



HAL
open science

Social ties in and out of the neighbourhood: Between compensation and cumulation

Joanie Cayouette-Remblière, Éric Charmes

► **To cite this version:**

Joanie Cayouette-Remblière, Éric Charmes. Social ties in and out of the neighbourhood: Between compensation and cumulation. *Urban Studies*, 2024, online first, 10.1177/00420980231212298 . hal-04382448

HAL Id: hal-04382448

<https://hal.science/hal-04382448>

Submitted on 9 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License



This is the version accepted for publication of Cayouette-Remblière, J., & Charmes, E. (2024). Social ties in and out of the neighbourhood: Between compensation and cumulation. Urban Studies, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980231212298>

Reuse is restricted to non-commercial and no derivate uses.

Social ties in and out of the neighbourhood. Between compensation and cumulation

Journal:	<i>Urban Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	CUS-1175-21-12.R3
Manuscript Type:	Article
Discipline: Please select a keyword from the following list that best describes the discipline used in your paper.:	Sociology
World Region: Please select the region(s) that best reflect the focus of your paper. Names of individual countries, cities & economic groupings should appear in the title where appropriate.:	Europe
Major Topic: Please identify up to 5 topics that best identify the subject of your article.:	Neighbourhood, Diversity/Cohesion/Segregation, Community, Built Environment
You may add up to 2 further relevant keywords of your choosing below.:	social ties, neighbourhood effects

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Social ties in and out of the neighbourhood. Between compensation and cumulation

Abstract

The central question addressed in this article is how social ties within and outside the neighbourhood are articulated in different contexts for various population groups. Two major perspectives emerge from the literature on personal networks, neighbourhood effects, and neighbourhood-based social capital. The first assumes a compensation mechanism, whereby local and extra-local ties flourish at each other's expense. The second considers that these two types of ties can be cumulated. After presenting the interpretations and empirical data that support these two perspectives and highlighting the persistent ambiguity on the issue, they are tested with the support of an original survey of 2,572 people in 14 neighbourhoods in the Paris and Lyon metropolitan regions. A range of indicators for social ties is used to build two indices, one for local ties and one for extra-local ties. The article then examines variations between these indices as a function of individual characteristics and contexts to test whether compensation or cumulation exists between the local and extra-local ties. The main findings are, first, that local and extra-local ties each evolve along one dimension. In particular, working-class social ties do not appear to have a specific pattern. Second, compensation exists, but cumulation of local and extra-local ties is predominant. Lastly, this cumulation is a factor of inequalities. It benefits those with the most resources in terms of income, qualifications and occupation, as well as the residents of upper-class or gentrified neighbourhoods. Geographical origins also play a role for the descendants of immigrants, who establish fewer extra-local ties.

Keywords: Neighbourhood, Diversity/Cohesion/Segregation, Community, Built Environment, social ties, neighbourhood effects

In the second half of the 20th century, as urbanisation progressed and affordable means of transportation and communication became more widespread, scholars wondered if local social ties would disappear. While some argued that these ties had persisted, especially in working-class neighbourhoods (Gans 1962; Young and Willmott 1957), Wellman (1979; Wellman and Leighton 1979) suggested that the geography of social ties was being rebuilt and freed in part from proximity. Numerous works have since either confirmed (Guest and Wierzbicki 1999) or qualified (Guest 2000; Drouhot 2017) this thesis, but few have provided recent empirical data balancing local ties with extra-local ties. Furthermore, to our knowledge, this debate has yet to be nourished by French data.

This question is neither rhetorical nor outdated. In France, as in many Western countries, various parallel processes are altering the geography of social ties. These changes are raising questions about the role of neighbourhoods in social capital or social cohesion (Forrest and Kearns 2001; Hoogerbrugge and Burger 2018; Middleton, Murie, and Groves 2005), the links between mobility and sociability (Kowald et al. 2013), and the role of urban forms such as suburban sprawl (Putnam 2001; Nguyen 2010). For example, when the debate on gated communities emerged in the 1990s (Blakely and Snyder 1999), a significant portion of the literature emphasised a withdrawal of local sociability in golden enclaves and saw it as a threat to the glue that binds the different groups of society (Atkinson and Blandy 2006). Although this idea was later nuanced (Charmes 2012), it is still a widespread concern. At the other extreme of the social spectrum, immigrants, particularly in the French context, are often stigmatised for their spatial and social withdrawal. For instance, in the aftermath of the 2015 Paris attacks, then-Prime Minister Manuel Valls denounced the “social apartheid” of working-class immigrant neighbourhoods where some of the perpetrators grew up. Unlike in the United States, where the lack of social cohesion is regularly observed in disadvantaged neighbourhoods (Putnam 2006; Forrest and Kearns 2001), the greatest subject of concern in

France is the communitarianism of immigrants and their tendency to establish local ties at the expense of extra-local ties. However, to our knowledge, no study has documented the local and extra-local ties of immigrants in France and compared them with those of other social groups.

Moreover, public policies regularly target social ties within and outside the neighbourhood and the resources to which they provide access (Curley 2010). In particular, social mixing is often presented as a central public policy objective when developing a new neighbourhood or renovating a working-class neighbourhood (August 2014; Arbaci and Rae 2013; Wood 2003; Cayouette-Remblière 2020; Bacqué and Charmes 2024). Despite the importance of this issue, relatively few studies have compared different types of residential contexts and populations (Forrest and Kearns 2001, 2138; Guest 2000, 608; Marpsat 1999; Héran 1988, 18; Fischer 1982, 11).

This article reconsiders these debates from a French perspective, connecting them to contemporary issues. Its core question is how social ties within and outside the neighbourhood are articulated in different contexts for various population groups. The literature addresses this question as part of various frameworks: personal networks (Wellman 1979; Fischer 1982; Favre and Grossetti 2021; Grossetti 2007; Völker and Flap 2007), neighbourhood effects (Sampson 1988; Guest et al. 2006), neighbourhood-based social capital or local social cohesion (Guest and Wierzbicki 1999; Guest 2000; Forrest and Kearns 2001; Hoogerbrugge and Burger 2018). Two major perspectives emerge from this literature. The first assumes a compensation mechanism, whereby local and extra-local ties flourish at each other's expense. The second perspective considers that these two types of ties can be cumulated.

After presenting the interpretations and empirical data that support these two perspectives and highlighting the persistent ambiguity on the issue, we test them with the support of an original survey of 2,572 people in 14 neighbourhoods in the Paris and Lyon metropolitan regions. Based

on this survey, we used a range of indicators for social ties to build two indices, one for local ties and one for extra-local ties. We then examine variations between these indices as a function of individual characteristics and residential contexts to test whether compensation or cumulation exists between the local and extra-local ties.

Local and extra-local ties in the literature: compensation or cumulation?

