Neighbourhood identity
Available in other formats

This publication can be provided in other formats, such as large print, Braille and audio. Please contact: Communications, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, The Homestead, 40 Water End, York YO30 6WP. Tel: 01904 615905. Email: info@jrf.org.uk
Neighbourhood identity

Douglas Robertson, James Smyth and Ian McIntosh
The Joseph Rowntree Foundation has supported this project as part of its programme of research and innovative development projects, which it hopes will be of value to policymakers, practitioners and service users. The facts presented and views expressed in this report are, however, those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Foundation.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation, The Homestead, 40 Water End, York YO30 6WP
Website: www.jrf.org.uk

About the authors
Douglas S. Robertson heads the Department of Applied Social Science at the University of Stirling and lectures in housing policy.
James Smyth heads the Department of History at the University of Stirling and lectures in Scottish history.
Ian McIntosh heads the Sociology, Social Policy and Criminology section of the Department of Applied Social Science at the University of Stirling and lectures in sociology.

© Stirling University, 2008

First published 2008 by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation

All rights reserved. Reproduction of this report by photocopying or electronic means for non-commercial purposes is permitted. Otherwise, no part of this report may be reproduced, adapted, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

ISBN: 978 1 85935 000 0

A CIP catalogue record for this report is available from the British Library.

Prepared and printed by:
York Publishing Services Ltd
64 Halffield Road
Layerthorpe
York YO31 7ZQ
Tel: 01904 430033; Fax: 01904 430868; Website: www.yps-publishing.co.uk

Further copies of this report, or any other JRF publication, can be obtained from the JRF website (www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/).
# Contents

Acknowledgements 00  
Executive summary 00  
1 Identities, neighbourhood and community 00  
   Context for the study 00  
   Housing policy in Scotland 00  
   Methods: multidisciplinary, historical and comparative 00  
   Summary 00  
2 Development of the three neighbourhood identities in Stirling 00  
   Stirling: royal burgh to commuting city 00  
   Rock and river 00  
   Case study selection 00  
   Contemporary situation 00  
   Summary 00  
3 Space, belonging and identities 00  
   Identity, culture and social positioning 00  
   Culture of knowing ‘whaur you are fae’ 00  
   Community: differing understandings and experiences 00  
   Social networks 00  
   Fragility of community 00  
   Social memory: telling tales of place 00  
   Edges, boundaries and differentiated community 00  
   Summary 00  
4 Gender, class and religion 00  
   Women, family and children 00  
   Men and employment 00  
   Social class and social stigma 00  
   Religious identities 00  
   Summary 00  
5 Conclusions 00  
   Policy considerations 00  
Notes 00  
Bibliography 00  
Appendix 1: Neighbourhood identity family histories 00  
Appendix 2: Data zone selection and qualification 00
Acknowledgements

In undertaking this study we are indebted to a number of individuals and organisations. First, we would like to thank all those we interviewed for giving up their time and for being lucid, candid and insightful on the topics of community, neighbourhood, social and class identities. Although we have been able to use only a fraction of the material recorded, no doubt in the future other work and other researchers will gain a great deal from this unique data-set. We would also like to thank Stirling Council for helping in the archive, contemporary profiling and mapping work.

Thanks should also go to the Advisory Group, namely Andrew Barker, David Chalmers, Mike Harmer, Elma Lindsay, Craig McLaren, Alison Peden, Alison Ravetz and Keith Yates, for their ideas and enthusiasm. In particular we would like to thank Mike, who originally suggested looking at housing from an identity perspective and Elma for her encyclopaedic knowledge of the local Stirling scene.

Credit should also go to Sarah Pugh for her secretarial and organisational skills on this project, and to Dot Kirkam for the speed, accuracy and exceptional phonetic precision in her transcription work. Thanks also to Fay Oliver and Steven Thomson for undertaking the archive and contemporary data search work respectively.

Finally, we are deeply grateful to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation for supporting this study and to Katharine Knox, the project's Research Manager, for her commitment and hard work and, most of all, for her enthusiasm. Given we all took on senior administrative roles in our respective university departments, which impacted on our time, she not only helped us to work round this but also ensured the final report measured up to our respective ambitions.
Executive summary

This study explores the ways in which neighbourhood identity is formed over time and place, and considers the implications this may have for policies that seek to improve and enhance neighbourhoods and communities. Part of the motivation for the study was to explore why ‘regeneration policies’ often fail in their objectives and why the reputations of housing estates – ‘good’ and ‘bad’ – display a remarkable longevity and resilience to change. Hence the interest focused on how such reputations are established and understood by those within and outside of particular places, and what implications this has for the identities of neighbourhoods and the individuals who live in them. In so doing, the study concentrated on three neighbourhoods in the City of Stirling in central Scotland, namely, Raploch, Riverside and Randolph Road. Each was chosen for its distinct socio-economic profile and differing relative identity. To this end, the study also explored what it meant to individuals to ‘come fae’ (come from) each of these areas as a way of understanding issues of ‘belonging’ and ‘attachment’ to particular places.

A key finding to emerge from the study is that the identity of a neighbourhood is often established at a very early part of its history. Neighbourhood identities are underpinned by social class and social status, and these identities are very resilient to change. Consequently, the ambitions, both explicitly stated and implicitly understood, set in planning a new neighbourhood are critical, given the longevity and resilience of neighbourhood identities. This has important implications for the future of ‘mixed communities’ and for the planning and design of new housing developments.

Neighbourhood identity was found to be associated primarily with outmoded notions of social class based on outdated male employment patterns, best characterised by the mining identity that still adheres to Raploch. It is still this facet that fixes the dominant social identity of a neighbourhood, an identity that is currently inaccurate, given long-standing structural changes in the local labour markets.

In each of the three different neighbourhoods studied, family networks, friends and neighbours were given various degrees of importance in the construction and sustaining of community. While different people gave a differing emphasis to the importance of these three categories, they recognised generally that their presence helped to sustain a sense of community and their involvement as individuals in that community.
It seems that what was understood as ‘community’ was often rooted in this realm of the familiar but mundane and everyday interactions – chatting at the post office or hairdresser’s and conversations related to the school, the bowling club and suchlike. Community was constructed through this myriad of intangible and fleeting, routine and mundane interactions in various localised settings. These were often enough to give people a strong sense of community and a powerful sense of attachment and belonging. This sense of community was also found to be very fragile and could be lost or gained with very subtle shifts in how residents perceived any changes to their surroundings. For example, with the loss of the post office or local shops, the opportunity to engage in a range of social interactions is reduced because the opportunity for chance meetings is reduced.

The core roles played by women in both home and family are critical to sustaining community. Women, in pursuing family and child-rearing roles, contribute greatly to the communications traffic that creates a sense of community. Many of the respondents perceived a loss of such community networking with the increasing numbers of working women; not having women about undertaking domestic and family chores during the day diminished the feeling of community.

The role played by older people in relation to construction of community was also important, but for slightly different reasons. They often provided a degree of historic continuity for a neighbourhood. At the same time, because their social world was focused at the local scale, they very often in the past and now more so currently played a role similar to women with young children as a mainstay of community.

Housing was also found to be core in defining a neighbourhood’s social identity. Housing and its specific spatial locality is a reflection of status and now, with the growth of the private housing market, it is also important to the accumulation of personal wealth. Of particular interest to this study was how the advent of the Right to Buy effectively maintained, and then over time exaggerated, the social segregation between what had been constructed originally as two large council estates in Riverside and Raploch. Right to buy sales had significantly changed the profile of Riverside into an aspirant owner-occupied area, while in Raploch, where home ownership take-up was lower, the area had become more entrenched through housing allocations policies that reinforced its poorer image.

Although there was a marked difference in the denominations of residents in each area – Raploch having more Catholics and less Protestants than the other two neighbourhoods – religion did not emerge as a key marker of identity and difference as it once had done. That said, it was still present as an identifier of difference between Raploch and the other two areas.
The relative social positions of Raploch, Riverside and Randolph Road remained stable and underwent little change. This can be expressed through the language of wealth and social class. Thus Raploch has always had a label that identifies it as ‘poor’, or ‘working class’, Riverside as ‘respectable’ and now with the advent of the Right to Buy increasingly ‘middle class’, while Randolph Road was always ‘aspirational’ and very much ‘middle class’. This has important implications for the planning of future renewal projects, as well as for the creation and subsequent management of new ‘mixed’ housing developments.

However, it is important not to overemphasise continuities and the homogeneity of each area. There was also evidence of long-existing internal differentiation within each neighbourhood, in terms of often minute perceived differences between households, streets and occupational stratification. Each had its own internal dynamic and residents often had their own stories that explained changes within the areas. This was particularly evident in the case of Raploch and Riverside.

It was also evident that the external perception of a neighbourhood identity was stronger and more of a caricature than those held by people who lived there themselves. Residents perceived greater internal social diversity than the homogeneity portrayed by ‘outsiders’.

The increased use of the car emerged as one key factor explaining why such processes were taking place. It was seen not only to have a major impact on the loss of a past ‘street’ culture, but also to contribute to the increasing anonymity of community life. Cars had become the preferred means of transport and because of the distances people could now travel to shop, socialise or work had, in the opinion of most respondents, reduced and constrained everyday opportunities for social interaction within the local neighbourhood. The car was also seen to have taken away public space, thus denying the opportunity for children to play in the street, which had been common in all neighbourhoods in years gone by.

Finally, there is an apparent irony in all of this work – the most aspirational neighbourhood in this study was found to have no obvious community. Given current policy moves to try and engender greater community, this represents a significant challenge. As people get richer, they move into a more individualised or atomised setting – places where community is largely absent. The social networks and connections of these residents link to a much wider social world, not merely the local neighbourhood. Yet, despite all this, it appears that we still hanker after some notion of community and belonging.
Overall, the study illustrates the value of adopting a sociologically informed understanding of neighbourhood dynamics. For over a generation, the lack of this perspective has blunted a clear understanding of how distinct social identities can impact on the life experiences of those who reside within neighbourhoods. Crucially, such identities can act against the stated ambitions of area renewal projects, thus ensuring they bring about limited improvements. By introducing a historical approach into the study, we were able to gain a better sense of how such identities were originally created and subsequently maintained over time.
1 Identities, neighbourhood and community

Context for the study

The creation of place or neighbourhood identities is a complex and dynamic socio-cultural process. The identity of a locality represents the interplay of social and physical factors, which can be externally and internally defined – simultaneously imposed and self-generated. Such identities have a major bearing on how particular neighbourhoods are viewed as places to live and to stay. This study explores the construction, prevalence and change in the social identities that are ascribed to three different housing neighbourhoods located in the Scottish city of Stirling. It was commissioned by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation as part of a programme of work that seeks to better understand the forces that act to transform places, so that more effective policy and practice interventions can be developed. The study aims to improve our understanding of how neighbourhood identities are created, then established and finally sustained over long periods of time. It also notes the dynamic nature of some aspects of place identity. The work also offers a direct challenge to relying solely on ‘problem-focused’ policy research, given that it is rarely, if ever, properly embedded within a solid historical and sociological understanding of the communities that such physical and related social interventions seek to ameliorate or change.

This study is centrally concerned with the dynamic nature of social identity and how it is inextricably tied to housing neighbourhoods. In particular, it examines the often long-lasting stigma associated with slum housing districts and contrasts this with what have for long been perceived as ‘better’ neighbourhoods. The use of the term ‘better’ in this context has both physical and, crucially, social connotations. An understanding of this process provides an important input into many current housing policy debates about generating ‘mixed communities’, the civic governance of housing neighbourhoods, as well as the management and process of renewal and its associated ‘place marketing’ activities. Therefore the strength of social identities ascribed to different neighbourhoods and how the lens of class, gender and religion act to distort and reshape them is a central consideration of this work. Its prime objective is to significantly improve our understanding of social class, social exclusion, privilege, status and hierarchy, and how this impacts on specific housing neighbourhoods.
Questions of identity and belonging have long been core to the sociological agenda. Having a sense of knowing where you are from can be a key part of understanding your own identity and your relationship with others. Asserting that you are ‘from’ a particular nation, region, town or neighbourhood can be crucial to how you locate yourself both socially and culturally. It is an understanding of this sense of attachment to a particular place or ‘locality’, the intensity, the connotations and development of this attachment, often packaged as ‘community’, that is central to this study.

Cooke (1989, p. 3) describes a locality broadly as ‘a place where people live out their daily working and domestic lives’ and, more specifically, as a potential base from which ‘subjects can exercise their capacity for pro-activity by making effective individual and collective interventions within and beyond that base’ (Cooke, 1989, p. 12). In this, we have the basis of a sense of ‘belonging’ to a particular locality or space – understood variously as an area, neighbourhood, estate or scheme. This is rarely best conceptualised as a given or static identity, but rather one that is worked out over time and that resonates with varying degrees of intensity at different moments in the lives of individuals and groups. The ebb and flow of such identities is the core focus of much of this research.

It has long been acknowledged that different housing neighbourhoods acquire different social identities (Roberts, 1971; Harvey, 1973, 1992). Those who live in particular localities can also develop attachments to places, which can inform, to a greater or lesser extent, understandings of themselves, others and how they are viewed by others. Thus the development and maintenance of a particular social identity for a specific neighbourhood can be the result of a complex weaving of internal and external interactions and forces. There is no assumption on our part that ‘coming from’ a particular locality is the most important part of a person’s sense of self, or even the key to understanding any form of collective mobilisation. Rather, these are treated as issues for investigation. This study, however, is concerned with the dynamic nature of neighbourhood and individual social identity, how such socio-cultural identity changes and also how it can remain largely unaltered for generations (Jenkins, 1991; Harvey, 1996; Dean and Hastings, 2000; Ravetz, 2001). Social profiles can and do change, and this impacts on the perceived neighbourhood identity. It is also true that the same if not identical housing in two different neighbourhoods can have markedly different social status. Additionally, within such localities, there may be a perceived hierarchy of status (Roberts, 1971), of areas composed of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ residents, and of localities going through ‘good’ or ‘bad’ phases (Robertson, 2003).

The mix of identities that exist within neighbourhoods and contribute to its overall social identity have been examined within the celebrated community study canon
of British sociology (Young and Wilmott, 1957; Frankenberg, 1966; Bell and Newby, 1971; Coates and Silburn, 1980). To an extent, these studies built on the pioneering survey work undertaken by Rowntree and Booth, and the early settlement funded slum clearance studies, such as that carried out in the Ancoats district of Manchester in the 1930s (MUS, 1945). Community studies eventually received official sponsorship through the Community Development Project (CDP, 1974) and later via the Inner Area Studies of the 1970s (Llewelyn-Davies, Weeks, Forestier-Walker and Bor for the Department of the Environment, 1977), both of which considered the dynamics of change and decline within older ‘inner city’ neighbourhoods. This body of work sought to explain the reasons for the demise of these localities, largely within the context of de-industrialisation, and then suggest remedies to ensure they still had a role to play in housing certain communities. There was also a great interest in what was then termed the ‘twilight’ nature of these areas, in that they were major receiving areas for varied and different migrant groups, so producing ethnically mixed and varied communities (Rex and Moore, 1967). This was not a new phenomenon, given historic Irish, Italian and Polish migrations, but the difference was that the new migrants from the ex-colonies were visible.

Such community studies were eclipsed in the late 1970s by the move to ‘problem-focused’ policy research (Atkinson and Moon, 1994). The emphasis here was to link policy research to specific ‘management’ issues that affected run-down neighbourhoods, so that better policy responses could be developed. There was to be no real place for broad-based explanations for ‘inner-city’ malaise, which argued that class-based structural problems ensured such neighbourhood outcomes. This move to a more policy-orientated, problem-solving agenda was, in part, an official government reaction against this overtly class analysis of ‘inner-city’ problems presented by the CDP studies. With the change of government in 1979, community studies were also not considered vogue by Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative administration, which officially questioned the whole notion of ‘community’. This position was held throughout the 1980s and 1990s, but began to shift with the New Labour Government’s focus on neighbourhood renewal strategies. Consideration of ‘neighbourhood’ and ‘community’ has since re-entered the urban policy arena.

A useful example of the policy focus of the 1980s is provided by the Priority Estates Project (PEP), which endeavoured to isolate distinct management and physical design solutions to address the social and physical demise of a range of neighbourhoods that were either privately or publicly owned (Power, 1987). This policy shift also ensured that an overtly environmental determinist agenda was established, articulated best in the work of Coleman (1985). As a result, extensive physical restructuring and remodelling of many post-war council housing estates took place throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Such remodelling was also promoted as a
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means to design out a certain degree of criminal and anti-social behaviour that was prevalent within such estates.

