though 'social dislocations' such as portrayed by Wilson are described. Rather, the reasons given for decline and departure reflect independent accounts of the residualisation of council housing in terms of both tenant and housing stock composition from the early 1980s onwards (Forrest and Muire 1983; Ravetz 2001), which undoubtedly influenced the public's perception. Our participants were often defensive or condemnatory of their experiences of high-rise; few were ambivalent.

Agency was present at different times. Moving to new flats was for some an active choice, and many of these same individuals were able to choose when they left and where they moved on to.   This echoes more recent findings on relocation where 'the widest-ranging effects…came from choice' (Kearns and Mason 2013, p.196). But this was not the case for everyone. Some felt forced out of high rise: for them, it was not the relocation of the 1960s that was traumatic but the residualisation and demolition of high rise that had social and emotional impacts.   The other side of this was increasing ambition and aspiration to have 'a better life' and to 'get out'; residential trajectories and long-term outcomes from relocation are therefore affected by societal trends as they impact on individuals' perspectives. Many of the individuals providing narratives, both those who had relocated and the subsequent generation that had grown up in high rise, now live in houses with their own garden rather than flats. Some of these individuals have chosen to stay close by to where they were relocated and grew up, others have emigrated and live abroad. Those that live in flats across Glasgow are owner occupiers. There are also those that never left the area in which they grew up. Despite the differing social outcomes for the group as a whole, most of these individuals expressed sadness and even trauma at seeing the blocks in which they lived demolished, for others it was cathartic. This long-term, lifetime outcome of relocation could not be reported or foreseen in short-term studies.

Conclusion

27

In conclusion, we can reflect on the significance of relocation for those affected, and on the status of relocation within housing studies. On balance, it cannot be said that relocation was a wholly negative or indeed entirely positive experience for those involved; on its own, it neither made lives nor wrecked lives. Moreover, relocation did not have an overtly negative influence on long term social outcomes, as portrayed in accounts of social dislocation and community destruction. As found in the re-analysis of Young and Willmott's study, family relations during the period in question appear to have been more influential than neighbour relations (Lawrence 2016). Within an individual's overall housing journey relocation is only one step and one factor affecting the overall outcome of an individual's life. However, oral histories showed that while relocation may not be the main life-time determinant, combined with other factors it could affect subsequent residential trajectories, particularly for the younger generation, i.e. trajectories could be an outcome as well as a determinant of the relocation experience (Lelevrier 2013).

Relocation cannot stand alone as an ontological category or as an explanatory paradigm, for a number of reasons. First, while relocation may accurately be considered as an event enacted upon the individual, their families and communities, there was also agency at the time, and the ability for people to make choices about what happened subsequently. Second, relocation and its outcomes are context specific in both space and time. It matters where people relocate to for reasons of quality of life and the maintenance of social relations, but it also matters when relocation occurs - during which historical period and at what point in the development of social housing. Lastly, over time relocation is transformed from an event to a process and an experience, one that is mediated by subsequent processes and events, particularly by family relations and dynamics. The meaning and significance of relocation only becomes apparent to people over time and from a distance. But retrospective accounts do not reflect relocation on its own, but rather its interaction with other experiences, making relocation complex, multivariate and emergent, rather than a single, point-in-time phenomenon. This has been revealed by combining different disciplinary methodologies and by taking both the short-term and long-term view.

References

Abrams, L. (2016) *Oral History Theory* (London: Routledge, 2nd edition).

Allen, T. (2000) Housing renewal – doesn't it make you sick, *Housing Studies*, 15, pp. 443–461.

Atkinson,R. (2004) The evidence on the impact of gentrification: new lessons for the Urban Renaissance, *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 4(1), pp.107-131.

Baum, A. & Valins, S. (1977) *Architecture and Social Behaviour: Psychosocial Studies of Social Density* (Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum Associates).

Bechhofer, F. (2004) Qualitative data and *The Affluent Worker* study: a missed opportunity? *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 7(1), pp.45-50.