As Campbell and Lee (1992, 1081) pointed out, the idea that neighbourhood ties compensate for limited support outside the neighbourhood is a common assumption, either implicitly or explicitly. Many scholars assume that a lack of extra-local ties promotes the development of local ties. This is the case in Hoogerbrugge and Burger's study on neighbourhood-based social capital, of which social ties are a key component. The authors admit that one of the limitations of their research is "that it does not elaborate on the mechanisms that explain why social contacts and social cohesion are more important for some subgroups in society than for others". Yet they "hypothesize that neighborhood-based social capital is related to neighborhood dependency and to whether people are more or less forced to invest in local contacts" (Hoogerbrugge and Burger 2018, 1500), implicitly suggesting interconnected vessels for people having few extra-local ties. When Guest and Wierzbicki (1999) explain why some groups continue to socialise in the neighbourhood whereas the majority turn away from the neighbourhood, they also implicitly consider that local ties flourish at the expense of extra-local ties. For instance, they suggest that if individuals with lower education levels develop more local ties, it may be because their personal choices are limited and they have less knowledge of the outside world. Similarly, the unemployed may invest more locally because they "lack social opportunities beyond those at the neighbourhood level" (Guest and Wierzbicki 1999, 97), while older people do so owing to problems of physical mobility and

energy. In contrast, childless individuals do not have the same interest as parents to invest in the neighbourhood, and “may opt to emphasize outside social opportunities” (p. 97) (for further examples, see McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001, 430; Henning and Lieberg 1996, 19; Suttles 1972, 266; van Kempen and Bolt 2009, 459).

Scholars point to two complementary mechanisms to explain such compensations. The first mechanism assumes that individuals have limited time available, and that “competing commitments” (Fischer 1982, 98) draw them away from one type of ties to another. “The structural circumstances that encourage people to build relations in one context sometimes impair their ability to build relations in another context”, writes Fischer (1982, 97). This idea has been echoed more recently by Knies (2013, 426), according to whom “interacting with others also takes away time from the individual that cannot be spent interacting with neighbours”. The second mechanism implies the concept of need and the opportunities a person may have to establish ties. As Wellman and Leighton (1979, 381–82) explains: “Network members have a finite lump of sociability, so that if they devote most of their energies to within-network ties, they do not have much scope for maintaining external linkages. Conversely, tight boundaries may also foster the creation of new ties within the community, as internal links become the individual’s principal hope of gaining access to resources”. While testing this idea, Völker and Flap (2007, 274) found that “network members residing outside of the direct local area do provide an alternative; the more friends one has outside the neighbourhood, the smaller the likelihood of also having neighbours in the network”.

It is noteworthy that two authors who point to compensation in the balance of local and extra-local ties also comment on empirical evidence that supports cumulation. Fischer (1982) observes that all types of ties, except kin ties, increase with educational attainment, and that while there may be “some trade-off [...] between near and far relations” in small towns, “in

big cities the two reinforce one another” (Fischer 1982, 171). Cumulation is also evident in the possibility of relying on different types of support (counselling, companionship, and practical). Writing that “respondents who lacked one kind of support tended also to lack another” (Fischer 1982, 127), Fischer goes on to challenge the argument of need: “Although one might think that income would also substitute for personal support, so that affluent people would name fewer helpers, affluent people in fact had more secure practical support than the poor” (p. 130). In addition, Guest and Wierzbicki (1999, 100-103) also mention, albeit only in passing, cumulation between local and extra-local expressive social ties.

Further research explicitly insists on the cumulation of ties. According to Guest (2000), Warren’s (1978) study was the first to empirically compare local and extra-local ties. Warren developed a typology of neighbourhoods based on the degree of social exchange between neighbours (local ties), the extent to which the local area is linked to the larger community (extra-local ties), and the extent of individual identification with the local area. If one disregards the latter aspect, this typology reveals more contexts where the levels of local and extra-local ties go hand in hand rather than one predominating (a situation concerning only one-fifth of the neighbourhoods, 21.4%). Guest (2000) found a .91 association between local and extra-local ties at the aggregate neighbourhood level using Warren’s data (1978). This led Guest (2000) to suggest a form of community which, echoing the work of Wellman and Leighton (1979), he calls the “mediate community”, that is with many endogenous ties but also links to the outside world.

This is consistent with findings regarding the factors that sustain local ties (Campbell and Lee 1992, see also Oropesa 1987). Campbell and Lee specifically tested the mechanisms of available time and of need, comparing them with an explanation in terms of social integration,

which is related to socio-economic status (SES). They concluded that, even if “need may be a flip side of the coin”, “social integration is the most appealing of the three” (1992, 1093–94).

The way in which local and extra-local ties interact therefore remains an open question (van Kempen and Wissink 2014, 103–4). This question also stands as an opportunity to shed new light on neighbourhood effects, as van Ham and Manley (2012) suggested when listing ten challenges for further research on neighbourhood effects. Several studies have already considered the role of contextual variables on neighbourhood ties. For example, Guest et al. (2006) demonstrated that these ties are strongly influenced by residential stability and the age of housing in the community. Völker et al. (2007) also concluded that the “amount of community” rises when a neighbourhood has more meeting places. However, to our knowledge, the balance between local and extra-local ties has seldom been examined through the lens of contextual or neighbourhood effects (one exception being Vandecasteele and Fasang 2021, who assess the chances of exiting unemployment based on the proportion of friends living within and outside the neighbourhood). Yet, as we will see, neighbourhood effects on the spatial distribution of ties are particularly important.

Data and methodological choices

In spring 2018, the *My neighbour, my neighbourhood* survey¹ (INED/CMW) was conducted in 14 neighbourhoods located in the Paris and Lyon metropolitan regions. In each region, seven local contexts, i.e. neighbourhoods, were selected (see Table 1) to reflect different relations to the city centre, social compositions, degrees of heterogeneity and histories, in order to shed

¹ In French, *Mon quartier, mes voisins* (MQMV). See website: <https://mon-quartier-mes-voisins.site.ined.fr/>

light on the effects of recent territorial changes. On average, the neighbourhoods included 1,220 dwellings. A housing census was conducted in each neighbourhood (Cayouette-Remblière, Santos, and Noûs, 2020) before sampling. This made it possible to collect data from a representative housing sample for each neighbourhood and simultaneously monitor the neighbourhood's social networks. The face-to-face questionnaires took an average of one hour to administer and provided information on activities and social ties within the neighbourhood, specific neighbourhood contacts, activities and social ties in other places, children's activities, residential trajectories, and socio-demographic characteristics.

Please Insert Table 1 here

From the outset, we would like to point out a peculiarity of our analytical strategy. Many studies consider the share of local and extra-local ties in networks as part of a zero-sum situation, implying that an increase in the proportion of local ties diminishes the proportion of extra-local ties (see Henning and Lieberg 1996; Völker, Flap, and Lindenberg 2007; Vandecasteele and Fasang 2021; A. Guest and Wierzbicki 1999 [variable LOCAL]). For example, in Völker et al., the demonstration of compensation is based primarily on the “relative network size within the neighbourhood” (2007, 105). This choice mechanically favours the observation of compensation mechanisms. When considering the potential for cumulation, an additional local tie should not be considered as a diminished orientation towards extra-local ties. In this respect, we agree with Oropesa, who considers that local and extra-local ties should be considered as “separate phenomena that are not necessarily intertwined” (Oropesa 1987, 91). This methodological choice involves classifying each tie into a single category and we operationalised the definition of local and extra-local ties based on the place of residence of the alter. Consequently, some of the ties considered as extra-local actually occur within one's neighbourhood and can therefore contribute to local community life (for example, when a

family member living in another city visits or when a person develops a relationship with a local shop owner residing outside the neighbourhood).