In the event, this physical approach failed to provide a total solution. The extensive physical renewal works and associated management practice changes introduced to many neighbourhoods were still insufficient to provide, in the popular imagination, acceptable housing environments. Further, with a number of these neighbourhoods being subjected over a 30-year period to what appeared to be an almost continuous process of renewal, which brought about limited tangible impacts on the localities’ popularity, it was clear that other more obstinate factors that acted to reinforce a negative neighbourhood image were operating. Recent work tracking 20 unpopular estates in England over 25 years, some of which were part of the PEP, has revealed that, despite enormous physical progress over the years, the persistence of severe social problems and high rates of worklessness has meant only limited progress in transforming some of these areas (Tunstall and Coulter, 2006).

Arguably, the lack of a sociologically informed understanding of neighbourhood dynamics has, for over a generation, blunted a clear understanding of how distinct social identities act against the stated ambitions of area renewal projects, and thus impact on the life experiences of those who reside within such neighbourhoods. The perceived limitations of the policy-research, problem-solving approach has not surprisingly recently brought about a reassessment of the value of community studies (Ravetz, 2001; Mumford and Power, 2003). It is within this context that this work has been undertaken.

Housing policy in Scotland

The Scottish housing context is also worth outlining in some detail, given that the focus of this work is within a major Scottish town. Scotland has long pursued an overtly area-based housing renewal policy. The renewal of poor-quality pre-1919 tenement stock was undertaken under the Housing Action Area procedures laid out in the Housing (Scotland) Act 1974. This physical restructuring approach to renewal brought about two quite distinct approaches. One in the East of Scotland involved providing generous grants for renovating the property of home-owners and the other in the West of Scotland involved purchasing this stock and its subsequent renovation by community-based housing associations, established specifically for this purpose (Robertson, 1992). Both were considered examples of successful renewal, but for very different reasons. The private approach led to limited physical improvements, but within a developing private housing market whereby gentrification resulted and
this brought about marked social change. Previously, poor neighbourhoods became attractive if not vibrant areas for first-time buyers. The other approach, of transferring sub-tolerable housing to housing associations, produced high-quality renewal for the original residents, who were retained throughout the process. Subsequently, the associations’ allocation policies have ensured these areas have remained poor and over time have become even poorer (see Robertson and Bailey, 1996).

This latter approach of stock transfer from councils to housing associations was rolled out to the vast public sector estates built to house families in the immediate post-war period under the ‘New Life for Urban Scotland’ policy initiative (Scottish Office, 1988). Again an overtly area basis for physical renewal was pursued, this time in four peripheral housing estates in Paisley, Glasgow, Dundee and Edinburgh. In addition to extensive physical restructuring, the intention was to diversify tenure through housing association ownership, which brought in new management practices and a few small-scale private housing initiatives. There was also a drive to introduce ‘social economy’ programmes, many of which had been pursued for a number of years in other ‘deprived’ areas under the auspices of the then Urban Aid programme.

This initiative in turn spawned in the late 1990s yet another area-based and physically dominated approach, namely partnership areas. These sought to widen the contribution to neighbourhood renewal from a wide range of public agencies, from the health board and the police, local enterprise company, the local community and local businesses, while the local authorities took on the co-ordination and planning role. It was central government funding, and housing monies in particular, that dominated the programme spend. Consequently, it was the Government’s housing agency, Scottish Homes, and its successor, Communities Scotland, that in reality controlled the programme. With the return of a Labour Government in 1997, local authorities were told to ensure partnership areas were tied into the new community planning framework. Funding such areas was still very much controlled by the Scottish Office and, after the advent of devolved government in 1999, the Scottish Executive. There was a further metamorphosis of partnership areas into social inclusion partnerships, which sought to more closely tie together housing renewal with what was now termed ‘wider action’ work within the evolving local authority community planning system.

Overall, all these housing renewal policy initiatives have had a strong area focus and a desire to ensure some involvement of the local community in the planning of future redevelopment of the neighbourhood. But this is not the same as ensuring some understanding of the community that is being renewed. While in the past social surveys were core to undertaking such work, these have almost fallen by the wayside. Community identity and its dynamics are no longer core to informing
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the renewal policy that brings about in its wake substantial physical, ownership and management changes. Renewal policy both in Scotland and in England and Wales is still very much a ‘top-down’ policy approach, which continues to follow limited physical and managerial agendas.

Another key aspect of Scotland's approach to renewal is that it has always been focused on localities that are, or have become over time, highly stigmatised. Renewal policy is evidence of a social as well as a physical deterioration, but there has been no concerted attempt to properly understand the dynamics of social change, rather a preference to focus on physical and managerial failings and their impact on the built form. There is therefore a need to re-examine and reassess the role community studies could and should play in helping us better understand the social dynamics that exist within all communities.

This is not to imply that the original 'community studies' approach did not have its shortcomings. The focus was almost exclusively on deprived neighbourhoods, with a dearth of work on more prosperous localities. Consequently, it is rare to find a comparative dimension to much of this work – that is, contrasting different types of neighbourhoods within the same town or city. This means that our understanding of community and social identity and its dynamics across different social class contexts is still rather narrow.

Another criticism is that these original community studies were very much fixed at one particular point in time and that there was little historical work undertaken in this context (Bailey and Robertson, 1997). This effectively ensured that a historically informed understanding of the dynamics of the social identities present within a neighbourhood was generally absent.

It was also the case that the social identity of neighbourhoods within Scotland has rarely been examined in any great detail, the exceptions being rural Westerrigg (Littlejohn, 1963), small town 'Cauldmoss' (Wight, 1993) and urban Glasgow and Edinburgh (Damer, 1989; Docherty et al., 2001). Community studies were by and large focused on deprived neighbourhoods within large cities, with some studies focused on rural England.

Developing a better understanding of this complex socio-cultural phenomenon is not just a means to better understand why renewal projects fail to have as marked an impact as first planned. It also has a wider currency in providing an important input into many current debates about ‘place marketing’, the civic governance of housing, as well as the ongoing management and renewal of housing in general. It should also be borne in mind that popular attitudes towards public and private ownership of
housing have changed dramatically over time. When many of the original community studies were carried out, owner-occupation was still out of the financial reach of most residents in the neighbourhoods studied, with public, and to a lesser degree private, renting the norm. Since this may no longer be the case, have the dramatic changes in tenure norms acted to transform attitudes about particular neighbourhoods? While neighbourhood perceptions are, if anything, more critical to the dynamics of local areas given their housing market connotations, this adds a further impetus to properly understand the localised nature of social identity.

Overall, while we acknowledge there is a solid community studies heritage, we believe a proper understanding of the socio-cultural dynamics of particular localities has been somewhat lost and needs to be resurrected. However, in order to resurrect this heritage, we do not solely wish to copy it, but rather build on it by adding a multidisciplinary, comparative and historical approach that addresses the shortcomings of previous ‘community’ studies noted above.

**Methods: multidisciplinary, historical and comparative**

So, to improve on the limitations of the previous community studies canon and to get a clear understanding of how social identity is both constructed and sustained over time, we pursued a distinct methodological approach here. This study was conceived as both interdisciplinary and comparative, blending historical and sociological research methods within a longer time-frame. Methodologically, the study adopts the often called for, but only occasionally practised, interdisciplinary approach through combining the academic disciplines of sociology and history with a distinct housing policy focus. The work also demanded a long trajectory, looking at how neighbourhoods have developed over the last 80 years. The comparative dimension is provided by examining and comparing three separate neighbourhoods within one Scottish town.

The selection of three differing ‘types’ of neighbourhoods allows for the investigation of the socio-cultural identity differences between middle- and working-class areas, as well as any divisions within the working classes themselves. The selection of neighbourhoods also allowed for the examination of the original aspirations set for what were designed to be ‘planned communities’, both utopian and utilitarian, and for the exploration of any continuities and changes. Such changes in socio-cultural identities within each neighbourhood are thus examined over the 80-year trajectory.
In order to utilise each of these dimensions, we devised a series of distinct, though complementary, research strategies. While a general historic overview of the whole period was provided through detailed archival and contemporary research work, this material was then matched and blended with qualitative material generated through a series of detailed interviews carried out with selected individuals in each of the three neighbourhoods. In all, 31 people were interviewed across the neighbourhoods and their life and work histories were examined in some detail.

The approach attempted to blend the history with the contemporary material gleaned through the selected narratives. The interviewees were chosen by selecting individuals from the 1961 Valuation Roll and then trying to find them either within that neighbourhood or in others within or outwith Stirling. Clearly, given this approach, which seeks to make the history contemporary, the views of younger people, the under-50 generation, were less prominent. To compensate, additional interviewees were generated, often from the same families, to bring in the younger voice. The core purpose of the interviews was to gain a better understanding of how individuals understood their identity in relation to the place in which they resided. They also explored personal notions of what constituted community, as well as who were considered ‘insiders’ and who were considered ‘outsiders’ in relation to that community. Given the length of time that many of the respondents had resided in their respective community, the interview schedule also sought to draw out their personal social histories.

This was then supplemented by interviews with seven key actors, individuals who, although not resident within these neighbourhoods, had a professional interest whether they were a local government official, policeman, local shop owner, estate agent, solicitor, journalist, local politician or local religious leader. By including their views on the social construction of these specific neighbourhoods and exploring the social identity they ascribe to them, we are able to add the ‘outsiders’ perspective on social identity, albeit interested ‘outsiders’, to complement and contrast that of the ‘insiders’.

**Summary**

In summary, this study seeks to get behind our understanding of how place identity is formed over time and to consider the implications of this for policies that seek to improve and enhance places. Within this context the following research questions were explored.
First, what is the historic context for the development of the three neighbourhoods, which might inform their identity, and what are the characteristics of the current housing and residents in each case? (See Chapter 2.)

Second, what role does an individual's area of residence, their particular neighbourhood, play in informing their sense of identity? How important are family, friends and neighbours in creating a sense of both individual identity and community or place identity? Alongside this, what role is played by the home, the nature of the housing stock and the local facilities to be found there? (See Chapter 3.)

Third, through examining these three different neighbourhoods, what differences are there in the sense of place identity in each of the areas examined? What is the contribution of gender to this and how is place identity affected by both class and religion? What are the differences in the perceptions about neighbourhood identity between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ of the three localities? (See Chapter 4.)

And, finally, what are the implications of this research for policy on housing and neighbourhoods and area regeneration? (See Chapter 5.)

By examining three linked but related communities within one urban locality over an 80-year time-frame using these specified interdisciplinary methods that break new methodological ground, we have been able to greatly enhance our understanding of the development of contemporary socio-cultural identities through exploring individual notions of belonging, place and locality. While the empirical work for this study relates to a distinct Scottish urban setting, the results and lessons detailed over the next four chapters have a far wider currency.

What this study reveals is how the social identity of neighbourhoods can and does change over time, yet, at the same time, the relative social positioning of neighbourhoods one to another does not alter, and this despite many physically focused interventions that have sought to do just that. That said, the basic understanding of ‘community’, the core element that underpins these differing neighbourhood identities, has undergone similar changes in all three locations, as the following chapters explore.
2 Development of the three neighbourhood identities in Stirling

Drawing on the extensive archive work, this chapter initially sets down the historical context of Stirling’s development. This details how Stirling has always been, and continues to be, a settlement that displays marked contrasts between wealth and poverty. One of Scotland’s richest neighbourhoods, King’s Park, located to the south of the castle, contrasts sharply with Raploch, on the north side, which still remains one of the country’s very poorest. Having set down Stirling’s developmental history, we discuss the physical importance of the ‘rock and the river’, as these hard-edge physical boundaries are very significant in determining the spatial extent of the three case study neighbourhoods selected for this study. The process of case study selection is then detailed, before the individual development histories of each neighbourhood are discussed. As will be shown in later chapters, this local history is critical to the current shaping of the social identities of these neighbourhoods, in that the past continues to inform and shape the contemporary.

Stirling: royal burgh to commuting city

A long-standing royal burgh, and officially designated a city in 2000, Stirling is dominated by an impressive castle that perches on a sharp precipice, the remains of an ancient volcano. This ‘crag and tail’ geological feature, the result of glacial activity during the last ice age, mimics the physical appearance of Edinburgh Castle. As with Edinburgh, the original town of Stirling was located around and immediately below the castle, ‘on the slope of the Castle Rock’; the side with the gradual slope allowed for the construction of houses within a protective town wall. Stirling Castle, therefore, helped shape both the physical and social structure of Stirling.

The official founding of the burgh is usually identified as 18 August 1226, when Alexander II granted Stirling its royal charter. Its significance, however, was established in the previous century, when it was already a significant town, given that the Scottish monarchs stayed there regularly.1 With the King’s Park, where royalty hunted deer, lying immediately below the castle, the River Forth with its salmon, as well as the forests of the Trossachs and Highland Perthshire close at hand, it is not difficult to appreciate Stirling’s attractions to royalty.

Since the kings of Scotland did not have a single permanent residence, but moved around their kingdom, the capital was wherever the monarch happened to be at
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that time. The monarch promoted royal castles and royal burghs and, in turn, they benefited from the king's presence and court patronage. Craftsmen and merchants were encouraged to congregate around Stirling Castle to serve the needs of the royal household and they thus developed a lucrative trade in luxury goods. The fact that Stirling had a navigable river, the Forth, intertidal up to the town itself, was also crucial to its development as a trading centre. Many, such as the seventeenth-century merchant John Cowane, the burgh's major benefactor, grew enormously rich on the trade monopolies created by Stirling's position as a royal burgh. As well as the advantages that accrued from royal patronage, the town benefited greatly from its military and in time garrison status.

Stirling did not participate in the fashion for urban development in the eighteenth century. The absence of the royal court, as a result of Jamie the Sixth heading off to London to become James I, hit Stirling's luxury goods trade hard, given that the aristocratic families quickly followed the Stuarts and deserted the town. The Forth also proved unsuitable for larger ships, given the river's many twists and turns and the constant need for dredging because of silting. As a result, the port went into decline. Finally, after the 1745 rebellion, the castle lost much of its significance as a military garrison. So, while Glasgow began to forge ahead in the later eighteenth century as an industrial centre, and Edinburgh remained the administrative and legal centre for Scotland, Stirling burgh stagnated, a town concentrated around its castle, with the population only growing from 3,951 in 1755 to 5,271 in 1801.

Stirling started to make up for lost time in the nineteenth century and there was a strong Glasgow connection with the town's development. Its growth in the 1800s included some industrial expansion, but was based largely on its traditional role as market town for what was a highly productive and increasingly wealthy farming hinterland. Industrial activity was based around the rapid development of the surrounding coalfields as well as weaving, but both activities took place outwith the confines of the burgh. What was more significant to the town was the marked growth in both local and national administration during the later Victorian period and during the twentieth century, as well as the revived significance of the military garrison during Empire. The coming of the railway in the 1840s strengthened Stirling's commercial activity, as well as promoting its position as a residential town that was popular with businessmen who were happy to live in a historic town and commute to their Glasgow offices by train, as well as with well-heeled retirees. Stirling's railway connection was initially with Glasgow, with the Edinburgh link not appearing for many years. With that link and the subsequent road developments in the twentieth century, combined with the move from manufacturing to service employment, Stirling's role as a commuting town for Glasgow and eventually Edinburgh became further reinforced. The description of Stirling in the *Third Statistical Account*, written in 1961, was that,
like Edinburgh, the town was ‘classical rather than romantic [and] has also been largely a middle-class community’ (Rennie, 1966). But that was never the whole story.

Stirling’s population in 1997 stood at 29,119, the largest settlement within the Stirling Council area with a population of 83,580 (Stirling Council, 1999). Although Stirling Council was the sixth smallest council in Scotland in population terms, it is one of the fastest growing, with a steady increase in population (Stirling Council, 1999). In the ten years from 1988 the population increased by 3 per cent, with the bulk of this growth occurring from 1993 onwards.

This pattern of growth continues, with the council now actively seeking to increase the population of the entire council area by 11,000 people in 15 years. That said, an earlier target of 20,000 has had to be revised down, amid concerns that the council could not find developable land to house such a large number and that one success of attracting retiring households could actually create more problems for the council in terms of increasing costs for care of older people. Household projections from 1996 to 2010 forecast a growth by 33 per cent in one-person households, 21 per cent for two-adult households and 41 per cent for one adult and children. Two adult and children households are expected to decline by 18 per cent. Overall, household size is projected to reduce in the Stirling Council area by 8.5 per cent to 2.26 people by 2010, with Stirling itself still retaining a higher size than the national average.