Cornwell, J. (1984) *Hard Earned Lives: Accounts of Health and Illness from East London* (London: Tavistock).

Cambridge Policy Consultants (1999) *An Evaluation of the New Life for Urban Scotland Initiative in Castlemilk, Ferguslie Park, Wester Hailes and Whitfield* (Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Central Research Unit).

Eiseman, M., Cove, E. & Popkin, S.J. (2005) *Resilient children in distressed neighbourhoods: evidence from the HOPE VI panel study*, Brief No. 7 (Washington: Urban Institute).

Ekstrom, M. (1994) Elderly people's experiences of housing renewal and forced relocation: Social theories and contextual analysis in explanations of emotional experiences, Housing Studies, 9, pp. 369–391.

English, J., Madigan, R. & Norman, P. (1976) *Slum Clearance: the Social and Administrative Context*. (London: Croom Helm).

Ferrari, E. (2012) Competing ideas of social justice and space: locating critiques of housing renewal in theory and in practice, *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 12(3), pp. 263-280.

Fielding, N. (2004) Getting the most from archived qualitative data: epistemological, practical and professional obstacles, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 7(1), pp.97-104.

Forrest, R. and Murie, A. (1983) Residualization and council housing: aspects of the changing social relations of housing tenure, *Journal of Social Policy*, 12(4), pp.453-468.

Fried, M. (1963) Grieving for a lost home, in: L. J. Duhl (Ed.) *The Urban Condition* (New York: Basic Books), pp. 151–171.

Gans, H. J. (1962) *Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans* (New York: Free Press).

GCC (1990) *House Condition Survey 1985. Volume 1: The Condition of Glasgow's Housing* (Glasgow: Glasgow City Council).

GHA (2009) *Review of Demolition and Clearance Programme* (Glasgow: Glasgow Housing Association).

Gibb, K. (2003) Transferring Glasgow's council housing: Financial, urban and housing policy implications, *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 3(1), pp. 89–114.

Gillis, A.R. (1977) High-rise housing and psychological strain, *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 18, pp.418-431.

Miles Glendinning (ed.) (1992) *Rebuilding Scotland: The Postwar Vision 1945-1975* (Edinburgh: Tuckwell Press)

Glendinning, M. & Muthesius S. (1994) *Tower Block: Modern Public Housing in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland* (Yale University Press).

Goetz, E. (2013) Too good to be true? The variable and contingent benefits of displacement and relocation among low-income public housing residents, *Housing Studies*, 28(2), pp.235-252.

Goetz, E. (2010) Better neighbourhoods, better outcomes? Explaining relocation outcomes in HOPE VI, *Cityscape*, 12(1), pp. 5-31.

Goetz, E. (2002) Forced relocation vs. voluntary mobility: The effects of dispersal programmes on households, *Housing Studies*, 17(1), pp. 107–123.

Grindrod, J. (2013) *Concretopia: A Journey Around the Rebuilding of Postwar Britain* (Brecon: Old Street Publishing).

Heywood, F. & Naz, M. (1990) *Clearance: the View from the Street* (Birmingham: Community Forum).

Horsey, M. (1990) Tenements & Towers. Glasgow Working Class Housing 1890–1990 (Edinburgh: Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland).

Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York: Random House).

Jennings, H. (1962) *Societies in the Making* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Jephcott, P. & Robinson, H. (1971) *Homes in High Flats: Some of the Human Problems Involved in Multi-Storey Housing* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd).

Johnston, N. (1957) 'Miracle in the Gorbals', *Architectural Prospect* (Spring).

Kearns, A. & Mason,P. (2013) Defining and measuring displacement: Is relocation from restructured neighbourhoods always unwelcome and disruptive?, *Housing Studies*, 28:2, pp. 177-204.

Kleinhans, R. & Varady, D. (2011) A review of recent evidence on negative spillover effects of housing restructuring programs in the USA and The Netherlands, International Journal of Housing Policy, 11(2), pp. 155–174.