Local social ties (hereafter LSTs), as well as extra-local social ties (hereafter, ELSTs), were assessed through distinct synthetic indices, built on several indicators. Three sets of choices need to be explained in this regard. First, we chose to use as many indicators as possible, rather than limiting ourselves to one or a few variables, as this type of analysis (e.g. Guest and Wierzbicki 1999; Knies 2013; Tulin, Volker, and Lancee 2021; Hoogerbrugge and Burger 2018) tends to overlook informal ties and/or overemphasise certain forms of neighbouring. Second, like the survey on which it is based, our analysis relies on questions about practices rather than opinions or representations. Questions about practices have several advantages, being less subject to interviewer-interviewee interactions and more suitable for comparisons between populations and contexts (Bugeja-Bloch and Couto 2015). Practices can also be more easily situated within or outside the neighbourhood. A drawback of this approach is that it prevents us from considering the “sense of community” which, according to some studies, is not consistent with neighbourhood practices (Völker, Flap, and Lindenberg 2007; Hoogerbrugge and Burger 2018). Yet our objectivist approach does not prevent us – and this is our third point – from considering both social ties and the resources to which they provide access, these being specific components of social capital (for a similar approach, see Méndez et al. 2021). These components include interactions that often lead “to concrete social and economic benefit” (Chaskin and Joseph 2011, 210; see also Mata and Pendakur 2014, 332; Wellman 1979), ties that are presumed to provide access to resources otherwise difficult to access (Henning and Lieberg 1996; Granovetter 1973), and reported effective or potential resources. Our approach is thus relevant for questioning inequalities between groups and territories.

Regardless of their characteristics, be they strong or weak, physical or digital, or otherwise, we divided ties according to the alter's place of residence. All the ties with someone living in the neighbourhood were used to build the LST index (see Table 2 for a presentation of the variables). Importantly, when inquiring about the neighbourhood or next-door neighbours, questions were worded in order to circumvent the problem of defining who is a "neighbour" and to avoid excluding strong relationships (such as family and friends) that are not considered neighbourhood ties (for a discussion of these issues, see Knies, 2013: 441–442). Interviewees were also free to determine the spatial boundaries of their neighbourhood, except in rural municipalities where the questionnaire referred to municipal boundaries (as these municipalities include fewer than 900 houses).

Indicators for ELSTs were harder to find because they are defined only as the spatial "negative" of LSTs (Suttles 1972; Hunter 1979). Further, since the survey was focused on LSTs, it provides fewer relevant indicators for measuring ELSTs. For example, the survey does not provide information on the number of friends living outside the neighbourhood, in contrast to the number of friends in the neighbourhood included in the LST index. Nonetheless, the nine variables used to construct the ELST index encompass different types of social ties established in various locations beyond the neighbourhood (e.g. elsewhere in the city, in another region, or in another country), which provide various resources. The variables selected to create the ELST index are presented in Table 3.

Like Guest and Lee (1983) and Guest et al. (2006), we used multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) to construct the indices. MCA is a statistical technique that reveals the proximity and distance between responses to different questions and summarises the information in a limited number of axes. Considering its strong inertia (see below), the indices were built using the coordinates of individuals on the first axis of the MCA. From a relational perspective, it is

believed that the importance of social ties cannot be measured on its own, but in relation to other individuals. As such, we normalised the coordinates, setting the average at 0 and standard deviation at 100. By standardizing their distribution, this operation also enables a more accurate comparison of the indices, considering that the number of variables used to construct them is unbalanced. The various indicators contribute unequally to the axis and the indices (see Tables 2 and 3). Yet the robustness of the analysis lies in the fact that no single variable predominates. This is particularly true for the LST index, where sharing a friendly moment (such as a coffee, appetizer, or meal) with a neighbour is the main contributor but weighs only 6.2%. Seeing friends living in a different part of France or overseas at least once a year contributes 27.2% to the ELST index, but two other variables weigh more than 17%. Last but not least, our decision to use indices rather than a typology (like Méndez et al. (2021) in a recent study on neighbourhood cohesion in Santiago) was informed by an analysis whereby the two MCAs actually revealed a continuum of differentiation and no frontiers between groups, rather than an *a priori* decision.

We conducted two main analyses. First, we studied variations in LSTs and ELSTs as a function of individual characteristics. Second, we supplemented our comparison of gross indices by using two linear regression models: first, to identify the net effects of socio-demographic characteristics (Model 1); and second, to identify the effect of neighbourhoods when *individual social characteristics are controlled* (Model 2)².

² Another way to control for neighbourhood effects is to use multilevel models. These models provide information on the fixed effects of individual characteristics, independently of their neighbourhood, but they do not provide information on neighbourhood effects. As the results for the fixed effects of the individual characteristics are almost equivalent to Model 2 (appendix), we do not present them (models available from the authors).

Findings

The importance of neighbourhood ties in the 21st century

Scholars have argued that the neighbourhood still matters, especially as a place where one feels at home and safe (Forrest 2008), as a source of weak ties (Henning and Lieberg 1996) and regular face-to-face contact (Wellman 1996). Our results confirm that neighbouring is a social activity concerning “a sizable segment of the population” (Guest and Wierzbicki 1999, 109) and that the neighbourhood is a place for the exchange of services based on proximity (Wellman and Wortley 1990; Völker and Flap 2007), particularly for “dealing with everyday matters” (Wellman 1979). In the 14 neighbourhoods surveyed, 70% of residents visited at least one next-door neighbour’s home or invited at least one next-door neighbour to their home in the past year, while 55% did the same with at least one resident from their neighbourhood not living next-door. Over the past year, 77% gave or received help in their neighbourhood, while four out of ten residents talked about schools with other residents in their neighbourhood and 23% shared job opportunities in their neighbourhood. Only 6% have no ties in the neighbourhood at all.

At the same time, the data confirm that neighbourhood ties are often a secondary source of resources compared with other ties, such as those with friends or family, or compared with the role of institutions. For example, 63% of economically active individuals say they found their jobs on their own or with the help of an institution, such as an employment centre, but only 8% say that the residents in their neighbourhood played an important role³. Similarly, 65% of all residents say that they can count on a family member in the event of a financial problem, while

³ Note that this situation is four times more common in France than in Canada, where Ray and Preston (2009) observed that less than 2% of individuals said that the residents in their neighbourhood played an important role in their job inquiries.

only 22% say that they can rely on a resident in their neighbourhood. Furthermore, in this case, the resident is usually a family member or friend, not just a neighbour.

One dimension fits all?

While we expected to establish different patterns of ties (i.e. pragmatic versus friendly ties), our data reveal that all types of local and extra-local ties follow the same trend. This appears clearly in the MCA, which reveals a strongly dominant axis in both cases, explaining 95% of the inertia according to Benzécri's modified rate (Le Roux and Rouanet 2010) for LSTs and 82% for ELSTs, despite analysing 63 and 18 modalities, respectively. Statistically speaking, this indicates that one axis suffices to summarise 95% and 82% of the information included in the variables.