This recent population growth is founded on a relatively strong and sustained local economic performance. The Stirling local economy is dominated by three large employers – the public sector, retailing and tourism. In relation to the public sector, the three largest employers are Stirling Council, the university and the local health board. Although all these employers are labour intensive, and thus generate many jobs, both productivity and earnings are below that of other industries (Stirling Council, 1999). These three employers are also far more dominant in the Stirling economy than in Scotland as a whole.

In relation to retailing, Stirling was for a long time a prosperous market town, but has undergone major shifts in the last decade. The agricultural market has now all but gone, with the centralising of markets throughout the country. Kildean, which lies just beyond Raploch, is about to close and will be redeveloped for housing. More recently, alarm bells have been sounded because Stirling is no longer in the top ten for retail centres for Scotland, finding itself losing out to other towns such as Perth and nearby Falkirk, and cities such as Inverness. In terms of retailing, the development of the Thistle Centre in the 1960s was revolutionary, although it decimated the historic centre of the town. It was further expanded in the 1990s with the Marches development, but, despite this, it is Falkirk that has grown and taken over as the retailing centre of central Scotland.
There have also been problems in relation to health board employment. The recent decision to relocate the Stirling Royal Infirmary to a new location, just on the outskirts of Falkirk, means that another element of the area’s economy is undergoing change. Although some services will be retained at Stirling, the hospital will be downgraded, and a sizeable part of its land area will again be redeveloped for housing.

Stirling had gained a reputation as being a commuting town, but this too has changed over the last few years. While commuters still exist, it is the nearby town of Falkirk that is proving more popular in attracting them to live there. Stirling house prices are proving prohibitively expensive and Falkirk, now effectively de-industrialised, has been better placed to develop new housing close to the stations and roads that allow quicker commuting to both Edinburgh and Glasgow, the two key drivers of the Scottish economy. The nearby local authority of Clackmannan is also attracting Stirling residents to live there and then commute into Stirling, again for development and house price reasons. There has been substantial growth right along the Hillfoot villages, which have also seen their old industrial past, in this case weaving and textiles, disappear.

So, at this point in time, Stirling finds itself at something of an economic crossroads.

Overall, productivity, given the nature of the employment base, is low and there are fewer value-added activities taking place in the local economy, despite a rash of out-of-town and in-town business parks (Stirling Council, 2004). There is therefore concern expressed by the council and the local enterprise company that, although the growth recorded in the last ten years will continue apace, resulting in output, employment and incomes rising more rapidly, the productivity and incomes gap between Stirling and the rest of Scotland will continue to widen (Stirling Council, 1999). The big question for Stirling is, as Scotland moves more towards creating a metropolitan region linking Edinburgh and Glasgow, what exactly will Stirling’s place be in that arrangement?

Further, while Stirling’s economy has been good at creating employment, not all communities have been able to share in that good fortune. Unemployment in August 1998 in the Stirling travel to work area (TTWA) was 4.7 per cent, amounting to just under 2,000 people, though below the Scottish average of 5.8 per cent. Long-term unemployment was 1.0 per cent of the economically active population, compared to the Scottish figure of 1.3 per cent (Department of Employment, 1998). Three-quarters of this group were men, although males represent just under half the workforce. Unemployment has been concentrated particularly in one Stirling community, Raploch, which had an unemployment rate of 16.3 per cent, three-and-a-half times higher than the Stirling average, with male unemployment standing at 27 per cent (Stirling Council, 1999). So Raploch, in large part, accounted for Stirling’s unemployed.
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Rock and river

As noted above, the ‘old town’ of Stirling, its medieval core, declined sharply during the latter half of the nineteenth century. This was in part encouraged by the ‘new town’ development of King’s Park, focused to the south and west of the castle. This residential suburb was based largely on an 1848 plan prepared by the renowned Edinburgh architect David Dick. As the middle classes departed the streets and vennels\(^2\) huddled around the castle to join the Glasgow commuters and retirees, so the tenements they vacated fell further into disrepair, producing the slum housing that became Stirling’s major social problem throughout the early years of the twentieth century. Just prior to the outbreak of World War I, this issue could no longer be ignored. By 1918, however, the local improvement plan for the ‘tap o’ toun’ (top of the town) was overtaken by the national momentum to create ‘homes for heroes’. Over the following decades, it was council housing that provided the vast majority of new homes in Stirling. The bulk of these were located to the north and east of the castle, away from the elegant Victorian streets of King’s Park.

As well as the castle and the rock on which it sits, the River Forth is the great natural force that determines the physical geography and in turn influences the social layout of the town. The river bends and turns as it meanders through the flood plain in which Stirling is located, creating a series of distinct areas, ‘each with its own local consciousness and community life’ (Rennie, 1966). Although this comment was made in the 1960s, it still retains much validity today; boundaries, physical and social, once established exhibit a remarkable tenacity, as this study reveals.

Case study selection

In selecting the three areas for this study, we deemed it important to have communities that were long established as well as quite distinct and separate from one another in order to examine how place identities had evolved over time. Neighbourhoods that had a distinct local identity recognisable within a Stirling context were sought. For this criterion to be achieved, the communities needed to be relatively long established. A decision was also taken to seek out planned or utopian settlements in which those designing the community were likely to have set down their ambitions for the development – to consider the importance of those early decisions in shaping subsequent place identity. This meant that the selected neighbourhoods had to be early twentieth century.
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Given the overwhelming importance of council housing in Scotland for most of the twentieth century, we then decided that two of the three selected neighbourhoods should be council estates, while one should be a private housing area. In order to meet the requirement for a long-established community, and ones that pursued utopian planning principles, council estates constructed in the inter-war years were sought. Two types of council estate were selected, one that was built for the ‘deserving’ working classes and another that was provided, somewhat more grudgingly, for ‘slum dwellers’. Given this different developmental history, it was felt that each of these two types of council estate would have a long-established and distinct social identity. This would allow the study the opportunity to discover just exactly what these identities were and to see whether they had been sustained over time. The study then needed to contrast these council house localities with an equivalent private housing estate. Again this would be a planned community. In this task the potential choices were quite limited, given the paucity of private housebuilding in the inter-war period. Only one area, which is now adjacent to the Stirling Royal Infirmary, met the requirements, as this proved to be the only really large-scale private housing development that had occurred in Stirling over the entire inter-war period.

The final selections were as follows (see Map 1).

- **Riverside**: where the first council houses, and generally considered the best, were built for clerical, lower-middle-class and skilled artisans. Riverside was built adjacent to a mixed Victorian development of terraces, tenements and four-in-a-block ‘cottage flats’.

- **Raploch**: where smaller and markedly poorer quality council houses were built, largely as part of a major slum clearance programme to replace the decaying medieval tenements of the ‘tap o’ toun’. This development replaced the earlier planned village of Raploch.

- **Randolph Road**: an area close to the newly constructed Stirling Royal Infirmary, where suburban bungalows and semi-detached villas were constructed in the later 1930s as a venture in what was then the small speculative private market, interspersed between grander Victorian villas and terraces. As noted above, these bungalows and semi-detached houses represented the bulk of private housing built in Stirling during the inter-war years.
Map 1  Stirling map detailing the three case study areas, 2007
Source: Stirling Council.
Overall, the selected neighbourhoods were categorised as being, respectively, ‘respectable’, ‘poor’ and ‘aspirational’. They were all new, inter-war constructions, but attached to pre-existing communities with already established identities. As will be shown, it is of both historic and contemporary interest, especially to town planners, that the addition of this new housing did very little to alter the pre-existing social structure of these localities; indeed, the relative social position of the three areas seems, if anything, to have been reinforced by these new additions. Using the census enumerator schedules for 1901, along with the Valuation Rolls for the same year, reveals a social profile that is still recognisable today: Raploch revealing the cheapest and most crowded housing; Riverside more expensive and lower-density accommodation; and Randolph Road the highest-value and most spacious housing.

Riverside

Riverside is clearly delimited by the shape of the Forth (Map 2). In common with Raploch, the lands at one point were owned by the Crown; the name Queenshaugh (a street in Riverside) derives from the land being part of the dowry of the Queens of Scotland. Legal documents from the early sixteenth century refer to the sale of land within ‘Schiphalch’. Much of Stirling’s early wealth, as noted earlier, was reliant on shipping, with the royal burgh’s harbour being located in Riverside. In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the main exports were hides, wool, salmon and, to a lesser extent, furs, Scots pearls and barrels of tar, while the imports comprised mainly luxuries, such as wines, spices, velvets, silver articles and books.

By the nineteenth century, the pattern of trade had changed and the harbour’s main imports were timber, wood and oil, with the major export being cloth. The high point of river trade, as well as the pleasure steamer trade on the Forth, was the late nineteenth century. Thereafter it went into sharp decline and effectively ended just after the First World War. Nonetheless, the area still supported a fair amount of industrial activity with a linoleum factory, Scotland’s first oil refinery, a cooperage and the extensive Ministry of War’s ordnance stores. This mix of industrial and residential functions gave Riverside part of its identity, though it was not without its tensions. Residents were often moved to complain about the noise and mess; the ‘Riverside ratepayers’ complaint’, about a garage located in the old Salt Works in Abbey Road, provides a useful example (Stirling Journal and Advertiser, 23 January 1936). Gradually, these factories and works have been pushed out of the area as the value of residential land has increased and now the area is almost entirely residential. The start of the Forthside development on the site of the old ordnance works marks the end for the last major industrial site.
For all that, Riverside was, and remains today, best known as a residential area, now much ‘sought after’ in estate agent parlance. The major residential development occurred in the nineteenth century, as the expansion of the railway network encouraged wealthy incomers, particularly from Glasgow, to settle in the town. To cater for such a solidly middle-class population, speculative builders constructed a variety of substantial terraced houses, tenement flats and the smaller four-in-a-block flats that are common throughout small-town Scotland. Being adjacent to the railway station greatly encouraged the popularity of Riverside.

It is interesting that many of the businessmen and tradespeople who were prominent within the burgh and on the town council, men such as James Ronald, chose to reside in Riverside. As a prominent builder, James Ronald left his imprint by naming two Riverside Streets after himself: James Street and Ronald Street. During this phase of development, a sizeable proportion of home-owners in the area also owned other adjacent or nearby flatted properties, which they rented out – a precursor of the present-day buy-to-let phenomenon. Interestingly, the building of smaller property
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at the far end of Ronald Street in the late nineteenth century created a demand by existing residents of Ronald Street to have the other end renamed, as they considered the smaller development would bring down the status of their homes.

Given the strong developer and councillor links within Riverside, it was perhaps no surprise that the original high-specification council housing for the Burgh of Stirling was to be located in Riverside. Council housing in Riverside was always going to be an attractive proposition given that the then Town Clerk of Stirling, the person responsible for the management of the town’s housing stock, was resident there. Most of the council houses were built under the original 1919 Addison Act or the 1924 Wheatley Act and genuinely constituted the ‘homes for heroes’ promised by David Lloyd George (see Photograph 1). As such they were also some of the very first council houses built in Scotland, perhaps only pre-dated by the Corporation of Dundee Law Housing development.

Photograph 1  Riverside house construction, Shiphaugh Place, 1920

Source: Stirling Council Archive, PH/61/63.
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Though some of the land in Riverside was owned by the Cowane's Trust, the council had a smaller and more restricted area at its disposal. The pre-existing middle-class terraced housing and artisan tenemental property created a geographic limitation on available space, but also ensured that the council housing in Riverside was assimilated into the established community. This was perhaps aided by the selection procedures for the original tenants who, as we will see in the next chapter, were in the main a mixture of white-collar and skilled workers. A touch of local colour was provided by the long-established circus and fairground community, who have always been well thought of by, but socially separate from, their neighbours. Another indication of the area’s desirability is the extent to which all but a handful of the council houses have been purchased by their tenants since the introduction of the Right to Buy in 1980. Riverside has also seen significant recent housing development as old industrial sites have been redeveloped largely for flats for young single people and couples. The very extensive proposed redevelopment of the old ordnance site is now under way after many years of land consolidation and planning work by Stirling Council.

Riverside has always been noted for its social activity and voluntary societies, such as the boating and bowling clubs, and amateur dramatics. There was, however, no church in the immediate Riverside area. Frenetic church-building activity following the ‘Great Disruption’ of the 1840s left Stirling well endowed with churches elsewhere and most of Riverside’s Protestant population went to the South Church. Much of this social scene has declined in recent years, though there remains a certain amount of wider community involvement in a variety of activities by many inhabitants.

Geographically, Riverside is almost an island, with access from the town over the railway bridge and a footbridge across to Cambuskenneth. People in the area clearly enjoy both the physical separation from the town and the proximity to the centre and its facilities. In a sense this sums up the area – an intrinsic part of the town, yet retaining something of its own distinct and separate identity.

Raploch

Raploch, or ‘the Raploch’ as it is commonly referred to, has often been seen as a ‘problem’ area, and somewhat distinct and separate from the rest of Stirling. What we know as Raploch today is essentially a twentieth-century council housing creation, with the first ‘scheme’ dating from 1928 and other developments taking place in the 1930s, 1950s, 1970s and finally in the 2000s. Raploch does, however, have a much longer history and two centuries ago could have been depicted as a rural idyll. In fact one of the earliest references in literature to Raploch, beyond the merely local,
appears in Sir David Lyndsay’s famous play *Ane Pleasant Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* written in 1550s. Agricultural activities notwithstanding, the mention of a coat of ‘Raploch grey’ in the satirical context of this play suggests a national reputation for the production of poor-quality cloth in the area. This reputation continued right up until the nineteenth century, for according to Jamieson’s Dictionary of 1808, it was a ‘coarse woollen cloth, made from the worst kind of wool, homespun, and not dyed’. As an adjective, Raploch now implied coarse. Robert Burns uses the word in that sense in his ‘Second Epistle to Davie Sillar’:

The Muse, poor hizzie

Tho’ rough and raploch be her measure

She’s seldom lazy.

The lands of Raploch were owned by the Crown and then the Earl of Mar, from whom they were purchased by the Burgh Council of Stirling, through the Cowane’s Hospital Trust, in 1677. In the final years of the seventeenth century, during the years of death and famine, the Stirling Burgh Council decided to encourage salmon fishing by feuing 14 acres of Raploch into two-acre holdings. Feuing refers to the old Scots feudal system of selling land whereby, for each piece of land sold, there was the feu superior, the ‘landowner’, who in addition to receiving a payment for the land sold imposed an annual feu duty on the ‘vassal’ in perpetuity. The tenants in this case were expected to farm, mostly oats and barley, while carrying on fishing (see Map 3 and Photograph 2 for the 1759 plan). This early example of local economic planning did not last long, as records soon after indicate that wealthy inhabitants such as burgesses of the town owned the salmon fishing cottages at Fishers’ Row and were sub-letting them.
Neighbourhood identity

Map 3 Historic fueling plan of Raploch, 1759

Source: Stirling Council Archive, MP/SB/35.
### Photograph 2  Historic fueing list of Raploch, 1759

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Jamieson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Walter Jamieson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>George Jamieson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>John Backon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>George Miller</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Robert Chambers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>James Dikson</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>John Thoma</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Robert Bohan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>George Levey</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alexander W. Chish</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>James Reid</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alexander Chambers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>John Chambers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>William Nelson</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>John Jeffery</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the above reference is to be read under the following conditions. The numbers in the column opposite each name denote the several items. For instance, number 5 denotes an item of 2s. You have no more to do than add up the rent paid by all the tenants. Work it with number 5 and it will show you the total amount due. When collected into one sum amount to 20s. and 0 for the rent and all other references of the same kind throughout the book.

Source: Stirling Council Archive, MP/SB/35.
At the end of the eighteenth century, in the spirit of land ‘improvement’, the Cowane’s Trust reorganised the lands of Raploch into a single large farm and built a small village to be inhabited mainly by artisans. The village expanded gradually and by 1813 secured its own school and schoolmaster, Samuel Forrester, who was paid his annual feu of three guineas by the Cowane’s Trust. The Census of 1841 reveals a population of 317 people, with the most significant occupational group being in textiles and clothing. The largest single category was weavers, of whom there were 45. There were also 22 labourers, half of whom were employed in agriculture. Nearly everyone was Scottish born, with only nine of the village being Irish born. Ten years later, the 1851 Census shows that the Irish population had expanded to 85, or 23 per cent of the total, a consequence of the widespread Irish migration to Scotland brought about by the potato famine of 1845. From this date on, the association of the Irish and Raploch was established. Shortly after, Raploch was described in an official account as an ‘Irish village’ and, in 1872, the Stirling Journal and Advertiser, referred to ‘the Connaught Brogue’ being spoken in the village. It was also reputed that when the ‘Irish’ went away on their annual bark-stripping work – bark being used in the tanning process – the crime rate in Stirling fell substantially.