Kleinhans, R. & van der Laan Bouma-Doff, W. (2008) On priority and progress: Forced residential relocation and housing chances in Haaglanden, the Netherlands, *Housing Studies*, 23(4), pp. 565–587.

Kleinhans, R. (2003) Displaced but still moving upwards in the housing career? Implications of forced residential relocation in the Netherlands, *Housing Studies*, 18(4), pp. 473–499.

Langhamer, C. (2005) 'The meanings of home in postwar Britain', *Journal of Contemporary History* 40:2, 341-62.

Lawrence, J. (2016) Inventing the 'traditional working class': a re-analysis of interview notes from Young and Willmott's *Family and Kinship in East London*, *The Historical Journal*, 59(2), pp.567-593.

Lawson,L., Kearns,A., Egan,M. and Conway,E. (2015 online) 'You can't always get what you want'? Prior attitudes and post-experiences of relocation from restructured neighbourhoods, *Housing Studies*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2014.994199.

Lees, L. & Ley, D. (2008) Introduction to special issue on gentrification and public policy, *Urban Studies*, 45(12), pp. 2379–2384.

Lelevrier, C. (2013) Forced relocation in France: how residential trajectories affect individual experiences, *Housing Studies*, 28(2), pp.253-271.

Levitt, I. (1997) New Towns, new Scotland, new ideology, 1937-57, *The Scottish Historical Review*, 76(2), pp. 222-238.

McCrone, G. (1991) Urban renewal: the Scottish experience, *Urban Studies*, 28(6), pp. 919-938.

Merrett, S. (1979) *State Housing in Britain* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

O'Connor, H. & Goodwin, J. (2010) Utilizing data from a lost sociological project: experiences, insights, promises, *Qualitative Research*, 10(3), pp. 283-298.

O'Toole,M., Snape,D. and Stewart,M. (1995) Interim evaluation of The Castlemilk Partnership (Edinburgh: Scottish Office Central Research Unit).

Paris, C. & Blackaby (1979) *Not Much Improvement. Urban Renewal Policy in Birmingham* (London: Heinemann).

Parker, B.J. (1973) Some sociological implications of slum clearance programmes, in: D. Donnison & D. Eversely (Eds) *London: Urban Patterns, Problems and Policies* (London: Heinemann).

Platt, J. (1971) *Social Research in Bethnall Green* (London: Macmillan).

Popp, H. (1976) The residential location process: Some theoretical and empirical considerations, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 67, pp. 300–305.

Posthumus, H., Bolt, G. & van Kempen, R. (2013) Why do displaced residents move to socioeconomically disadvantaged neighbourhoods?, *Housing Studies*, 28(2), pp. 272-293.

Ravetz, A. (2001) *Council Housing and Culture: The History of a Social Experiment*. (London: Routledge).

Savage, M. (2005) Working-class identities in the 1960s: revisiting the Affluent Worker study, *Sociology*, 39(5), pp. 929-946.

Taulbaut, M., McCartney, G., Walsh, D. and Collins, C. (2016) *Excess Mortality and Urban Change* (Edinburgh: NHS Health Scotland).

Thomas, A. D. (1986) *Housing and Urban Renewal: Residential Decay and Revitalization in the Private Sector* (London: George Allen & Unwin).

Thorpe, F.T. (1939) Demolition melancholia, *British Medical Journal*, July 15, pp.127-8.

Tulle-Winton, E. (1997) Happy in Castlemilk? Deprivation and depression in an urban community, *Health & Place*, 3(3), pp. 161-170.

Urban Task Force (1999) *Towards an Urban Renaissance* (London: DETR).

Van Kempen, R. & Priemus, H. (1999) Undivided cities in the Netherlands: Present situation and political rhetoric, Housing Studies, 14, pp. 641–657.

Williamson, E., Riches, A., & Higgs, M. (1990) *The Buildings of Scotland* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Young, M. & Willmott, P. (1957) *Family and Kinship in East London* (London: Penguin).

Wilson, W.J. (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).