This result differs significantly from previous studies on LSTs, which identified two or three complementary dimensions, particularly between instrumental and expressive ties (Guest and Lee 1983; Guest 2000). We considered three factors to explain why this dimension does not appear in our data: first, it fails to identify these dimensions; second, a historical trend has favoured the uniformity of various forms of LSTs; and third, France is a specific case. The first factor has to be rejected, as 13 of the 28 indicators refer to instrumental ties as defined by Guest (exchange of services, participation in neighbourhood associations, etc.), 11 involve expressive ties, and 4 cannot be classified as either (such as having family or a colleague in the neighbourhood). All the necessary data were thus available to distinguish between these two patterns. Regarding the other two factors, it is difficult to draw a conclusion, but the fact that expressive and instrumental ties often go together has already been noted for old neighbourhoods in France (Grafmeyer 1995, 198).

Since this result was not expected, we conducted several robustness tests. They demonstrated that our indices are extremely stable and not highly sensitive to the selected variables. No other

significant pattern of social ties emerged, even when the choice of variables was modified (by excluding those potentially unfavourable to a specific social group, such as interacting with neighbours at one's home rather than in public spaces) or when the analysis was reduced or enhanced (by including the reasons for visits or services, such as distinguishing rationalised means-ends from worldly relationships).

In summary, the LST and ELST indices each evolve along one dimension based on the strength, frequency, characteristics, and diversity of all the ties involved and on the resources to which they provide access. Each of the two indices distinguishes individuals with a combination of weak and strong, utilitarian and friendly, physical and digital, and familial and non-familial social ties from individuals with fewer and less resourceful social ties.

Cumulating local and extra-local ties

Many factors impact LSTs and ELSTs in the same way, thus favouring cumulation (Figure 1). Socio-economic status (SES) is a key factor as it strongly determines LSTs and ELSTs alike. The ELST index is the highest for the most highly qualified, professionals and executives, and the wealthiest individuals. This aspect was also pointed out by Fischer (1982), Oropesa (1987), Henning and Lieberg (1996), and Drouhot (2017), though they rarely discuss the cumulative mechanisms.

Occupations and qualifications also have a strong impact on the gross and net LST index (see appendix). This finding is consistent with previous research on voluntary memberships in local associations (Oropesa 1987), strong and weak local ties (Campbell and Lee 1992; Henning and Lieberg 1996; Fischer 1982), and, more specifically, with the variation of neighbourhood ties

in France according to social class (Grafmeyer 2001, 114; Héran 1988; Favre and Grossetti 2021).

Moreover, SES has a stable impact on LSTs, regardless of the socio-spatial context. The variation in LSTs according to qualifications, incomes and occupations trends in the same way in each neighbourhood. Local atmosphere or norms have little effect on the weight of SES in LSTs. Therefore, even in working-class neighbourhoods, those with higher SES have the highest LST index. Many scholars have also noted that home ownership (Oropesa 1987; Fischer 1982; Mollenhorst 2015), as well as length of residence (Grafmeyer 2001; Fischer 1982; Kasarda and Janowitz 1974), support neighbourhood ties, especially instrumental ones, and contribute to class lines. It is noteworthy, then, that the net effect of SES remains significant in models where these variables are controlled.

Please insert Figure 1 here

Age is another factor to consider (Figure 2). Although Forrest (2008) identifies the elderly as a category for which the neighbourhood is still important, they form the second group with the fewest LSTs, after the youngest generations. ELSTs also decline considerably with age, as already observed by Campbell and Lee (1992). Consequently, individuals aged 75 or over cumulate weak levels of both local and extra-local ties.

Please insert Figure 2 here

The results also emphasise the need for caution when analysing the situation of immigrants and their descendants. Despite the French media and public debates regularly highlighting the supposed predominance of co-ethnic and local ties among their social networks (Pan Ké Shon and Verdugo 2015), the ties of immigrants depend more on their SES (primarily qualifications, income and occupation) than on their status as immigrants. As observed in other countries (Ray

and Preston 2009; Zelinsky and Lee 1998), in France, immigrants do not differ significantly from other people in regression models. This result holds whether or not their neighbourhood is considered. The only specific effect is related to the ELST index of the descendants of immigrants, a result that will be discussed in our concluding remarks.

Residential contexts are the last, but not the least, factor favouring cumulation. Model 2, which includes contexts as variables, has a significantly higher explanatory power than model 1, which only considers individual characteristics, ranging from 18.7% for LSTs and 19.6% for ELTs to 25.2% and 24.5%, respectively. While contexts have a greater net effect on LSTs, the two indices are once again influenced by the same cumulative logic (Figure 3). LST and ELST indices are the highest for residents of upper-class and gentrified neighbourhoods and the lowest for residents of working-class neighbourhoods.

Please insert Figure 3 here

It should also be noted that contextual effects and social positions have cumulative impacts. Comparing 161 block groups in the Seattle area using data from the 1990s, Guest et al. (2006, 375) found that “levels of social interaction are nearly identical across neighbourhoods, once we have controlled for individual-level characteristics.” However, in France in 2018, the advantage of upper-class and gentrified neighbourhoods, where high-SES individuals tend to cluster, further reinforces the already privileged position of these individuals. Furthermore, since there are no (more) specific patterns of ties associated to a working-class neighbourhood ambiance, a concentration of working-class individuals exacerbates the lack of LSTs for their residents. This is shown in Model 2, which demonstrates that the net effect of socio-occupational categories and qualifications is still present, even after factoring in contextual effects.

When compensation holds

Compensation applies, but only to a limited extent. Several cases of compensation in favour of LSTs are worth pointing out. Two socio-occupational categories stand out with respect to their LSTs: self-employed small-business owners and white-collar workers providing care and personal services (including childminders, cleaners, and hairdressers). These groups tend to develop significantly more ties within their neighbourhoods than other individuals with similar qualifications and incomes, but they still maintain their position in the social hierarchy in terms of ELSTs. By frequently working with the public in or near their neighbourhood, these two categories seem to specialise in establishing LSTs.

As noted by Moore (1990), women also tend to develop more ties in the local space. This trend is amplified in the two *grands ensembles* and in the planned social mix project in Paris, home to a high concentration of pre-school and school-age children. Although Forsé (1993) found that differences in sociability between women and men are largely attributed to women's lower participation rates in the labour market, the gaps between women and men persist even when economic inactivity is taken into account. In contrast, women tend to report fewer ELSTs than men, but this effect is five times smaller than the effect of socio-occupational category.

The pattern is much the same for single parents. Their social ties tend to be concentrated in their neighbourhood, where single parents (usually mothers) establish or have access to local support networks that are often crucial in caring for their children. At the same time, the family situation of these individuals makes it difficult for them to venture beyond their neighbourhood.

Compensation mechanisms can also favour ELSTs. This is particularly evident among young people, private-sector tenants, and "newcomers" (groups that partly overlap since private-sector tenants and young people tend to have lived in the neighbourhood for shorter periods of time than other residents). Those who perceive their residential status as temporary or have

recently moved to the area are typically less involved locally, and some of them also maintain ties in their previous places of residence (Vermeersch et al. 2018).

Regarding local contexts, two types depart from the cumulative logic mentioned earlier. Firstly, rural municipalities are associated with high LST and low ELST indices. While the high average length of residence can contribute to a high LST index and the concentration of white- and blue-collar workers can explain the low ELSTs, these factors only partially account for this observation (as shown in Model 2). Rurality may be a factor, since earlier studies have found higher levels of local sociability in rural areas (Fischer 1982; Héran 1988; Guest and Wierzbicki 1999). However, contrary to these studies, all other things being equal, the level of LSTs in rural municipalities is equivalent to that in inner-city upper-class and gentrified neighbourhoods. The difference is that all types of ties cumulate in the latter neighbourhoods but do not do so in the former.