In such stories and events, accurate or not, we find the basis of enduring myths and understandings of particular locales and their identities.

Housing conditions within Raploch were described as being bad as early as the 1850s and the national housing survey undertaken just prior to the First World War revealed just how poor many, if not most, of the houses in Raploch were. The Georgian planned village had deteriorated badly. However, it was not until after the First World War that any serious attempts were made to improve the housing of the working classes of Stirling. The earliest council scheme, Riverside, was an exemplar of good-quality, high-specification if slightly utilitarian housing. By the late 1920s, however, there was a growing recognition that council housing was failing to address the needs of the bulk of the labouring population and the emergent council housebuilding in Raploch was intended to address this problem. Raploch provided a ready-made solution, given it was flat, relatively close, but not too close, to the town centre and with plenty of room for future expansion. Since the Town Council, through the Cowane’s Trust, effectively owned most of the site, there were few legal complications in acquiring the land, which, in turn, made it cheaper to build there.

Nevertheless, almost from the beginning, by seeking to address affordability issues, some of the social problems that this new housing should have addressed persisted. In order to construct houses that lower-paid workers could afford to rent, the council had to build them smaller and to less exacting standards. Against the advice of the local Sanitary Inspector and the Scottish Office, cost-cutting measures such
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as reducing the thickness of party walls and reducing the number of bedrooms were imposed, which meant that these houses would always fall short of Riverside standards. As early as the mid-1930s, warnings were being given about the danger of constructing the slums of the future, particularly by those in the Thistle Housing Trust who wished to preserve the old properties around the castle. By 1936, however, even the burgh’s own Medical Officer of Health drew attention to the overcrowding that was ‘becoming almost as common in the housing schemes as in the slums’ (Stirling Journal and Advertiser, 23 January 1936).

Many of the new tenants came from the most insanitary housing within the burgh, especially the tenements at the ‘tap o’ toun’, but also from St Ninians, another mining community, and even further afield. A large number of the incomers and previous residents were miners, with some Raploch streets almost exclusively tenanted by such men and their families, as revealed by the valuation roll data. It was also the case that many very large families were housed in what were small, two-bed-roomed properties, thus ensuring overcrowding was an issue that persisted throughout the twentieth century (see House plan 1).

House plan 1 Raploch council house plans, 1927
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Following the initial inter-war developments, Raploch in the immediate post-war period expanded east of the Drip Road onto what were the old army parade grounds that lay immediately below the castle. This flat-roofed Orlit housing, of ‘non-trad’ construction, did not prove popular, however, and became hard to let from the late 1960s onwards. Non-traditional housing was common in the years immediately following the Second World War when local authorities, keen to build new property to deal with the massive housing shortage, resorted to using new construction methods for speed, economy and because traditional building materials were, at that time, in short supply (SDD, 1996).

There were a few small 1970s’ developments before the estate underwent whole-scale renewal involving council-funded housing and environmental improvements, a process that has now occurred twice, with a new phase about to start as part of the current regeneration project. Part of this initial work has involved extensive demolition of the Orlits, which, despite various renewal and letting initiatives, remained very unpopular (see Photograph 3). The most infamous was the Glendevon Lettings Initiative, which ran from the late 1980s through to the early 1990s. By reducing the points needed to secure a house, a highly transient and problematic population was attracted into the area, resulting in major estate management issues and a complete collapse of that part of the estate. The site will now be completely redeveloped, largely for private housing, so again there is the prospect of creating an old and new Raploch in a social sense. This does not appear to be creating the mixed community that the initial regeneration plans talked about (SPUR, 2000).

In the mid-1980s, Stirling had promoted a partnership area that encompassed Raploch and the ‘tap o’ toun’ and was called Stirling Partnership for Urban Renewal (SPUR, 2000). This phase resulted in some new housing being built by Forth Housing Association, funded by Scottish Homes. Subsequent planning and development work led to the Raploch Regeneration Project, which was promoted by a newly created delivery vehicle, the Raploch Urban Regeneration Company Ltd (RURC, 2004). It is envisaged that the total spend over its ten-year programme will exceed £20 million, the most significant proportion of which will be spent on private housing.

Raploch over the last 30 years retained and then went on to further develop an unflattering reputation, which has persisted to this day. As was noted above, it has also always displayed a social separateness. These views of Raploch were initially constructed by characterising the neighbourhood as Irish, then as miners and through those that did not work. Later this developed into a reputation for violence, drunkenness, petty crime and eventually drugs. This separateness may have been in part because Raploch, as noted above, was a separate village for a very long
time. It might also have been because Raploch lay spatially directly behind Orchard House, Stirling’s poorhouse, now a cottage hospital, in the narrow gap between the Gowanhill and the Forth. This separateness also ensured that Raploch servicemen who died in the First World War were listed separately from those of Stirling. Over the twentieth century, press reports of local crime have tended to refer to a ‘Raploch man’ as the perpetrator, rather than a ‘Stirling man’. Yet, as the recent BBC television series Raploch Lives has shown, people remain proud of their neighbourhood and its distinctiveness. Many families have stayed there over several generations (The Herald, 2 September 2006) and large interrelated families remained a key feature of the Raploch. This, at least in part, may account for the area’s strong sense of community. That said, Raploch in relation to the rest of Stirling remains spatially, socially and culturally separate.

Photograph 3 Raploch Orlit housing, Glendevon awaiting demolition, 2007

Source: Douglas Robertson.
Randolph Road

Between Randolph Road and Stirling Royal Infirmary is the area of 1930s’ bungalows and semi-detached villas, sometimes referred to as Brentham, but historically part of the wider locality known as Livilands. This area was created from two large estates west of Stirling, the name Livilands being derived from the Scots ‘levislandis’, meaning level lands.

The grand houses and villas of Randolph Road were part of the later urban expansion of nineteenth-century Stirling, and were built to accommodate those who were among the wealthiest inhabitants of the burgh. The Mansion House of Brentham Park, for example, was a very substantial residence, built in 1872/73 by the Edinburgh architect Dick Peddie. The name was later incorporated as a street name for part of the development of 1930s’ bungalows. Of even more historical significance was Wester Livilands, reputed to have been inhabited by General Monk, Cromwell’s commander in chief of the English army in Scotland, who besieged Stirling Castle in 1651. Dating from perhaps the sixteenth century, Wester Livilands was knocked down in 1898 by its then owner, J.W. Drummond, seedsman of Stirling, in order to have a new mansion erected in its place. Drummond’s wealth provides a useful indication of the scale and profitability of local agriculture. Westerlands suffered the fate of many such grand houses, being requisitioned by the Army during World War Two, and then sold by Drummond for the princely sum of £4,525 in 1948, when it was turned into a residential care home for older people, a function it still performs today.

The most significant change to the locality was the siting of the new Stirling Royal Infirmary in Livilands, just off Randolph Road (see Map 4). After the First World War, an appeal was launched to raise £30,000 for a new infirmary to replace the existing one in Spittal Street, which had been opened in 1874 with 70 in-patient beds. The appeal was successful and 15 acres at Livilands were purchased for the building of a new large infirmary with 126 beds. Work started in June 1926 and the infirmary opened in 1928, at a total cost of £108,000. An extension with a further 200 beds was opened in 1939, in anticipation of war casualties.
Further building under the NHS in the post-war period, and especially in the 1960s, saw the hospital dominate much of the area. In the 1930s there sprang up the bungalows and semis that remain today. These houses are historically significant because so few privately built homes were constructed during the inter-war period. Stirling was a relatively prosperous burgh, which was spared the worst of the Great Depression, yet, between 1929 and 1939 when 1,772 houses were built, only 115 of these were for private ownership, all the rest being council houses. So a high proportion of these private houses were built in and around Randolph Road (see House plan 2). This is why this area was chosen for the study – namely to explore in what ways a private housing development secured its social identity and to relate this to the experiences of the two council developments built in the same period.
House construction work began in the 1930s, with a feu disposition granted by the Governor and Company of the Bank of Scotland, with the consent of William Gourlay, in favour of the Stirling Lands and Investment Trust Ltd, just recently formed and based at 20 Barnton Street (see House plan 2 and Map 5). When the council discussed the company's application, William Gourlay's father, Ballie William 'Judge' Gourlay, had to declare an interest and excuse himself from the proceedings. Nonetheless, the application was granted. The Gourlays were an established family firm of builders who were responsible for many of the largest construction projects in Stirling, including the Riverside Secondary School constructed in the 1920s. Gourlay Senior had first joined the council in 1890 and was a keen Freemason (*Stirling Journal and Advertiser*, 27 October 1927).

**House plan 2 Randolph bungalow plans, 1935/36**

Source: Stirling Council Archive, MP/SB4/3/16/2729.
As will be detailed in Chapter 3, early owners and occupants of these newly constructed properties included businessmen, commercial travellers, shop owners, a butcher, a manufacturing confectioner and a couple of teachers. Most were owner-occupiers, though some owners let out their properties to tenants. There were also a few tied houses attached to the hospital for doctors and to the National Coal Board for pit managers. There was also a manse house for the St Ninians Parish Church. Brentham Park was developed partly because of the extensive grounds of the big house and partly because of the adjacent market garden occupied by a John Currie.

Little is generally known about the area in modern times, as it rarely makes an appearance in the press or other media. It does not have the large family connections that distinguish Raploch, nor, apparently, the active voluntary societies of Riverside. It could almost best be described as the place where nothing very much appears to happen.
Neighbourhood identity

Contemporary situation

The original master plan for Raploch renewal noted that the area had long been one of the most deprived and disadvantaged communities anywhere in Scotland (SPUR, 2000). Data derived from the Scottish Executive’s Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics (SNS) shows the situation has worsened, if anything, in recent years. The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) is a multifactor measure that sets out to identify neighbourhoods with high concentrations of deprived households and a high incidence of neighbourhood problems such as crime or poor access to services. It claims to measure deprivation in a multidimensional way by scoring each neighbourhood on a number of different ‘domains’, such as income deprivation, employment deprivation and health deprivation. This means that neighbourhoods can be deprived through having a different combination of problems. In practice, there is a very high degree of correlation between the different domains (with the exception of the access to services domain) so that the index effectively identifies areas with high concentrations of deprived households. The most deprived 10 per cent are scored as decile 1, while the least deprived are decile 10.

The four data zones⁴ that make up Raploch are all in the most deprived decile overall and there are particularly severe problems in relation to income, employment, health and education that highlight severe household deprivation. Also, although the housing problems are not quite as bad, they still score as the second or third most deprived deciles nationally.

The 2004 data on social security uptake indicates that 55 per cent of Raploch households are in receipt of some form of Housing and Council Tax Benefits. The area also has a high number of Income Support claimants, some 400 within a total population of 3,161, made up of 1,335 households. There were also 115 single parents on Income Support. In addition, there were a further 115 people between the ages of 16 and 64 claiming Job Seeker’s Allowance (JSA). This is the group who are considered to be closest to the labour market.

In terms of employment, 1,024 (47 per cent) people in Raploch are listed as economically active, a figure that includes 160 people registered as unemployed (16 per cent of the economically active population). Of the 1,135 people listed as economically inactive, when those who are retired are omitted, then the figure falls to 888. So, in total, 53 per cent of Raploch’s population are listed as inactive.

While the pattern of deprivation is marked in Raploch, just yards away in Riverside it is very much the reverse. For the three data zones that make up Riverside, the SIMD records 9, 8 and 7. Current income records 8, 5 and 6, a reflection of the low
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incomes of some of the older households. In relation to employment, health and education, the decile scores range from 7 to 9. Housing deprivation scored 5, 7 and 9. So, despite part of Riverside at one time reflecting a similar council tenure, there is very little in terms of social conditions that would link these two neighbourhoods. In respect of employment, of the 886 people classed as economically active, only 26 people were registered as unemployed, that is just 2 per cent of the economically active. Of the 313 people registered as economically inactive, when older people are subtracted, this total falls to 187. Overall, only 26 per cent of Riverside’s population are listed as inactive.

The comparable 2004 data on social security uptake indicates that 15 per cent of Riverside households are in receipt of some form of Housing and Council Tax Benefits. There were just 35 people on Income Support and no one on JSA.

To a large degree, the explanation for these markedly contrasting patterns of deprivation and affluence lie with the significantly different levels of economic activity (see Table 1). While, in Riverside and Randolph Road neighbourhoods, full-time employment stands at 48 per cent and 43 per cent respectively, the equivalent figure for Raploch is just 25 per cent. Interestingly, it is Randolph Road that has the highest proportion of retired people, at 15 per cent, while both Riverside and Raploch are just above 10 per cent, which is below the Scottish average of 14 per cent. The real differences in respect of economic activity are explained by the figures for unemployment, looked after home/family and permanently sick/disabled. Perhaps it is the latter figure for permanently sick/disabled that, at almost 20 per cent – approaching three times the national average – helps explains so much of Raploch’s deprivation. The other telling figures are that Riverside has high proportions of school-age children and full-time students, while Randolph Road has almost twice the national average of self-employed people, partly explaining its wealthier social status.

Given this socio-economic pattern, housing tenure reflects similar marked contrasts (Table 2). While, in 2004, in Raploch, almost 80 per cent of households lived in some form of social rented housing, this contrasts with Riverside at just over 7 per cent and with Randolph at just over 5 per cent, the latter figure inflated by the wider data boundaries (see Appendix 2). The council house figure for Riverside is also inflated in that much of this stock is in fact the housing association property at Cooperage Quay, which is tenanted by ex-council house tenants from Raploch. In reality, all but a handful of Riverside’s council housing remains in council ownership, as Map 6 illustrates.
Table 1  Summary of economic activity in case study neighbourhoods, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Economically active (%)</th>
<th>Economically inactive (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Looked</td>
<td>Permanently</td>
<td>sick/</td>
<td>disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employees</td>
<td>employees</td>
<td>employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>after home/</td>
<td>family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raploch</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Road</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001.

Table 2  Summary of tenure pattern in case study neighbourhoods, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All households (n)</th>
<th>Owned outright (%)</th>
<th>Owned mortgage (%)</th>
<th>Shared ownership (%)</th>
<th>Council rented (%)</th>
<th>Other social (%)</th>
<th>Private let (%)</th>
<th>Rent from relative (%)</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raploch</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Road</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics.
Owner-occupation is by contrast high in Riverside at 74 per cent and higher still in the Randolph Road area at 87 per cent. It is also worth noting the level of outright ownership exhibited in these two neighbourhoods. In the Randolph Road area the figure is almost 50 per cent, while in Riverside it is 27 per cent, reflecting the differences in both wealth and the age profile of the respective owners, Riverside being a younger community. Private renting is highest in Riverside, at 16 per cent, indicative of the recent growth in the buy-to-let market, the town’s significant student population and the number of small Victorian and new-build flats in the Riverside area. The median house prices in 2004 for these three neighbourhoods reflect the expected pattern, with Raploch coming lowest at £26,728, Riverside, £99,333 and Randolph Road highest at £118,518 (Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics, www.sns.gov.uk). Riverside is described by the main conveyancing solicitors and estate agents as the most active part of the local housing market, given the mix of family accommodation and good local primary school, plus the new flats for single people and couples. Raploch was described as being ‘less popular’, while Randolph was ‘slow but stable’.

Finally, in this statistical résumé of the social construction of these three neighbourhoods, variations in religious affiliations were examined. The data is derived from the 2001 Census, although this is a restricted data-set (see Table 3). Despite commonly held perceptions, in all three neighbourhoods, including Raploch,
the largest self-identifying religious grouping was Church of Scotland, and not Roman Catholic. That said, the Catholic proportion in Raploch is three times the level of the other two neighbourhoods. Given the slow pace of Irish Catholic assimilation into mainstream Scottish society, there are parallels with other deprived migrant communities. This reflects the overt social and economic discrimination of the past and, although it no longer exists to any degree, its influence still has a noticeable degree of persistence.

Table 3  Summary of religious affiliations in case study areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No affiliation (%)</th>
<th>Church of Scotland (%)</th>
<th>Roman Catholic (%)</th>
<th>Other Christian (%)</th>
<th>Not answered (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raploch</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph Road</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001.

The only other interesting feature from Table 3 is the significance of ‘other Christians’ in the Riverside area, mainly Baptists, and, in the Randolph Road neighbourhood, Episcopalians. Non-affiliation was distributed equally in all three neighbourhoods. In the past, religious affiliations did have a strong link with social class. It will be interesting to see if that distinction is still present in contemporary Stirling.

Summary

These historical sketches detailing the development of the three areas are drawn from the extensive archive work undertaken as part of this study. They highlight how a longer perspective is needed to inform our contemporary understandings of particular neighbourhoods as they evolve with their own historical and social trajectories. The study investigates more fully in the following chapters the resident and outsider views of the identities attached to these three areas. However, we would argue that the broadly shared understanding of the histories of Raploch, Riverside and Randolph Road constantly filters through into the interviews and to some extent becomes a common resource that respondents draw on when discussing the social identities and particular characteristics of each neighbourhood. This is why combining the historic with the contemporary is so central to the research method adopted by this study.
3 Space, belonging and identities

Having set down the method and historical context for these three Stirling neighbourhoods, we now turn to consider the results of the analysis. The focus of this chapter is to explore the interviewees' attitudes to their particular social identity and the social identity of others within their neighbourhood. The core consideration is how notions of community are constructed and these fall into three broad categories – namely, family, neighbours and wider social networks. The chapter sets out some of the demographic characteristics of residents in each neighbourhood and then examines how notions of community and identity are constructed across the three areas, and the fragility of notions of community. It then explores the social and physical boundaries that are employed to encase these social constructions and attitudes, and the inclusive and exclusive nature of community.

The study’s interest in ‘whaur you are fae’ (where you are from) implies an individual identity with an attachment to a particular locality. In turn, it also suggests a lengthy period of residence, of being born and, in the majority of cases, growing up in that neighbourhood. This assumption, of course, ignores geographic as well as social mobility. The interviews were designed to explicitly explore this aspect of identity by incorporating people who have lived in the same area effectively for all, or most of, their lives and others who have moved into, as well as out of, the study areas. Of particular value are those small number of cases who were born in one of the three areas, but subsequently moved to another. The interviewees revealed some movement from Raploch to Riverside, no doubt aided by local authority housing allocations, at least until the recent past. Not surprisingly, given that access was via market mechanisms, there was a less established route from Riverside to Randolph Road. From the interviews, only one of the participants had through his lifetime moved from Raploch to Riverside, before moving onto Randolph Road. What was most evident, however, was that a significant number of people had been resident in these localities for quite a considerable time, but that of course is a reflection of the selection method employed, which produced the bulk of the interviewees.

Identity, culture and social positioning

Questions of identity, culture and social positioning have long been on the sociological agenda. Having a sense of knowing ‘where you are from’ can be a key part of understanding one’s identity and one’s relation to ‘others’ (Bauman, 1996). Asserting that you are ‘from’ a particular region, town, locality or neighbourhood
Neighbourhood identity can be an important way in which individuals locate themselves both socially and culturally and through which they can find a sense of being ‘rooted’ in the world (cf. the community studies of Young and Wilmott, 1957; Frankenberg, 1966; Bell and Newby, 1971; Coates and Silburn, 1980). In examining the notion of ‘neighbourhood identity’ we need to know how people in the various areas understand and relate to where they live and to each other, and in what ways identities and communities manifest themselves. Are communities established and maintained via more formal events and meetings enshrined in particular spaces and places such as community centres, social clubs or church halls? Or is community more likely to be found and acted out in the fleeting and more ephemeral social interactions such as the idle chit-chat on the street corner, or a brief encounter in a local shop or post office? Perhaps it is reducible to just knowing that people are ‘watching out for you’, having ‘good’ neighbours or a close-by family network who are there to offer help and support. Is it also the case that notions of community identity are fixed or do they alter and change over time? And are they experienced in the same way or do they differ depending on who you are?

To answer these questions, we drew up two related but distinct qualitative interview schedules, one to focus on the residents or past residents of the three neighbourhoods and another to explore similar issues with those considered key actors within these areas, given their professional work. So, while the resident interviews focused on the ‘insiders’ perspective, the key actor interviews brought in the interested ‘outsiders’ views.

These then produced the answers to the above questions and each aspect is discussed more fully below. We also explored the extent of people’s ‘attachments to place’ and the extent to which they have a recognisable ‘sense of belonging’ to where they reside. As Cohen (1982), in a somewhat ebullient manner, suggests:

‘Belonging’ implies very much more than merely having been born in a place. It suggests that one is in an integral piece of the marvellously complicated fabric which constitutes the community; that one is a recipient of its proudly distinctive and consciously preserved culture – a repository of its traditions and values, a performer of its hallowed skills, an expert in its idiosyncrasies. The depth of such belonging is revealed in the forms of social organisation and association in the community so that when a person is identified as belonging to a particular kinship group or neighbourhood he [sic] becomes, at the same time, a recognisable member of the community as a whole and of its cultural panoply. (Cohen, 1982, p. 21)
More prosaically, Cooke (1989) describes a locality broadly as ‘a place where people live out their daily working and domestic lives’ (Cooke, 1989, p. 3) and, more specifically, as a potential base from which ‘subjects can exercise their capacity for pro-activity by making effective individual and collective interventions within and beyond that base’ (Cooke, 1989, p. 12). In this way, we can have the basis of a sense of ‘belonging’ to a particular locality or space – understood by participants variously as a neighbourhood, estate or scheme. This is rarely best conceptualised as a given or static identity, but one that is worked out over time and that resonates with varying degrees of intensity at different moments in the lives of individuals and groups. The ebb and flow of such identities forms much of the focus of this research.

It has also long been acknowledged that different housing neighbourhoods acquire different social identities (Roberts, 1971; Harvey, 1973, 1992). Those who live in particular localities can develop attachments to places, which can inform, to a greater or lesser extent, understandings of themselves, others and how they are viewed by others. Additionally, within such localities, there may be a perceived hierarchy of status of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ residents (Roberts, 1971) and of localities going through ‘good’ or ‘bad’ phases (Robertson, 2003).

**Culture of knowing ‘whaur you are fae’**

Stirling’s housebuilding of the 1920s and 1930s was executed with a clear idea of what type of occupant would be appropriate for each of the three areas examined in this study. In effect, these were planned communities, visibly and explicitly so in the case of the Raploch and Riverside, and implicitly by the ‘hidden hand’ of the market in the case of Randolph Road. As already indicated, these three localities existed prior to the First World War and had their own distinct histories. While the newly constructed houses acted to change the areas to a greater or lesser extent, they did not transform them; rather there was an overlaying and merging with the already established local social structures. This was most clearly the case in Randolph Road, where the new bungalows and semis did little to alter the existing established pattern of middle-class owner-occupation. Those with the money could afford to buy into this area and this new housing extended that opportunity to others who previously might not have been able to buy their own home. In Raploch, while the council houses changed the physical landscape most clearly – by more or less obliterating the old village – nonetheless it remained as a place apart, spatially, socially poor, with a large ‘Irish-Catholic’ population. It also retained, and in time consolidated, its reputation for petty crime and social problems.
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Riverside experienced the most subtle change. While the council houses were new and a challenge to the more prestigious of the existing privately owned housing, the tenants were clearly vetted to ensure they were sufficiently respectable for this area. This was because certain prominent councillors who decided on the building and subsequently the allocation of these houses had strong Riverside connections. The rents charged for what were high-quality modern houses also ensured they were outwith the financial means of most manual workers. There also appears to have been a religious element to the house allocations right up until the 1970s in that they were considered to be informally sorted out within kirk session of the local Church of Scotland (Female 70, Riverside).

Therefore, people first moved into areas that already had an ‘identity’ and, through residence, that ‘identity’ was also ascribed to them. This was consciously and most forcefully articulated in relation to the prospective tenants of Raploch. During a debate in the town council in 1931 over the precise location of an additional scheme of housebuilding in Raploch, there was an objection lodged that the area identified was ‘within the prescribed distance of the royal palace in Stirling Castle’. This was news to at least one councillor and it seems apparent that there was a degree of dissimulation about the true reasons for the debate over location. At last one member of the council spoke directly, ‘Baillie Morrison described the site selected as the best for this class of house. It kept that class of tenant by themselves, and everyone would be satisfied’ (Stirling Journal and Advertiser, 23 April 1931).

Historical research into the social structure of localities in the twentieth century is hampered by a lack of sources; without the enumerator schedules – or notes from the surveyors – from the Census (1901 being the last Census for which these are available) it is difficult to identify occupations at a microlevel. The Valuation Rolls are therefore crucial, since they give the occupation of the tenant or occupant, though this is not done on a consistent basis. It is frustrating that we can find out much more about localities in the late nineteenth century from documentary sources than we can for most of the twentieth century. Below, the social structure of our three localities is discussed through examining the occupations of the early inhabitants of each locality.

Riverside

Riverside was among the very first council developments anywhere in Scotland; work began in 1919 and, by 1922, there were 52 houses, mainly four-in-a-block ‘cottage flats’ – a traditional Scottish housebuilding form, a scaled-down form of tenement.
Photomontage 1 Riverside

Photographs clockwise from top left: ex-council housing, Waverly Crescent; ex-council housing, Shiphough Place (current-day image of Photo 1 in Chapter 2); four-in-a-block housing, Abbey Road; new housing association properties, Cooperage Quay; show people’s site, Abbey Road; Forthside development, Shore Road; Edwardian Terrace, Forth Crescent; Post Office, Abbey Road.

Source: photographs by Douglas Robertson.
The development followed clear ‘garden city’ principles in that these were cottage flats and semi-detached houses with their own sizeable gardens and not three- or four-storey tenemental property with common gardens. The houses were also set out along well laid out streets that had extensive public space, especially along the actual riverside frontage.

The first rents charged ranged from £21 to £36 per annum. In total, 49 of the houses were tenanted by men and three by women. Of these women, two were single and both were teachers, while the other was either married or widowed and had no occupation given. Out of the 49 male tenants, eight were not listed as having an occupation and one was designated as a pensioner. The 40 remaining male tenants were: fitter; chauffeur (two); boilermaker; saddler; engineer (three); mechanic; assistant foreman; foreman (two); cashier; painter; linesman (two); draper; electrician; blacksmith (two); clerk (two); manager; baker; pastry baker; commercial traveller; joiner; machineman; ironmonger; carter; miner; tinsmith; bank accountant; storeman (two); mason; french polisher; superintendent] Forth Fishings. These were in the main skilled artisans and white-collar workers who earned a reasonable income, which, given the rent charged, was not surprising.

The actual means by which these new houses were allocated is not recorded within the archive, but it does not appear to have been based on meeting housing need, rather, an ability to pay the rent seemed the most significant consideration on the part of the council, which was keen to ensure the loans were paid and an extra burden was not imposed on the ratepayers. Bear in mind, at this time, poor relief was the only form of income support for the poor and it was set at a level that was substantially below these rents.

**Raploch**

The Raploch scheme started in the 1928 and was a much more ambitious undertaking than Riverside. By 1932 there were a large number of tenemental streets built, with more to be added. Unfortunately, most of the entries in the Valuation Roll for that year do not list occupations. The reasons for this are not given, though Valuation Rolls gradually stop giving occupations on a consistent basis from about this time. To get round this omission, this study opted to concentrate on two streets where most entries do give the occupations of the tenants. Numbers 42–52 Raploch Road were council owned, and amounted to 26 flats, with rents set at either £12 or £15 per annum, significantly lower than those charged in Riverside. Of these properties, five were tenanted by women, four of whom were married or widowed, and one was single, but none was given an occupation. Of the 21 male tenants, three were without occupations. The occupations of the remaining 18 were quite limited: labourer (eight); coal miner (eight); and carter (two).
Photomontage 2 Raploch

Photographs clockwise from top left: Woodside Road, Raploch; Drip Road, Raploch; Menzies Drive, Raploch; looking up to the castle from Ochil Crescent; Raploch Urban Regeneration Company Ltd sign, Drip Road; Woodside Road, Raploch; Menzies Drive, Raploch; Huntly Crescent, old Stirling Council and new Forth Housing Association housing.

Source: photographs by Douglas Robertson.
Neighbourhood identity

The second street was Beatty Avenue and again all 48 flats were council owned, with rents of either £18 or £23 per annum. All the tenants were male, of whom 13 had no occupation listed. The 35 with listed occupations comprised: ordnance labourer; grocer (three); housepainter; coal miner (five); engineer (two); clerk (three); motor driver; colliery fireman; signalman; police constable (two); civil servant (two); postman; fireman; builder’s clerk; oil depot foreman; telephone linesman; joiner; baker; rubberworker; engine driver; weaver; painter; tailor; bus driver. It was clear that there was a social distinction between these two streets within Raploch and that the rent charged reflected the tenant’s occupation – those with a better job could afford the higher rent. But there was also a social cleavage between Raploch and Riverside. The high number of Irish surnames suggested there was a religious/cultural division as well. That said, Raploch was religiously a mixed community, whereas Riverside was not.

Randolph Road

The bungalows of the Randolph Road area were the last development to be constructed. By 1941, there were 25 houses in Brentham Avenue, Brentham Mansions and Brentham Crescent, with annual rateable values of between £15 and £80, though the vast majority fell between £35 and £40. Of these, 18 houses were occupied by their owners, while seven were tenanted. It would appear that buying to let was prevalent then, with private housing being seen as a means to generate a steady income. Given that the majority of households rented at this time, such rented property would be at the ‘top end’ of the market.

Nine of the owner-occupiers were female, as was one of the tenants who rented from a female owner. Five of these women were either married or widowed. Two women – both single – were given occupations (a teacher and a grocer). Of the 15 properties occupied by men, only two were not listed as having an occupation, though one of these was a ‘major’ (presumably a retired army officer). The 13 male occupations were: commercial traveller; joiner; manufacturing confectioner; fishmonger; butcher; actuary; artist; coal salesman; insurance inspector; teacher; sales manager; (market) gardener; HM Inspector of Taxes. Just as there was social distance between two streets in Raploch, and between Raploch and Riverside, this is even more exaggerated between the two council areas and Randolph Road. The social profile reinforces the fact that, to live here as an owner, you needed both capital and a good and steady income. To a renter, the good steady income was also essential.
Photomontage 3  Randolph Road

Photographs clockwise from top left: 1970s’ infill housing, Randolph Road; Victorian Housing, Randolph Road; Edwardian mansion, Randolph Road; 1990s’ infill, Annfield Grove; Stirling Royal Hospital; classic 1930s’ semis, Randolph Road; bungalow extension, Randolph Road; classic bungalow, Brentham Avenue.

Source: photographs by Douglas Robertson.
Given what we have already seen in respect of the current social positioning, while it is clear the nature of employment has altered substantially over the last 80 years, it is also evident little has really changed in respect of the relative positioning of these three neighbourhoods. That said, it would also be the case that Riverside has a profile that is now more akin to Randolph Road than Raploch, whereas in the past the social closeness, at least in employment terms, might have been leaning more towards Raploch.

**Community: differing understandings and experiences**

In understanding how the area’s identity affects perceptions of community among residents, we noticed that community, for one respondent, could be reduced down to the various attitudes and perceptions of different types of individuals and the length of residence:

I think people have different attitudes to living in the Riverside. Some people are there forever. Some people are there and they want to stay and some people just come and buy a house, make a pot of money and move on. You’re bound to get different attitudes to housing or where you live and things … some people, it’s more important than others to live in a community and have an identity.

(Female 46B, Riverside)

Clearly, community is a slippery and elusive term that evades a precise definition and to which people attach a variety of often conflicting emotions and interpretations. As Frazer (1999, p. 45) notes:

The term is used in shifting ways. Sometimes it denotes a particular kind of social entity, sometimes it denotes a particular kind of relationship between persons. Sometimes it is used as a general noun to encompass all kinds of groups and collectives.

All these understandings of community were evident in the interviews. In these interviews, residents from the three areas were asked specifically about their particular understanding of what was meant by community and then whether they felt part of one. In order to work through these differing understandings and experiences, it is helpful to consider notions of community as they are understood or relate to family, neighbours and other formal or less formal social networks.
Family

In Raploch, the role of immediate and extended family networks was a significant reality for most people and it was this that seemed crucial in fostering a particular sense of community. In part this was self-generated and a matter of ensuring mutual support. In part it was borne of necessity. The significance of family was seen to take on greater importance because of the absence of a wider social welfare infrastructure. This was well articulated by one of the respondents who was brought up in Raploch in the 1950s in a family unit that contained three generations – her grandfather, her parents and her and her brother. In addition, there were an aunt and uncle who were permanent members of the household and who played an increasingly important role in the lives of the children when their father died at the relatively young age of 36.