Compensatory mechanisms are also present in the two planned social mix projects, but with a reverse relation. The contrast between LSTs and ELTs is very clear in the gross values. The low LST index of inhabitants of these projects, built between 2007 and 2013, can be attributed to their relative newness to the neighbourhood, though this aspect fails to account for the Quartier du Port suburb of Paris, where the LSTs of the inhabitants are still not significantly different from those of more disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Model 2. In short, the LSTs of the planned social mix projects are consistent with the finding that social mix may not encourage local relationships (van Kempen and Bolt 2009; Hipp and Perrin 2009; Kleit 2005) and appear to be partly offset by extra-local social ties.

Conclusion

We will conclude this article by stressing two main points. First, compensation exists, but cumulation is predominant. As such, there is no automatic substitution between LSTs and ELSTs. For example, although our study confirms that women have more LSTs and fewer ELSTs than men, it is difficult to conclude that the former are more significant because the latter are less so. Indeed, for other variables, the lack of ELSTs does not create LSTs. To assume a substitution, specific hypotheses would need to be formulated on compensation among women that do not apply to other variables, and it is difficult to see why women would have a specific relation to time available and need or opportunity mechanisms, which generally support the interpretation in terms of compensation. We thus believe that our study provides sufficient empirical evidence to encourage future research to approach LSTs and ELSTs as distinct phenomena, without assuming a set of communicating vessels *a priori*.

One important implication of this finding concerns the representation of immigrant and/or working-class neighbourhoods, at least the predominant one in France. The prevalence of cumulation challenges the idea that neighbourhoods with many ties are ones that confine (Lapeyronnie 2008; Wilson 1987; Wirth 1928). In fact, the wealthiest neighbourhoods have the highest LSTs, as well as a high level of ELSTs. Conversely, the lack of ELSTs in working-class neighbourhoods does not correspond to a significant level of LSTs.

The case of immigrant descendants provides an opportunity to examine and interpret the two distinct phenomena of LSTs and ELSTs. While immigrants themselves do not exhibit a specific pattern of ties, a type of spatial closure emerges in the case of their descendants, even though they tend to have higher qualifications and more skilled occupations than their parents. Immigrant descendants have fewer ELSTs than non-immigrants but their LSTs are not significantly different. One possible explanation for this is that immigrant descendants struggle

to develop ties outside their neighbourhood, particularly when they live in *grands ensembles*, as they are often stigmatised and subject to significant discrimination (Talpin et al. 2021). This could explain their lower ELST count but has no impact on their LSTs. Considering the two types of ties separately thus challenges the idea that immigrant descendants voluntarily confine themselves to their neighbourhood. As they do not have more LSTs than others, this cannot be the reason why they have fewer ELSTs. Furthermore, since they do not compensate with more LSTs, they suffer from narrower networks and fewer available resources.

Our second main point is that cumulation reveals inequalities. It benefits those with the most resources in terms of income, qualifications and occupation, as well as the residents of upper-class or gentrified neighbourhoods. These favourable social and geographical positions often concern the same individuals, thereby doubling their advantage. In contrast, working-class individuals and/or those living in working-class neighbourhoods appear to be disadvantaged across all types of social ties, be they deep, expressive, or solidary, and fail to compensate for their lack of ELSTs through ties within an “urban village”. This is a significant finding because such social and geographical inequalities may be concealed when assuming compensation. This type of assumption was consistent with findings from the 1950s to the 1980s, when working-class neighbourhoods reflected a specific pattern of sociability, in which working-class individuals “set the tone” (Chamboredon and Lemaire 1970; Young and Willmott 1957) and developed deep and strong ties (Campbell and Lee 1992; Guest and Lee 1983), while the well-off began to free their social ties from the constraint of distance (Drouhot 2017).

But this is no longer the case. Our data show that a single pattern for LSTs now prevails in France, articulating expressive and instrumental ties, and that the weight of SES follows the same logic in every context (and, as stated above, this result holds regardless of the composition of our indices). This finding echoes a recent research programme on the working classes in

France suggesting that they differ less and less from other social groups in terms of values, standards, and aspirations, while existing inequalities in everyday practices and access to goods have not diminished (Masclat et al. 2020).

The issue here quite clearly is inequality in the full sense of the term since ties are appreciated on the basis of shared rather than opposing norms such as working-class culture versus a legitimate culture. The working classes are not dominated because they relate to the world in a local way, but because they lack the resources to make the most of the spatial dispersion of everyday living places, unlike the upper classes. And, as this research reveals, this domination is determined not just socially but also spatially.

These questions call for further examination. First, our data are on practices rather than on feelings about the neighbourhood. Further analysis is required to articulate these two dimensions, especially in working-class neighbourhoods where a specific “sense of community” has been observed (Völker, Flap, and Lindenberg 2007; Hoogerbrugge and Burger 2018). Second, the scales of ELSTs should be more properly distinguished, especially between metropolitan, national and international levels. The uses and functions of different places also need to be considered. Last but not least, these findings should be consolidated with other surveys conducted in other types of neighbourhoods (beyond the influence of large metropolitan regions) and in other countries.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to the Voisinage Collective with whom the survey was conducted and the results discussed. We would also like to thank James Tovey and Christopher Leichtnam for the translation as well as the anonymous referees of *Urban Studies* for their constructive comments on previous versions of the paper.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The *My neighbour, my neighbourhood* survey received funding from *Union sociale de l'habitat* and social landlords, *Agence nationale à la cohésion des territoires*, the Research Institute of *Caisse des dépôts et consignations*, Lyon Metropolis, the City of Paris and the Ministry of Housing (*Plan Urbanisme Construction Architecture*) and was supported by the National Institute for Demographic Research (INED) and Max Weber Center (CNRS).

References

- Arbaci S and Rae I (2013) Mixed-Tenure Neighbourhoods in London: Policy Myth or Effective Device to Alleviate Deprivation? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37(2): 451–79.
- Atkinson R and Blandy S (eds) (2006) *Gated Communities: International Perspectives*. Abingdon and New York, NY: Routledge.
- August M (2014) Negotiating Social Mix in Toronto's First Public Housing Redevelopment: Power, Space and Social Control in Don Mount Court. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(4): 1160–80.
- Bacqué MH, and Charmes E (2024) The Myths of Social Mix. In Martinez MA *Research Handbook on Urban Sociology*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. Blakely E and Snyder MG (1999) *Fortress America: Gated Communities in the United States*. [New edition.] Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

- Bugeja-Bloch F and Couto M-P (2015) *Les Méthodes Quantitatives*. Paris: PUF.
- Campbell KE and Lee BA (1992) Sources of Personal Neighbor Networks: Social Integration, Need, or Time? *Social Forces* 70(4): 1077–1100.
- Cayouette-Remblière J (2020) Les rapports sociaux dans les quartiers de mixité sociale programmée. *Sociologie* 11(1): 1–22.
- Cayouette-Remblière J, Santos A and Noûs C (2020) Regards sociologiques sur la constitution des bases de sondage. *Genèses* 121(4): 121–41.
- Chamboredon J-C and Lemaire M (1970) Proximité spatiale et distance sociale. Les grands ensembles et leur peuplement. *Revue française de sociologie* 11(1): 3–33.
- Charmes E (2012) Gated Communities: Ghettos for the Rich? In: *Books & Ideas*, October. Available at: <https://booksandideas.net/Gated-Communities-Ghettos-for-the.html> (accessed 24 June 2023).
- Chaskin RJ and Joseph ML (2011) Social Interaction in Mixed-Income Developments: Relational Expectations and Emerging Reality. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 33(2): 209–37.
- Curley AM (2010) Relocating the Poor: Social Capital and Neighborhood Resources. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 32(1): 79–103.
- Drouhot LG (2017) Reconsidering “Community Liberated”: How Class and the National Context Shape Personal Support Networks. *Social Networks* 48 : 57–77.
- Favre G and Grossetti M (2021) Les réseaux personnels en France ont-ils changé? Une comparaison entre 2001 et 2017. *Revue française de sociologie* 62(2): 167–208.
- Fischer CS (1982) *To Dwell among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Forrest R (2008) Who Cares about Neighbourhoods? *International Social Science Journal* 59(191): 129–41.

- Forrest R and Kearns A (2001) Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies* 38(12): 2125-2143.
- Forsé M (1993) La fréquence des relations de sociabilité: typologie et évolution'. *L'Année Sociologique* 43: 189–212.
- Gans HJ (1962) *The Urban Villagers. Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Grafmeyer Y (1995) Sociabilités Urbaines. In Ascher F (ed) *Le Logement En Questions*. La Tour d'Aigues: L'Aube, p. 189-212.
- Grafmeyer Y (2001) Les Sociabilités Liées Au Logement. In Authier J-Y *Du Domicile à La Ville. Vivre En Quartier Ancien*, Paris: Anthropos.
- Granovetter MS (1973) The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6): 1360–80.
- Grossetti M (2007) Are French Networks Different? *Social Networks* 29(3): 391–404.
- Guest A (2000) The Mediate Community: The Nature of Local and Extralocal Ties within the Metropolis. *Urban Affairs Review* 35(5): 603–27.
- Guest A, Cover J, Matsueda R and Kubrin C (2006) Neighborhood Context and Neighboring Ties. *City & Community* 5(4): 363–85.
- Guest A and Lee BA (1983) The Social Organization of Local Areas. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 19(2): 217–40.
- Guest A and Wierzbicki S (1999) Social Ties at the Neighborhood Level: Two Decades of GSS Evidence. *Urban Affairs Review* 35(1): 92–111.
- Ham MV and Manley D (2012) Neighbourhood Effects Research at a Crossroads. Ten Challenges for Future Research Introduction. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 44(12): 2787–93.

- Henning C and Lieberg M (1996) Strong Ties or Weak Ties? Neighbourhood Networks in a New Perspective. *Scandinavian Housing and Planning Research* 13(1): 3–26.
- Héran F (1988) La sociabilité, une pratique culturelle. *Économie et Statistique* 216(1): 3–22.
- Hipp, JR and Perrin A (2009) The Simultaneous Effect of Social Distance and Physical Distance on the Formation of Neighborhood Ties. *City & Community* 8(1): 5–25.
- Hoogerbrugge M and Burger M (2018) Neighborhood-Based Social Capital and Life Satisfaction: The Case of Rotterdam, The Netherlands. *Urban Geography* 39(10): 1484–1509.
- Hunter A (1979) The Urban Neighborhood Its Analytical and Social Contexts. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 14(3): 267–88.
- Kasarda JD and Janowitz M (1974) Community Attachment in Mass Society. *American Sociological Review* 39(3): 328–39.
- Kempen RV and Bolt G (2009) Social Cohesion, Social Mix, and Urban Policies in the Netherlands'. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 24(4): 457–75.
- Kempen RV and Wissink B (2014) Between Places and Flows: Towards a New Agenda for Neighbourhood Research in an Age of Mobility. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography* 96(2): 95–108.
- Kleit RG (2005) HOPE VI New Communities: Neighborhood Relationships in Mixed-Income Housing. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 37(8): 1413–41.
- Knies G (2013) Neighbourhood Social Ties: How Much Do Residential, Physical and Virtual Mobility Matter? *The British Journal of Sociology* 64(3): 425–52.
- Kowald M, Berg PVD, Frei A, Carrasco JA, Arentze T, Axhausen K, Mok D, Timmermans H and Wellman B (2013) Distance Patterns of Personal Networks in Four Countries: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Transport Geography* 31(July): 236–48.

- Le Roux B and Rouanet H (2010) *Multiple Correspondence Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Marpsat M (1999) La modélisation des effets de quartier aux États-Unis: une revue des travaux récents. *Population* 54(2): 303–30.
- Masclet O, Amossé T, Bernard L, Cartier M, Lechien M-H, Schwartz O and Siblot Y (2020) *Être comme tout le monde - Employées et ouvriers dans la France contemporaine*. Paris: Raisons d'Agir.
- Mata F and Pendakur R (2014) Social Capital, Diversity and Giving or Receiving Help Among Neighbours. *Social Indicators Research* 118(1): 329–47.
- McPherson JM, Smith-Lovin L and Cook JM (2001) Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27(1): 415–44.
- Méndez ML, Otero G, Link F, Morales EL, and Gayo M (2021) Neighbourhood Cohesion as a Form of Privilege. *Urban Studies* 58(8): 1691–1711.
- Middleton A, Murie A and Groves R (2005) Social Capital and Neighbourhoods That Work. *Urban Studies* 42(10): 1711–38.
- Mollenhorst G (2015) Neighbour Relations in the Netherlands: New Developments. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 106(1): 110–19.
- Moore G (1990) Structural Determinants of Men's and Women's Personal Networks. *American Sociological Review* 55(5): 726–35.
- Nguyen D (2010) Evidence of the Impacts of Urban Sprawl on Social Capital. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 37(4): 610–27.
- Oropesa RS (1987) Local and Extra-Local Orientations in the Metropolis. *Sociological Forum* 2(1): 90–107.
- Pan Ké Shon JL and Verdugo G (2015) Forty Years of Immigrant Segregation in France, 1968-2007. How Different Is the New Immigration? *Urban Studies* 52(5): 823–40.


- Putnam R (2001) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. [New edition.] London: S & S International.
- Putnam R (2006) E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30(2): 137–74.
- Ray B and Preston V (2009) Are Immigrants Socially Isolated? An Assessment of Neighbors and Neighboring in Canadian Cities. *Journal of International Migration and Integration / Revue de l'integration et de La Migration Internationale* 10(3): 217–44.
- Sampson RJ (1988) Local Friendship Ties and Community Attachment in Mass Society: A Multilevel Systemic Model. *American Sociological Review* 53(5): 766–79.
- Suttles GD (1972) *The Social Construction of Communities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Talpin J, Balazard H, Carrel M, Belgacem SH, Kaya S, Purenne A and Roux G (2021) *L'épreuve de la discrimination: Enquête dans les quartiers populaires*. Paris: PUF.
- Tulin M, Volker B and Lancee B (2021) The Same Place but Different: How Neighborhood Context Differentially Affects Homogeneity in Networks of Different Social Groups. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 43(1): 57–76.
- Vandecasteele L and Fasang AE (2021) Neighbourhoods, Networks and Unemployment: The Role of Neighbourhood Disadvantage and Local Networks in Taking up Work. *Urban Studies* 58(4): 696–714.
- Vermeersch S, Launay L, Charmes E and Bacqué M-H (2018) *Quitter Paris? Les classes moyennes entre périphéries et centres*. Ivry-sur-Seine: Créaphis.
- Völker B and Flap H (2007) Sixteen Million Neighbors: A Multilevel Study of the Role of Neighbors in the Personal Networks of the Dutch. *Urban Affairs Review* 43(2): 256–84.