While this non-nuclear family relationship may have been a more intense example than the norm, it was hardly exceptional. Although the houses in Raploch tended to be smaller than the original council homes in Riverside, because of the different subsidy regime used to build them and because the families tended to be larger, space would be found where necessary. Another respondent, who grew up in the 1930s, recalled her parents taking in a cousin who had been orphaned at the age of 14. Given that the family already numbered seven, living in a two-bedroom house, this must have stretched domestic arrangements. To the child, however, there was nothing unusual about that decision and, reflecting on it now, she remarked humorously, ‘that's quite a lot in a wee hoose like that eh!’ (female 74, Raploch). A number of other interviews involved stories of orphaned children being taken in by relations, and at times by neighbours or family friends, in an almost casual manner that seems to have had little or no input from the official authorities.

In contrast with the other two areas, an examination of the Valuation Rolls over the last 70 years suggests there have been large family networks in existence over time within the Raploch, given the prevalence of certain surnames, such as the Lenons, McIntyres, McKinlays, Goodwillies, Cullys, Burns, Buchanans, Camerons and Campbells. On its own, this evidence does not prove the existence of family networks but, through the construction of family histories using the Civil Registers of Births, Deaths and Marriages, this pattern of large families is substantiated, as is the long-standing existence of numerous relations living near one another (see example of the ‘Raploch’ family in Appendix 1). While other family networks did exist in the other two areas, the scale of such networks was markedly different, as is discussed later.

Proximate family links are not something restricted to a bygone era, as a local news report from 1977 reveals. On 27 December fire ripped through a ground-floor flat in
Ferguson Street and only the quick thinking of an 8-year-old boy saved his disabled father. While the Social Work Department moved quickly into action, securing another flat in the area as temporary accommodation and providing beds and blankets, it was relations who responded immediately to the emergency; the 8 year old (one of five children) ‘rushed to his uncle’s house next door’ and it was the uncle who pulled the father out of the house and who housed his relatives for the first night (*Stirling Observer*, 28 December 1977).

A former Raploch resident now living in Riverside ably highlights the role of networks of family:

> Ah think at some stage or other you do need support. My daughter's just along the road and ma son's just along the road as well. But we never, you know, run in and out each other's houses. But, by the same token, if we need anything, or, you know, they're in bother, we're there. But, em, you know, ah suppose people's attitudes have changed as well. Where, when ma family were growin' up, ma aunt Helen and ma mum came maybe two or three times a week to see them and it was fine. But nowadays, I think, if you were doin' that, they'd be sayin’, ‘Oh God! Here they come again!’ Because the way of life has changed as well. You know, as ah say, you don't have this extended family like you used to have. But ma daughter along the road, Lyn, she’s very family minded. You know, she wants to know all about the family background and what have you and she'll phone up, as ah say, she's just along the road there, but she'll phone up and she can be on that phone for about an hour. Ma son, he comes round, em, every Saturday, em, takes his dad up the town and thing like that. Ma daughter in Tullibody, she works unfortunately. She works at eh, the Prudential so, they're very, very busy. She's workin' sometimes Saturdays an' everything. But we see her, she comes in every Tuesday, she pops in for a wee while … not blowin' ma trumpet but ah’m the sorta hub o’ thing that go on here. Em, that's what they say, ‘God knows what we did before you came here!’

(Female 63, Riverside)

However, living in a familiar area with strong local networks of family and friends can clearly provide important emotional and psychological, as well as social and economic supports. As one woman put it:

> I don't know why we still live in the Riverside; I think it's just our insecurities really, to be honest.
Q: Is there still a strong community feeling in Riverside?

I think my mum’s generation, and even ours, there are. I think the next generation there aren’t really.

(Female 46, Riverside)

Neighbours

An understanding of community as being closely related to the relationships you have with the people you live beside, your neighbours, was strongly articulated in all three areas. A lifetime resident of the Randolph Road was very positive about the contemporary local sense of community ‘feeling’, ‘I would say right now that there’s a good, certainly a good community feeling. I mean, the neighbours that I have round about here are super’ (female 76, Randolph). For this respondent, a community ‘feel’ was very much related to a sense that people looked out for each other, ‘We just watch out for each other, I would say’. Similarly, a long-time resident of the Raploch pointed out emphatically that, ‘The people have made Raploch what it is, it’d be the people, the people that’s made it, they’re all friendly, they are friendly people down there, they will mix with one another’ (female 86, Raploch). This comment was made despite the fact that the respondent was equally insistent that she did not ‘mix’ with that wider community. As another ex-Raploch resident of the post-war Orlit housing recalled:

... lookin’ back, as ah say, the space in that house too was good, but gosh, it was cold! Cos they had stone floors downstairs and they had no central heating. You had a fire in your sitting room and a fire in the bedroom up the stairs but everywhere else, oh gosh, it was cold! And then of course the flat roof, but em, again, a really good community spirit. We always seemed to land really good neighbours.

(Female 63, Riverside)

Having ‘good’ neighbours was also central to notions of community in both Riverside and Randolph Road. In interviewing two residents who had moved out of Randolph Road a number of years ago, it was interesting to note that they could name all their immediate neighbours and provide information on the males’ employment and the number of children each of the families had.
But I mean at one time there was eight or nine women over 90 in this street … Yes aha, it is I mean Mrs Finlayson over there has been, she’s in her 90s and Mrs McDermott well she’s actually in hospital now, she’s in her 90s and Mrs Wright’s 100 and then there was Mrs Yule she was in her 90s … 99 aye when she died. And who else was there? Oh there was two old ladies lived up in the flat next, the building next door. They were connected to Green and Morton. Mrs Morton lived there but she moved out to Beechwood Gardens. And then there was Andrew, no Willie Porter and his wife.

(Female 75, Randolph)

A retired couple of show people who live in their own small enclave within Riverside and who, as a result, see themselves as slightly set apart from the rest of the community nonetheless recognised that same familiarity with neighbours and its relation to community:

Everybody knew everybody in this area, everybody did. Each man could tell you where so and so lived and who lived at the back of them and all the rest of it, and everybody used to go to maybe the Bowling Club and whatever. I think from then up until now, I think that has been the foundation of the community. That’s my opinion.

(Male/female 85, Riverside)

The earlier Raploch woman, reflecting on how much she had liked the house she grew up in, described the ‘warmth’ and ‘ambience’ of the house, which was due to her extended family and the range that provided heating as well as the cooking facilities. But she went on to apply this feeling more widely, ‘this lovely warmth about the house, and, actually, the whole building and the whole street’. In this, neighbours played a crucial role:

… not even just your next-door neighbours but the whole length of the street in fact! You knew people in the streets across the back and used to talk over the fence [laughs]. It was a very social area. We used to have, there was a man called Dusty Stewart who, he was an ex-navy man, but he was a good singer and what have you, and he used to organise back-garden concerts, you know, you all had to get up and do your wee bit, and you maybe paid a penny or your parents paid a penny and would come and watch, and he would spend the money buyin’ you things. But eh, really! You know, some o’ them were really first-class [laughs], though ah say so. Somebody would get up and tap dance and somebody would get up and sing, Dusty would sing. It was really great.

(Female 63, Raploch)
Similarly, a couple, born in the 1940s and who have lived in Raploch all their lives, reflect on what they liked about the area they grew up in:

**M:** Well we had a swing park across the road and we had good neighbours. Goin’ in one another’s hoose, ye knew everybody.

**F:** Oh aye that wis a good thing. Every door wis open aye.

**M:** Where nooadays ah think people’s no the same as whit we were when we were younger. Everybody was the same then. There were naebody tryin’ tae keep up wi’ the Jones then. Everybody was the same. It was a happy atmosphere. An’ that’s what ah liked.

**F:** An’ how many times did you pass half a dozen women standin’ at the close blethering? You never see that now.

(Male/female 63, Raploch)

These quotes indicate that there was a familiarity with neighbours that went beyond one’s immediate neighbours and embraced the wider community. It was also evident that this was more pronounced in Raploch and Riverside than it was in Randolph Road.

While having good neighbours underpins one core aspect of community for certain people, the interview evidence also revealed that, for others, their understanding of community often seemed to be only tangentially related to their relationship with neighbours. As one Riverside respondent suggested:

I don’t have much to do with my neighbours. They’re OK neighbours, if they weren’t nice neighbours I don’t know how I would feel about that, it’s friends and family.

(Female 46, Riverside)

A Raploch woman noted:

When I moved here they were all nice neighbours, all the neighbours have passed away. They’re bringing in other ones. Rose is the only one I’m friendly with. If someone says it’s a nice day, I’d say it’s lovely, but I’ll no stand and gossip. I’m no one for that, and they don’t run in and out of one another’s houses. This is a good street, well it was a good street.

(Female 86, Raploch)
Neighbourhood identity

It seems that, for some, ‘nice’ neighbours are what is required and neighbours that can subsequently be seen as friends are something of an unexpected bonus. So the notion of community in these neighbourhoods is not the sum of neighbour networks. As the above Raploch resident of 52 years’ standing went on to say:

I’ve got Rose across the road, she’s my neighbour but I call her my friend, if she does’nae see me she’ll phone and ask me if I’m all right. I dinnae really mix, I just say good morning an it’s a lovely day, I dinnae get entangled with them. I’m no one that goes to meetings and things like that … The Raploch has a community and they go away every Tuesday and Friday to a club. I dinnae really bother, I’m no one for mixing. I go to church but that’s a I bother aboot.

Q: Do you feel part of the community?

No really, I’m being honest with ya, I don’t mix with them. I’m no being snobbish, I just don’t mix, no my way.

(Female 86, Raploch)

Overall, it would appear that both Riverside and Raploch produced very distinctive social identities and at times a powerful sense of belonging, in part related to length of residence and the networks of friends and kin. For Randolph Road, a less definite sense of identity emerged from the interviews, perhaps related to this neighbourhood having a more mobile and wealthier population, an issue this report explores later.

Social networks

It is a strong theme emerging from the interviews that many people’s understanding of community, and any concomitant identification and sense of belonging to a particular area, involves the establishment of a series of, and perhaps very few, micro-social settings, which then become ‘community’ to that individual. It is these crucial face-to-face encounters that are seen to be the basic constituent elements of community and an identity with place that allow an individual to set down ‘roots’ into a particular space.

Extended networks of family, friends and neighbours within an area, and the associated wealth of accumulated ‘social capital’ (Putnam, 2000) are not always a necessary constituent part of a community. Rather, a communal identity and strong
feelings of belonging and attachment are established and played out through fleeting chats in the local shop, a monthly visit to the hairdresser, swapping some news or gossip at the post office, the bowling or tennis club or suchlike. These mundane and routine interactions can be infrequent and ephemeral, but they can be of great significance. There is reassurance in the familiarity of such interactions, given that the social settings and the people involved provide crucial feelings of stability and reassurances for those involved. As the respondent from Riverside offered:

> We do have the local shops and I go to the hairdresser and of course you get to know the other women that go in and you hear about what’s been happening … I definitely feel part of the community … it’s got the post office, which I can’t speak highly enough of, and there is a bus service. (Female 46B, Riverside)

A friend of the woman quoted above, and a lifetime Riverside resident, concurred with this view of community when she noted that:

> … our friend Cheryl wrote a great piece in the [Stirling] Observer about why [a] community probably isn’t a community any more. It is to do with the local shops and things … It was when they were thinking of closing the post office [that she wrote this piece]. (Female 46, Riverside)

More formal attempts at creating, or imposing, community structures on residents of Randolph Road were short-lived and unsuccessful, only briefly coalescing around a particular set of issues:

> We did have a community group at one time. The community group we had didn’t last very long. It was mostly got together because we were having problems with number 11, because it was a hospital house … there was [also] problems with parking, quite a lot of problems with it. So the community group was set up. I would say it was a good place to live … well it was until we got this awful parking. (Female 76, Randolph)

It was a similar situation in Riverside when, in 1996, an attempt to regularly publish a community newsletter – *The Riversider* – ground to a halt after just two years. Another respondent discussed the lack of a community ‘focus’ within Riverside, other than through informal meetings at the hairdresser, the post office or bowling club:
Neighbourhood identity

There used to be an old folks’ club but I don’t think that is in existence now. I went round to do talks and things like that on a few occasions.

_Q:_ But no other institutions that would maybe give the area a focus?

Not really, there’s a community house, there’s a drop-in centre, these sort of places but nothing for a, nothing for a focus.

_Q:_ OK.

There’s not a church.

_Q:_ No, I noticed that.

There’s no church you know, there’s nothing like that, there’s not a church, that’s why the hairdresser you know, that’s why you know … Well that’s right, that’s right, it’s their weekly, their weekly visit. There’s nothing like a church or, oh now the bowling’s probably got something to do, quite a lot of the older folk bowl, the indoor bowling.

(Female key actor 1, Riverside)

In common with so many large council estates, the emphasis on housing tended to be at the expense of social amenities. In 1936, Councillor Moore proposed that the burgh build a recreation hall for Raploch, as ‘The district was drab and deserted, especially on dark nights, and there was not even a public house’. Moore went on to say that the construction of the scheme, which ultimately was intended to house a population of 6,500, had been done on ‘government orders’ and that, as a consequence, ‘the Council had upset the whole living conditions of many of the inhabitants of Stirling by sending them to the Raploch district’ (Stirling Journal and Advertiser, 19 March 1936). What Moore was referring to was the large-scale transfer of families from the slums at the ‘tap o’ toun’ into Raploch. While the tenants may have been escaping the slums, they were also leaving behind the social infrastructure of shops and pubs within the ‘auld toun’. The response Moore received was partly one of mystification, ‘Councillor Gourlay admitted he’d never heard of any town in Scotland providing such a facility but agreed to consider the matter’ (Stirling Journal and Advertiser, 19 March 1936). In the event, the deliberations lasted some 40 years because it was not until the 1970s that a proper community facility was provided for Raploch.
Despite the observations of certain interviewees, organised societies and their related facilities have acted to solidify community feelings and attachments within Riverside, at least in some people’s eyes. Older respondents fondly remembered time spent at the bowling club, the rowing club and the amateur dramatics. Others had been involved in the playgroup when their children had been younger. But it was also evident that much of this had been lost in recent years with, for instance, the closure of the rowing club after the recent flooding and the demise of ‘am dram’, which had existed in one form or another for over 50 years. That said, there were current efforts, with some council support, to recreate this type of local association in the form of a women’s over-50s’ club.

Raploch by contrast still had a number of clubs and societies, many of which were semi-official bodies funded by the council to tackle poverty. Within Raploch, as with Riverside, it is often a small number of individuals who foster and promote community activities, as the following quote illustrates:

At this moment in time I’m voluntary organiser of the Raploch Friday Club, which is my wee elderly group, my husband drives the minibus for that. I recruit my brothers [laughs] to do a bit o’ performing at wee concerts and that for them because they’re quite capable o’ that, keeping them happy. I’m the chairperson o’ the community council. I’m part o’ the regen, the community partnership in there. I’m the treasurer of the credit union. I’m the voluntary organiser of the Raploch Community Transport. I think that’s all.
(Female 63, Raploch)

At the other extreme was Randolph Road, where, apart from the tennis club, interviewees had no real attachment to local clubs and societies. Local residents are also not represented on the local Torbrex Community Council.

It was also evident from the interviews that Riverside, in common with Randolph Road, did not appear to have any tradition of the more boisterous form of street life that had been common in the Raploch. The following comment about the street life in Raploch could never have been made about Riverside:

Aye in Weir Street, we were. Kinna, aye it wis a rough area, course it wis! Eh, but naebody had very much an’ everybody seemed tae help one another as ah recall. Eh ye maybe got the odd drunk and the odd sorta battle, but more or less the people sorta did sorta support one another, you know what ah mean?
(Female 73, Raploch)
Neighbourhood identity

Not that everyone appreciated this street culture. As a former Raploch resident noted, he had 'mixed memories' of his years in the estate:

My immediate neighbour downstairs was a good sort and sadly died only months before I left, he died of cancer and my neighbours across the fence I got on fine with them. Across the road not the same, there was a gentleman that I used to think of as Windae Hanging Archie who spent much of his day hanging out of his window with his eyes out on stalks looking at everything he could see, greatly to the annoyance of my downstairs neighbour. We grew a hedge to a surprising height for the Raploch in order to impede some of his peering eyes and there was a chap on the ground floor under him who used to do his car repairs in the middle of the night and his son would bounce a football on the road endlessly so that, when Asher's ice cream chimes were not ringing, the thump, thump of the football would delight the ear. So I've mixed memories.
(Male 70, Riverside/Raploch)

As this last quote illustrates, there were, in the course of conducting the interviews, numerous occasions when 'community' was also seen in a more negative light, akin to the 'destructive Gemeinschaft as discussed by Sennet (1977, 1994). As one woman puts it when reflecting on her community, 'I think it probably it's a good thing even if it bugs us sometimes cos they know too much of your business' (female 46, Riverside). Another woman adds, 'My son would want to go out and just wander Riverside and I say you can't do that cos everybody knows who you are' (female 51, Riverside). This comment had a distinct generational dimension in that your perspective on such matters may change over time. As one Riverside resident stated, 'I think we were lucky to be brought up there actually. As a teenager I hated it because I did think everybody knew what I was doing, I loathed it' (female 46, Riverside). In this way the community can for some be seen to be a limiting, and at times oppressive, force of social constraint and conformity, more of an impediment to social life and belonging than a set of supports and comfort.