- Völker B, Flap H and Lindenberg S (2007) When Are Neighbourhoods Communities? Community in Dutch Neighbourhoods. *European Sociological Review* 23(1): 99–114.
- Warren DI (1978) Explorations in Neighborhood Differentiation. *The Sociological Quarterly* 19(2): 310–31.
- Wellman B (1979) The Community Question: The Intimate Networks of East Yorkers. *American Journal of Sociology* 84(5): 1201–31.
- Wellman B (1996) Are Personal Communities Local? A Dumptarian Reconsideration. *Social Networks* 18(4): 347–54.
- Wellman B and Leighton B (1979) Networks, Neighborhoods, and Communities: Approaches to the Study of the Community Question. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 14(3): 363–90.
- Wellman B and Wortley S (1990) Different Strokes from Different Folks: Community Ties and Social Support. *American Journal of Sociology* 96(3): 558–88.
- Wood M (2003) A Balancing Act? Tenure Diversification in Australia and the UK. *Urban Policy and Research* 21(1): 45–56.
- Young M and Willmott P (1957) *Family and Kinship in East London*. London: Routledge.
- Zelinsky W and Lee BA (1998) Heterolocalism: An Alternative Model of the Sociospatial Behaviour of Immigrant Ethnic Communities. *International Journal of Population Geography* 4(4): 281–98.

Figure 1 - From the neighbourhood to extra-local: cumulation or compensation?

		Social ties in the local space (LSTs)	
		High level	Low level
Extra-local social ties (ELSTs)	High level	Cumulation of social ties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High SES (qualification, incomes, professions) - 30-44 years old - Couples with children - Owners - Residents in upper class and gentrified neighbourhoods 	Prevalence of ELSTs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Men - Young people (18-29 years old) - Childless couples - Tenants (private sector) - Residents in planned social mix projects - “Newcomers”
	Low level	Prevalence of LSTs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Craftsmen, tradesmen and care employees - Women - Single-parent families - Residents having lived in the neighbourhood the longest 	Cumulation of lack of social ties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low SES (qualification, incomes, professions) - The elderly - Single people - Tenants (social housing) - Residents in suburban housing estates and small peri-urban town centres

Figure 2 – LST and ELST according to age




Source: *My neighbourhood, my neighbours* survey (INED/CMW, 2018).

Field: residents in 14 neighbourhoods.

The figure represents moving average of LST and ELST by age. Due to the presence of fewer than 20 individuals born in the same year and aged over 89, they have been grouped together.

Figure 3 – LST and ELST by residential contexts



Source: *My neighbourhood, my neighbours* survey (INED/CMW, 2018).

Field: residents in 14 neighbourhoods.

Lecture: The boxes represent the distribution of indices for the 2nd and 3rd quartiles. The mean line represents the median, and the vertical lines encompass the distribution from the 1st decile to the 9th decile.

Note that each residential context encompass two neighborhoods

Table 1 – The neighbourhoods in the survey

	Region	Name of neighborhood	City	Average living standard (euros/unit of consumption)	% social housing	% immigrants	Mean seniority in the neighborhood (years)	Average pop. density (inhab./km2) (5)
Inner city upper class	Paris	Auteuil	Paris, 16th arrondissement	3,346	0	13	18	29 054
	Lyon	Ainay	Lyon, 2nd arrondissement	2,856	9	11	15	18 148
Inner city gentrified	Paris	Batignolles	Paris, 17th arrondissement	2,986	11	14	15	51 618
	Lyon	Croix Rousse	Lyon, 4th arrondissement	1,959	3	5	14	25 701
Inner city working class	Paris	Riquet	Paris, 19th arrondissement)	1,771	70	34	20	62 756
	Lyon	Grange Rouge	Lyon, 8th arrondissement	1,230	56	37	15	21 896
Planned social mix project (1)	Paris	Quartier du Port	Choisy-le-Roi	1,974	51	35	6	12 546

	Lyon	Bon Lait	Lyon, 7th arrondissement	1,806	27	22	6	8 741
Suburban housing estates ("grands ensembles") under renovation (2)	Paris	Navigateurs	Choisy-le-Roi	1,242	81	51	15	20 600
	Lyon	Armstrong	Vénissieux	1,092	79	41	17	13 003
Peri-urban town center (3)	Paris	Montereau-fault-Yonne city centre	Montereau-fault-Yonne	1,539	5	19	7	8 251
	Lyon	La Tour-du-Pin city centre	La Tour-du-Pin	1,561	12	13	13	2 311
Rural municipality (4)	Paris	Marolles-sur-Seine	Marolles-sur-Seine	1,862	3	7	19	88
	Lyon	La Bâtie-Montgascon	La Bâtie-Montgascon	1,880	9	6	20	229

- (1) The two projects are new-build neighbourhoods with a social mix objective (Cayouette-Remblière, 2020)
- (2) Urban renovation is a public policy typically implemented in French working class neighbourhoods
- (3) The towns selected are among the most remote of the Lyon and Paris peri-urban rings. Their centres, home mainly to apartments and townhouses, are largely occupied by populations with modest incomes.
- (4) The two "villages" selected have fewer than 2,000 residents. They are close to the two peri-urban towns and most of the houses are detached.
- (5) Calculated on the basis of aggregated units for statistical information (IRIS). Source: Insee.

Source: *My neighbourhood, my neighbours* survey (INED/CMW, 2018)

Field: residents of 14 neighbourhoods.

Table 2 – Indicators of local social ties			
Variables	Yes	No	Contribution to the index (%) (7)
Ties with next-door neighbours (in the past year) (1) (contribution: 10.4%)			
Has been to a neighbour's or has invited a neighbour home	70	30	3.9
Has helped or received help	69	31	3.4
Has chatted with neighbour	90	10	3.1
Ties in the neighbourhood, beyond next-door (2) (in the past year) (contribution: 14.2%)			
Has been to a neighbour's or has invited a neighbour home	55	45	5.1
Has helped or received help	41	59	4.3
Has chatted with neighbour	77	23	4.8
Specifications of next-door and beyond next door ties (contribution: 40.9%)			
Has been to a neighbour's or has invited a neighbour home to share a cup of coffee, a meal or an appetizer	69	31	6.2
Has been to a neighbour's or has invited a neighbour home for a casual chat	73	27	5.7
Has been to a neighbour's or has invited a neighbour home to accompany children	22	78	2.4
Has helped or received help for one of these reasons: to keep keys, to receive a package, or to take care of animals/plants	42	58	4.3
Has helped or received help for one of these reasons: to borrow ingredients or objects, to help with home improvements, or to accompany or take care of children	56	44	4.9
Has helped or received help for one of these reasons: to help with administrative matters, to accompany them somewhere	32	68	3.4
Has talked about the neighbours, the neighbourhood, the city or the building	84	16	4.6
Has talked about private subjects (work, personal life, country of birth, children, etc.)	81	19	5.5
Has talked about politics or religion	48	52	3.9
Other ties in the neighbourhood (contribution: 19.2%)			
Has family in the neighbourhood	16	84	0.5
Has at least one colleague in the neighbourhood	7	93	0.2

Number of friends mentioned in the neighbourhood (6)	0	1	2	3	4	5.3
	42	30	13	9	5	
Number of social ties mentioned in the neighbourhood (6)	0	1	2	3	4	5.5
	14	17	20	14	24	
Member of the co-owners council, a tenants' association or an association that preserves the neighbourhood or organises activities	13		87			0.5
Communicates with neighborhood inhabitants using ICT	(3)	(4)	(5)			3.6
	35	33	43			
Refers to the people in their neighbourhood as people they see or talk to in a general question	42		58			3.6
Ressources from local social ties (contribution: 13.9%)						
Can count on a neighbourhood inhabitant in case of financial trouble	22		75			1.0
Has shared information about schools	40		60			3.4
Has shared information about job opportunities	23		77			1.9
Has shared information about home services	32		68			2.8
Has shared information about shops	36		64			4.7
Has found their job thanks to the help of a neighbourhood inhabitant	5		56			0.1

(1) Next-door refers to neighbours living in the same buildings or nearby houses.

(2) In peri-urban rural municipalities, the questions concern the municipality.

(3) At least once a week.

(4) Less than once a week.

(5) Never

(6) According to the research protocol, interviewees can report 4 social ties and be asked for each one if they consider them to be friends.

(7) The contribution to the index of a variable depends on the coordinates of its modalities on the first axis weighted by their frequency (mass).

Source: My neighbourhood, my neighbours survey (INED/CMW, 2018)

Field: residents of 14 neighbourhoods.

Table 3 – Indicators of extra-local social ties

Variables	Yes	No	Contribution to the index (2)
Types of ties (contribution: 70.3%)			
See family living in the metropolitan region (outside the city of residence, or the neighborhood if they live in inner Paris or Lyon) at least once a year	64	36	0
See family living in a different part of France or overseas at least once a year	74	26	17.2
See friends living in the metropolitan region (outside the city of residence, or the neighborhood if they live in inner Paris or Lyon) at least once a year	78	22	8.2
See friends living in a different part of France or overseas at least once a year	60	40	27.2
Mention important ties linked to other places (1)	66	34	17.7
Resources from extra-local social ties (contribution: 29.7%)			
Can count on a member of their family living outside their neighborhood in case of financial trouble	64	36	10.8
Can count on a friend living outside their neighborhood in case of financial trouble	76	24	12.9
Can count on a colleague living outside their neighbourhood in case of financial trouble	2	98	4.3
Has found their job thanks to a relationship outside their neighbourhood	21	40	1.6

(1) Mention ties in “another country than France” or “another place where they have lived”.

(2) The contribution to the index of a variable depends on the coordinates of its modalities on the first axis weighted by their frequency (mass).

Source: My neighbourhood, my neighbours survey (INED/CMW, 2018)

Field: residents of 14 neighbourhoods.

Table A1 – Linear regression models

Variables	LST		ELST	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Constant	-60.43****	-64.43****	-30.30****	-31.90****
GENDER				
Female	3.12*	3.01*	-4.33**	-4.19**
<i>Male</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
AGE				
18-29	13.92****	12.68***	27.47****	24.76****
30-44	16.77****	15.10****	29.23****	26.84****
45-59	12.52****	11.15***	22.02****	20.37****
60-74	5.75 (ns)	5.19 (ns)	13.12****	12.28****
75 and over	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
LIVING ARRANGEMENTS				
<i>Single</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Couple with children	15.69****	16.70****	-0.74 (ns)	-0.11 (ns)
Childless couple	1.40 (ns)	1.40 (ns)	-0.38 (ns)	-0.22 (ns)
Single parent	8.57**	10.77****	-3.57 (ns)	-2.36 (ns)
Other	7.17*	7.95****	3.81 (ns)	4.76 (ns)
LENGTH OF TIME LIVED IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD				
<i>Less than 2 years</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
2-4 years	13.41****	13.17****	1.80 (ns)	-2.03 (ns)
5-9 years	21.79****	21.78****	-6.15*	-6.99**
10-19 years	29.06****	27.73****	-6.19*	-7.90**
20 years or more	33.33****	31.04****	-10.17***	-12.55****
HOUSING TENURE				
<i>Tenant (social housing)</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Tenant (private sector)	6.05**	-3.21 (ns)	11.64****	9.24****
Owner occupier	12.05****	6.60**	8.15****	8.52****
OCCUPATION				
Manager and executive	15.24****	7.83**	22.03****	11.08***

Professional	18.82****	11.05***	28.97****	19.43****
Teaching, health and social services intermediate profession	19.38****	12.84***	16.14****	9.81**
Administrative and technical middle-management profession	13.07****	8.71**	12.37****	5.87*
Self-employed small business owner	21.9+2****	14.52****	9.49*	2.31 (ns)
Care white-collar worker	14.15****	10.91**	2.44 (ns)	-1.64 (ns)
Administrative and commercial white-collar worker	6.21 (ns)	4.29 (ns)	9.13**	5.43 (ns)
Public sector white-collar worker	7.60*	5.66 (ns)	5.15 (ns)	2.49 (ns)
<i>Blue-collar worker</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Economically inactive (excluding retired pensioners and students)	8.05*	7.39*	0.02 (ns)	-2.74 (ns)
Student	14.83***	9.33*	18.81****	11.65**
IMMIGRATION STATUS				
<i>Immigrant</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>	<i>Ref</i>
Born in France, at least one immigrant parent	0.92 (ns)	0.51 (ns)	-6.64**	-6.43**
Born in France, parents born in France	1.92 (ns)	-2.66 (ns)	-1.15 (ns)	1.47 (ns)
NEIGHBOURHOOD				
Paris inner city upper class		15.81***		11.27**
Lyon inner city upper class		32.53****		18.77****
Paris inner city gentrified		25.06****		22.23****
Lyon Inner city gentrified		39.18****		17.50****
Paris inner city working Class		16.78****		11.83***
Lyons inner city working class		1.36 (ns)		-3.03 (ns)
Paris planned social mix project		7.07 (ns)		17.83****
Lyon planned social mix project		15.04***		10.34*
Paris "grand ensemble"		9.98**		7.96*
<i>Lyon "grand ensemble"</i>		<i>Ref</i>		<i>Ref</i>
Paris peri-urban town		16.80****		7.71 (ns)
Lyon peri-urban town		8.46*		-10.85**
Paris rural municipality		25.40****		9.58*
Lyon rural municipality		17.11****		1.40 (ns)
R2	18.7%	25.2%	19.6%	24.5%

Source: My neighbourhood, my neighbours survey (INED/CMW, 2018).

Field: residents in 14 neighbourhoods.

Note for understanding the degree of significance: ****: significant to 1/10,000; ***: significant to 1/1,000; **: significant to 1/100; *: significant to 5/100; ns = not significant.