Fragility of community

A Riverside resident provided a useful insight into the complexities and ambiguities involved in feeling part of the community. Rather than being born and brought up in Riverside she moved there from Bristol 12 years ago:
Q: Do you feel part of the community?

Yeah I do, I think that’s because of having been involved with the playgroup, being chair of the playgroup, and having done The Riversider [local newsletter] … we do have the local shops and I go the hairdresser and of course you get to know the other women that go in and you hear about what’s been happening … I definitely feel part of the community. But I don’t think that would necessarily happen, I think you could move into the Riverside and not be a part of the community at all. You have to make a bit of an effort – it depends whether you like that sort of thing, it wouldn’t appeal to everybody. I think community is important, partly because I’m familiar with the small community that my mum grew up in and that was really supportive. It’s what I’m used to and I think it is a good thing.

(Female 46B, Riverside)

While length of residence can aid in fostering a sense of community attachment, getting involved in local activities, as the above quote suggests, is another way of getting to know the people who live around you. So people can opt in or just as easily opt out. These days, given people’s greater mobility, it is probably easier to opt out, especially if you do not intend to put roots down in that particular area. This of course produces a fragile sense or form of community, which does not seem to be rooted in anything fixed or permanent. Hence, community or a community feeling can dissolve and evaporate quickly, and many respondents felt this to be a real loss. As another Riverside resident recalled:

Well I used to take a playgroup so I used to know everybody, their kids, I used to know everybody … For a while, spotty teenage boys up in town used to blanch when they saw me because I’d wiped their bums when they were 2.

(Female 62, Riverside)

The comments made by older residents in Riverside provided clear evidence of how their understanding of community had been diminished by the demise in the crucial face-to-face encounters that are clearly seen to be the basic constituent elements of community and place identity. What they described was a decline or lack of contacts with people in the neighbourhood, resulting in a superficial flux – the day-to-day movement of individuals going about their private business in a way that was a detached form of more ‘meaningful’ social (communal) interactions:
Neighbourhood identity

People are in a rush [now]. Everything went quietly, when we first came down here it was a lovely place. ... the biggest thing is they’re all on mortgages and they’ve to work and they’re in such a hurry ... it’s usually the folk that walk the dogs that I know, I meet them when I walk the dog. (Female 79, Riverside)

It’s all changed. There was a time when everybody knew each other and it was different entirely, I wouldn’t say so now ... I just find now that people are not so friendly, the people that are coming in, there’s no eye contact. Everybody [used] to talk to each other, ‘nice day’ or ‘terrible weather’ or something like that but normally there’s no eye contact. (Female 85, Riverside)

The new scheme is different. These are new people that are here now, all the old people are away. They’ve got a different outlook, different attitudes, different styles of living. There must be people [who] objected to the flats going up there. (Male 85, Riverside)

We used to know everybody in Queenshaugh Drive ... we don’t know anybody now, it’s all changed. (Female 85, Riverside)

These comments, largely from older residents, illustrate the perceived emergence of increasingly atomised forms of relationships. This reflects their understanding of a key social change within contemporary communities (Bauman, 2001). Indeed, many of these comments concur with Simmel’s (1997) classic analysis of the changing urban setting, which is increasingly characterised by fleeting relations between individuals that are detached and display a somewhat ‘blasé’ attitude to their social encounters. In trying to explain the change in recent times to a more remote politeness, some respondents refer to changing patterns of employment where both members of a couple are in paid work:

But, you know, the reason for that is we were retired and everybody else was working. So they’re working during the day, we’re out and when they come back what do they want to do? They want to sit down, have a meal, maybe watch the television. They’re not going to run about socialising! (Male/female 85, Riverside)

One long-time resident of Randolph Road concurred with these aforementioned sentiments and revealed another cause of this tendency towards individualism, the
increasing privatisation of space. This resulted in less room for routine and informal interactions. Again, this observation revealed a clear understanding of the historical trajectory and development of her area in terms drawn from a long view stretching over decades:

We had allotments there during the war, then all the houses were built, Randolph Court, we've all had to put fences or hedges up you know. Like everything else, you have to get used to it.
(Female 76, Randolph Road)

Another explanation given for the emergence of this individualism or atomisation of community was the ever-increasing role played by the car and an over-reliance on driving to go anywhere. This more than anything minimised opportunities for face-to-face interactions and denied the contexts within which these fragile yet important instances of community could develop. People with cars used supermarkets and not the local shops. As these respondents explained:

I think the car is the main problem, its just cos people drive to work, they drive to the supermarket, they're maybe not using the local shops ... and all the old people who don't own one, they are more rooted, they do things more locally.
(Female 46B, Riverside)

You go for the rolls and they come out of the house and cross the pavement right in front of you and get in the car, normally the older people would have said 'good morning'.
(Female 85, Riverside)

I think also driving as well, cos I do think nobody walks anywhere in the Riverside now. They take their car to the school to pick up the kids if it is raining, at which I am horrified.
(Female 46, Riverside)

The highly critical reference to cars is another common remark made by older people as if cars have made individuals and families more remote from one another, as well as reducing the available social space for community life, ‘We knew everybody that lived along the area because, as I say, there was hardly any cars’ (female 75, Randolph Road).

The question that arises from all of this is just how far this change in people’s sense of community is linked to their age and length of residence? Is it not the case that
older residents exhibit an understandable degree of nostalgia? For older residents in Riverside it seems that, while they share the same space as other residents, their lives demand a different tempo and a different pace. As such they tend to bypass each other as they go about their daily routines:

They’re too busy, they’re working. You must take into consideration that if they’re doing a day’s work they want to come home, they’re not interested. (Male 85, Riverside)

Clearly, this sense of the changed nature of social interaction and the resulting feelings of partial isolation can be related directly to the age of the majority of interviewees. As their contemporaries pass away they feel increasingly isolated. As one of the Randolph respondents detailed, the loss of community was closely linked to the deaths of friends and neighbours, which diminished her own particular friendship and support networks, ‘I’ve lost 47 friends in the last three years …So you realise I’m lonely compared to what I used to be’ (female 93, Randolph Road).

Another Riverside resident reflected a similar sense of loss with the death of her neighbour, ‘My neighbour there, she was a neighbour for 50 years, she died five years ago come April’ (female 79, Riverside). That said, it would be wrong to ignore that there was also a fundamental point being made here about the changing nature of local social relations and interactions in general. As a Riverside resident noted, although she thought not everyone in Riverside would agree, ‘there continues to be a strong community “feel” about the area’. She went on to say, ‘I think that the older people would say that there isn’t as much [community] as there was. I think there is compared to some other areas. But it probably is declining actually, badly’ (female 46B, Riverside). It is also important to appreciate the value of the time-frame some of the respondents can draw on to make their observations on the changing nature of community.

Social memory: telling tales of place

When the respondents were discussing the contemporary period in Riverside, it was noticeable that many of them made a number of references to the longer historical trajectory of Riverside’s development. The ‘settled’ nature of the Riverside seemed to make it ‘normal’ and unproblematic for people to draw on the past as a resource with which to understand, and compare with, the present. Older residents commonly weighed up the present state of Riverside by drawing comparisons with the past:
Ah would think possibly the original housing is one big community, but ah think you’ve got a separate community down maybe at Cooperage Quay. They’re not as integrated into the community. And neither is Forthview. That’s the later developments. A lot of people in the older houses have been here for so long, no one ever moved out of the Riverside at one time. So everyone knew everyone else again but, with the expansion at Cooperage Quay, Forthview, new people coming in and a lot of them, you know, work so you don’t really see a lot.
(Female 63, Riverside)

This use of history as a resource, and with it the tendency to dichotomise both the past and the present, mirrors Tonnies’ (1963) familiar distinction between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft – that is, a distinction between a tight-knit rural society of the post-industrial period and an atomised industrial society with looser social relations. A Riverside resident of 54 years’ standing suggests that the ability to share memories and experiences of the same place, which can stretch back over decades, was a key way in which they could remain connected to a particular space, such as Riverside, in the present:

I mean we can talk about things that folk kind of say ‘what’s she slavering aboot?’ We can go way back to the school, when we were in the forces, oh aye …. The place is changed, it’s all newcomers that are in, I don’t know them … it’s not as it was, a lovely place, a wee bit snobbish but naebody bothered ye.
(Female 79, Riverside)

A respondent from the Raploch has similar recollections of the changes she has experienced:

And I tell ya it was a friendly, it was friendly … everybody knew everybody, you could leave yer door open and just say, your mother would say ‘go and see if Mrs Binton’s needing any messages’. We knew everybody. And at summertime we would sit at the foot of the castle steps and Mr Hardy, he had his violin an’ everybody would sing, everybody knew one another … I’m down here and I only know about two people now. Aye it’s changed, no for the good … the roughness that’s goin’ on and the drug dealers, cursing and swearing, noisy neighbours; nothing gets done about it. They shouldn’t have to be like that in this day and age, maybe I’m an old fusspot.
(Female 86, Raploch)
It seems that the social and historical trajectory of the three areas can be understood by residents by gauging the nature and extent of changes to the internal social structure of the areas in which they live. From the interviews, it seems that all areas are seen to exist in a dynamic rather than a static state, and this can be subject to varying levels of stability and change. Obviously this state of the internal dynamics of an area, and subsequent understandings of attachment, belonging and community, are felt most keenly by older residents. But many of the respondents used historical references and markers such as the deaths of friends and neighbours, the building of new houses and ‘new’ people moving into the area, the increased use of the car and the increasingly impersonal nature of their interactions on the street to allow them to judge the nature and extent of any changes.

Older respondents in particular would often draw on a familiar stock of metaphors when explaining how things have changed. For example, a Raploch resident notes:

  My daughters played, there were all children in the street and they played with one another. If a ball went in the garden they’d go to the door and ask for the ball but now they jump over the garden and get what they want.
  (Female 86, Raploch)

In such ways, the relationships between individuals, houses and streets are understood, reflected on and gauged across a longer time-frame. This evaluation undoubtedly has a degree of nostalgia attached, but at the same time the social changes that are discussed are real and tangible, and these have had, and continue to have, a marked impact on the varying understandings of community.

**Edges, boundaries and differentiated community**

When residents were asked to reflect on who belonged or not, their responses often gave a much more definite sense of who was or who was not part of the community.

Geographical location was very important in throwing both physical and in turn social boundaries around a particular space. Feeling part of a clearly demarcated area that could be distinguished from other areas was an important factor in being able to say you ‘came from’ or ‘belonged’ to that particular place. It helped to define it as ‘home’ – somewhere you could form an association with and identify with.
Certainly, this came across strongly with some of the respondents from Riverside, an area bounded in large part by a long loop of the River Forth and demarcated from Stirling town centre by the railway. A Riverside resident put it down to the boundary made by the course of the River Forth, ‘the river, it feels more like a village … You don’t have to go through it to go anywhere. It feels like an island’ (female 51, Riverside). Another concurred that the slightly isolated nature of the Riverside location was a key to understanding any sense of identity and community that developed there:

Q: What makes Riverside what it is?

I think geography, you know, the actual boundary bit, it helps. I think … Maybe it has got very distinct boundaries, gives it something that a lot of communities don’t, it’s almost like a village, that would be the main thing.

(Female 46B, Riverside)

Another resident of Riverside, and a former Raploch resident, discusses what makes Riverside a separate community:

Q: What do you think has made Riverside what it is? Is it the people? Is it the houses? Is it the location?

Ah think a combination of all three. Probably, Riverside at one time ah think was a little place apart because you had to come over the bridge. The initial housing, you know, was all that was here but ah think with the expansion of the Riverside, at Cooperage Quay and up at Forthview, places like that, the community’s expanded to such an extent, and, ah think, em … This is another thing as well, people are concerned now about this Forthside development, you know. How it’s goin’ to affect the Riverside, but em, no, it definitely is a nice community spirit getting up in Riverside … Ah think it still retains that, a little bit of that separate entity, the Riverside. And you can get away from the sort of city environment as ah think. Cross over the bridge and go through Cambuskenneth, yer into lovely open countryside. And ah think even the fact that you’ve got the river. You’ve got the river at the Raploch but it’s not the feature like it is here. I mean we cross the road there and you’ve got the river. You can follow it right round.

(Female 63, Riverside)
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As with Riverside, it seems that one of the key advantages of the Randolph Road area was its geographical location:

> You’ve got the hospital there, you’ve got the schools up there, you’ve got the primary schools and the High School and it’s not too far to walk into the town, you’ve got the shops up at St Ninians, which are closer, so we’re well catered for.

(Female 76, Randolph Road)

But these locational advantages were about convenience and centrality. They were not about being distinct and separate in a physical boundary sense, as was the case in both Riverside and Raploch.

As we have shown above, there is a need to be cautious about asserting hard edges to any of the three areas that have been studied. As one of the key actors interviewed suggests:

> … within this area, you don’t necessarily see people identifying themselves as coming from Riverside or Randolph Road. Riverside may be partially. You’ll hear people talking about Riverside as an area, you won’t hear people talking about Randolph Road as an area. But Raploch is particularly identifiable.

(Male key actor 2, Stirling)

Raploch shares with Riverside the river boundary but, rather than being central, it has always been seen as isolated and out of the way, hidden on the wrong side of the castle. To get to Raploch you had to pass by the poorhouse, which lay in the gap between the promontory of the Gowanhill and the river at Stirling Bridge. Although the site of the old poorhouse is now a cottage hospital, the unit for homeless people is located in the tenement block that lies immediately below Gowanhill. Raploch was a village and has always kept its separateness and distinctiveness both in a physical and, crucially, in a social sense. Social boundaries are perhaps more significant in this context.

However, internal differentiation should make us cautious about over-homogenising these areas. Communities, spaces and boundaries are often clearly social and cultural in nature, and need to be understood as being in a constant state of flux, of becoming rather than being fixed and frozen. The somewhat physically indistinct nature of Randolph Road often mitigated against it being seen as an identifiable ‘community’. The above respondent commented further:
Yes and I mean you come through and, if you think of the link round the back of the castle, you’re coming through the grand villas of King’s Park and then you’re coming round Castle Rock round the King’s Knot and then there’s Raploch, but there is nothing else, you know, that is the end of Stirling. If you went through it that way and you’ve got the boundary of the river, you’ve got the boundary of the old brig coming up to Lawrence Croft there so … It’s geographically identifiable, if you’re speaking to somebody from Raploch, ‘Where do you come from?’ ‘Raploch’, so I think there is an identifiable area … Randolph Road I wouldn’t necessarily say that’s an identifiable community to me.

(Male key actor 2, Stirling)

The following comment in another of the key actor interviews was made in relation to Randolph Road:

It’s also interesting that, although I have lived in Stirling almost all my days, I don’t really have any idea who lives in Randolph Road. These are places that when you drive through you don’t see people about. No one’s working in their garden, there’s no kids about, there’s no street life. Riverside is also a bit like that. It’s something of a closed shop. Has a big primary but don’t really see many kids about. Both are a bit like the ‘land that time forgot’.

(Male key actor 1, Stirling)

Another key informant also saw the Randolph Road area as being much more nebulous, comparing it negatively to the Raploch and Riverside. For this respondent, the indistinct nature of Randolph Road limited the chance of it being seen as an identifiable community or of a strong sense of place identity forming there:

I think Riverside is one community. I think Randolph Road, as you call it, is hardly a community at all, it’s just a, it’s just part of this no-man’s land between the city centre and, you know, the suburbs. You get it in all cities but it’s hard to define it as a community and I think Raploch probably does operate as four or five different communities and I mean if you actually think about the areas to the west of Raploch Road you know, by the fire station down there, that’s a distinctive area.

(Male key actor 3, Stirling)

In relation to people having a definite sense of who was or who was not part of a community where social boundaries existed, a good example is provided by certain Riverside people’s understandings of those who lived in the newly constructed housing association development in Riverside, Cooperage Quay, which was built in
2000. As one respondent suggested when reflecting on the strength of community in that area, ‘people have felt it [Riverside] has changed because of those bits, the new houses have been added on. Cooperage Quay just seems like a separate area altogether’ (female 46, Riverside). Cooperage Quay was built on the old cooperage, hence the name, right next to the Forth, and there is no physical space between it and the rest of Riverside. However, there is clearly a social gulf in terms of ‘belonging’ in the minds of those long-established Riverside residents with lengthy historical roots to the area: ‘People call it Raploch Quay actually … it’s Riverside and Cooperage Quay, Riverside’s all a community apart from the showground’ and Cooperage Quay’ (female 46, Riverside). A Riverside resident, and former Raploch resident, also talked of the development at the Quay:

Q: Would you say Riverside is best described as one big community?

Ah would think possibly the original housing is one big community, but ah think you’ve got a separate community down maybe at Cooperage Quay. They’re not as integrated into the community. And neither is Forthview. That’s the later developments. A lot of people in the older houses have been here for so long, no one ever moved out of the Riverside at one time. So everyone knew everyone else again but, with the expansion at Cooperage Quay, Forthview, new people coming in and a lot of them, you know, work so you don’t really see a lot. But most of the people round about now are retirement age ah would say in the older housing.

(Female 63, Riverside)

This same resident was also acutely aware of other social changes that had taken place within the Riverside area:

Q: See the older sandstone houses, are they regarded as, as different, or do they see themselves as different?

The bulk, ah think Abbey Road now is predominantly let accommodation. So it’s not as it used to be because, again, they were all mostly owner-occupied and the older houses round about the school, Argyll Avenue, Forrest Road, they were obviously the upper-crust houses because, you know, owner-occupied before any others. But they’re still in the core of the community as it were, because our houses are built all round about them. It’s the ones on the periphery, like Forthview and Cooperage Quay – they’re apart.

(Female 63, Riverside)
Not all agreed with this interpretation of social separation, however. As another respondent stated, when asked if she thought the Cooperage Quay development has had a major negative effect on the area:

I don’t think so. Some people in the hairdresser’s who I get on with would say it has been a bad thing and, you know, that it brought in all these people from the Raploch … ‘it’s lowered the tone’ and all that but I’ve got no reason to think that. I think there is a general perception that it has kind of changed the tone of the area a bit. But that’s not something that I would agree with.
(Female 46B, Riverside)

It should be noted that many in Riverside had expected the council to provide sheltered housing for local older people, instead of general needs housing for those outwith the community. Hence, this partly explains some of the negativity. The fact that there were initially some allocation issues that caused some local concerns added to this.

I would say possibly, maybe a little bit of class distinction came in initially with Cooperage Quay, because there were decants from the Raploch and from St Ninians, ah think.
(Female 63, Riverside)

Clearly, the issues in Riverside relating to the Cooperage Quay development are indicative of the often fragile nature that many perceive a ‘community’ to have, something that can exist in an uneasy and dynamic equilibrium, but that can be easily knocked off its axis (Frazer, 1999). Freud’s notion of the ‘narcissism of small differences’ is perhaps useful in this regard. He notes that:

It is precisely communities with the adjoining territories, and who are related to each other in other ways as well, who are engaged in constant feuds and in ridiculing each other.
(Freud, quoted in Blok, 1998, p. 35)

The point here is that minor differences can loom large and be magnified and, in this way, they can serve a role in emphasising the identity of the ‘original’ or ‘authentic’ group – a constant foil against which their own identity is reinforced and difference asserted. As Lamont suggests:

Boundaries emerge when we try to define who we are: we constantly draw inferences concerning our similarities to, and differences from, others, indirectly producing typification systems.
(Lamont, 1992, p. 11)
The arrival of people from Raploch and St Ninians into Riverside brought to the surface long-held social distinctions or prejudices between what were considered the respectable working class, for whom the council housing in Riverside had been built, and those considered less respectable and less deserving:

The Riverside I knew, they were all just hard-working folk. You could nae say this yin disnae work, or that yin disnae work, there was none of this business o’ running to the broo and off yer work. My husband worked for 56 years on the railway and never had a day off work.

(Female 79, Riverside)

As we can see from the above, an awareness of the internal differentiation of areas comes through strongly in the interviews:

Ah think a lot o’ folk eh, think that the folk doon here are a bit toffee-nosed, but they’re no really! They’re no! But yes, ah suppose there’s maybe some folk might think it’s a bit snobbish. Ah’m no snobbish an’ ah’ve never ever been but that wis what ah wis sorta sayin’ like that ma husband wis brought up down here an’ ah used tae say tae him, ‘You don’t know you’ve been born!’ no really, because it’s so nice doon here [Riverside] … ah know ah wis brought up in the Raploch! That is me! That is the way I talk! And ah can’t change it, ah won’t try to change it! … Eh, an’ none o’ the rest o’ the family speak like ah do because they were a’ brought up abroad or down in Shornecliff in England and that, so they’re a’ quite well-spoken [laughs] … So, yes, if ye come from the Raploch ye are kina, an’ you know the people doon there were genuine people, they were! Would nae like to go back an’ live there now! Ah’ll be honest with you, but em, aye they were genuine an’ they helped one another.

(Female 73, Riverside)

Other respondents discussed the internal differentiation, such as it is, in Riverside and drew on their understanding of the historical development of Riverside as a community. One noted:

I think it is one big community now. I think in the past there may have been a bit of a divide between what was seen as the private houses and the council houses, but I think that is much less now. There may be a little resistance to the new Cooperage bit [the new housing association development] and the Abbey Mills bits [new private flats] … I think they are seen as a bit yuppyish. On the whole it is seen as one community. There is definitely a perception that there are more kids hanging
around the streets and more crime, which I try to counter. I have lots of interesting discussions at the hairdresser’s about this … We don’t get a lot of trouble I don’t think.
(Female 46B, Riverside)

The same respondent gives a detailed account of how she views any social divisions within Riverside:

Age … there are the kind of older people who have been there a long time who would maybe think that the place is full of incomers and all that stuff, and then there’s … a kind of middle-class professional sort of group and they’re all social workers and civil servants and teachers and things. And then there are groups of kinda young parents who go to the playgroup or the nursery at the school, I think a lot of people get to know each other through that. Not divisive groups, it has changed over the years, you need to speak to people who have been there longer.
(Female 46B, Riverside)

Another respondent recalls some, in her view entrenched, social divisions within the Randolph Road area:

When we moved to Randolph Road in the early sixties, there were clearly two communities, those that lived in ‘Snobs’ Alley’, the large Edwardian houses, and those who lived in the bungalows. Not that bungalows were a uniform group, in that two were owned by the National Coal Board for mine managers, a couple were owned by the hospital for visiting doctors and one was a manse. So there were both owners and tied housing.
(Female 65, Randolph Road)

The often complex and subtle, from an outsider’s point of view at least, nature of these internal distinctions and in some cases divisions within particular localities is again expressed by the following comment from a resident of ‘the’ Raploch: ‘There are those who like to say they don’t come fae Raploch. The nearer the town the less you say you’re from Raploch, you’re Drip Road. The further west then yir Raploch’ (male 63, Raploch). Within a particular place, the divisions can be very subtle and hard to observe if you are not from a particular area. The following comments from an older couple living in Raploch highlight this:

M:  Ah’ll put it this way tae you, when ah wis doon at that other end o’ the Raploch an’ ah come up tae this end o’ the Raploch, ah found that the people doon that end o’ the Raploch were more friendly an’ neighbourly than this end.
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\( F: \) Ah think they're strange. Ah mean they're no like neebours. Well there's one or two nice people.

\( M: \) Ah noticed it the first time ah come up here. Hardly spoke tae you, they hardly. Ah mean in the summer you used tae everybody oot haein' a blether ay? Especially the women, the men were workin' ... Ah mean yer no wantin' tae live in somebody's hoose. Yer no wantin' tae go an' like the neebours next door, yer no wantin' tae go an' live in their hoose an' know everythin' aboot them, their business an' that, cos that's up tae them. But if ye see, oh ah don't know. There's jist ye know, the feelin's no the same ... Aye there's somethin' funny aboot this street.

(Male and female 64, Raploch)

This division within Raploch, between one side of the Drip Road and the other, was commented on by another respondent:

Oh very much so, you know, I mean I remember a time when there was, you know, they had these street parties and things like that for all the different occasions then, you know, and they were, the Raploch's split ... the two sides and never the twain shall meet.

(Male key actor 5, Stirling)

So there are clearly edges and boundaries, both physical and social, that separate different communities from each other, reflecting in a way the famous John Cleese, Ronnie Barker and Ronnie Corbett sketch about the upper, the middle and the working classes. What is evident from this study is that, within each of these communities, there are also subtle nuances of minor difference that act to separate those within each of those communities. The best example of this was Riverside where the impact of new development had introduced new groups to what was deemed a stable community. The housing association property resulted in an influx of people deemed socially inferior, whereas the new private housing introduced 'yuppies', who were not considered long-term stayers. Riverside was also split between the old substantial private housing and the council stock. Although the social divisions were breaking down, largely because of the transformation of the housing into the private market with the Right to Buy and subsequent sales following the death of the long-standing residents, a distinction still existed. The 'show people's' site, which was considered separate – and that was confirmed by the show people interviewed – illustrated how long-lasting these divisions were. That said, the 'show people' also made clear that they liked the idea of being considered separate but at the same time a unique part of Riverside:
Now you’re there talkin’ about the community, there was a time when they was talkin’ about moving this site. And there was a meeting in a hall around here and they were trying to discuss where they was going to put us, so one man got up and he says … ‘They’ve been here longer than half the people that’s in this hall!’, he says, ‘There’s never been a policeman come in this gate, there’s never been a case in the court from here!’, he says, ‘And your talkin’ about shiftin’ these people out of here!’, he says, ‘Think well on what you’re doin’!’ And he went on a bit further than that. Well after that they must have discussed it, went up to the council and this is a designated site now. So the community accept us, well look at the people we meet going down to Riverside! We can stop and talk to anybody and it’s not that they don’t notice us, we don’t hide the fact that we’re round here.
(Male 85, Riverside)

The hierarchy of distinctions and social division within Raploch was also evident:

Cos it makes me mad when they say, if yer waitin’ they say, ‘Ye come frae the Raploch’. Ah says, ‘Excuse me, ah don’t come from the Raploch, ah come from the Drip Road’. See we’re Drip Road, we’re no Raploch. The Raploch is after St Mark’s Church. Because, when we came here, our postal address wis the Drip Road, an ah don’t class masel’, ah say, ‘Drip Road, not Raploch’. That’s how ah feel.
(Female 86, Raploch)

As one of the key actors who had been brought up in the area, and had represented it for years as a councillor, also noted:

There was a social status … obviously one side of the Drip Road thought themselves better than the other side. And, even within that other side, the bits round about Craighall Street now which face on to the motorway always thought themselves a bit above the core Weir Street, Hope Street, Glendevon area. Which was where most of the social problems were to be fair. I mean I identified that as a kid that there was a lot of poverty in there you know.
(Male key actor 5, Stirling)

Different development phases clearly play a part in this process, in that the Orlit housing in Glendevon had always been considered poor and consequently unpopular. With Raploch about to embark on another major regeneration programme designed to transform the estate, we are currently witnessing another significant
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piece of social turmoil that will create other marked social divisions that will take many years if ever to reconcile themselves. The rehousing records following the clearance of Glendevon showed the vast majority of people opted to be rehoused within Raploch, rather than move elsewhere. So Raploch has become, if anything, more concentrated and consequently more socially deprived. This will be in marked contrast to the envisaged residents of the new private housing about to be built on the other side of Drip Road, where once the Orlit housing stood.

Similar distinctions were also noted in Randolph Road between the different phases of development, because each brought with it a perceived difference in the people who lived there – another case of Freud’s ‘narcissism of minor difference’. Such differences exist within all communities and they are also important in all communities as long as the differences are not too major. Where they are major, it appears conflicts arise.

Summary

This chapter explored the various dimensions of belonging and identity that were revealed by the resident interviews, and the perspectives of outsiders looking in at these three neighbourhoods. Each of the three ‘communities’ has a distinct and different developmental history in terms of initial and subsequent construction, housing tenures and the associated socio-economic profiles of people who have lived there. There are very long-standing identities attached to each area, despite the various changes in housing and people that have taken place over time. We found clear understandings of belonging, community and place attachment, and a shared acceptance of the identity attached to that locality and of identities within these localities. It was also evident that, within these ‘communities’, there were subtle and at times less subtle distinctions between those who belonged and those who belonged but perhaps should not have done.
4 Gender, class and religion

This chapter explores how the notions of community and neighbourhood identity are influenced by gender, class and religious identity. The core question that the chapter seeks to answer is whether there is a difference in the understanding of the identity of particular places and notions of ‘community’, given the influence of these different social lenses. Based on the evidence that emerged from this study, we consider the term community to mean what it is like to live in a particular locality, whereas identity is more of a label, how a particular place is viewed externally. The chapter explores how women and children play a particular role in concepts of community and how historic patterns of employment for men have informed the social identity of particular neighbourhoods.

Women, family and children

Across many of the interviews, there was a powerful sense that community emerged as a consequence of strong family groupings, inextricably linked to networks of women and children. Within the family, the role of women was considered central, if not core. When respondents mentioned the term family, it was often used as shorthand for, or strongly implied, the role of women. Women and their families were seen to characterise each of these three neighbourhoods and informed the basis of differentiating between them and defining what is the ‘essence’ of each place.

From the interviews, the nature of the family, its size and composition, was a defining feature between the three neighbourhoods. The Raploch was regularly discussed as a place characterised by large families and associated interconnecting family networks. As was noted in Chapter 3, there are a number of long-established family names that have existed in the Raploch for generations. This was the most common reason given for suggesting that it had, and still has, a strong sense of community. It is family that defines community in the Raploch. As one of the key actor respondents observed, ‘in the Raploch obviously it is more family based and, you know, that goes back for many generations’ (male key actor 2, Stirling). Riverside, by contrast, was seen to be more individualised in relation to families and Randolph Road even more so. There was not the same prevalence of large interconnected families, rather both these areas have a set of distinct and separate family units. While the extended family does exist, it is not immediately resident, rather it is, as in the case of Riverside, spread out across the Stirling area, and in Randolph Road the wider family is spread throughout the country. This difference can be very much related to social
class and employment patterns, in that the most economically mobile move to exploit employment opportunities elsewhere and thus do not retain the same connections with their immediate family. Those with less skills to offer may be less mobile and may find themselves shackled to the local area and thus better able to retain close family connections.

It was clear that, irrespective of the actual size and scale of a woman’s immediate family, her role in raising a family, and in organising events and activities around child rearing, was perceived as being critical to the development of a sense of community. As one of the key actor respondents observed:

So, if you use community in the wider sense, I think you can become attached to it very quickly provided you have family circumstances that allow you to get there and I think that is largely related to children … I think it really is a function of family circumstance … it’s very evident that you get quite a number of clan families, people who go back three, four generations and so they’re a key part of the community and … you know that they’re there for the duration. The kids don’t disappear when they leave school, they come back or they take their apprenticeships and stay in the community … Take the children out of the equation, is it really their community?
(Male key actor 2, Stirling)

It was also clear that this is now regarded as being under threat because of the change in patterns of female employment. Where our respondents refer to such a change in that now ‘everyone’ is out working, what they generally mean is that married and co-habiting women are out ‘at work’. The observation is that mothers are simply not around the area during the day to maintain the routine socialising that is so necessary in constructing the sense of a community. In addition, with both partners away from home during the day, it is assumed that they would be less likely to spend time out of the family home in the evenings. While this does provide a common sense and commonly shared explanation for a perceived decline of community feeling, it might be considered that, given the skewed nature of the age profile of interviewees, this is very much the perspective from an older generation. It is revealing, however, that one of our younger respondents from Raploch also placed a strong emphasis on long-lasting friendships and acquaintances as being crucial to a sense of belonging to a community:

Aye I would say that definitely there is because like it’s, like it’s back there it was like kind o’ who knows them and like when you come intae it, it’s like a lot o’ groups as well o’ people and who you like hung around wi’ and like it’s all there whoever and like that’s how you kind of made
friends through other people as well but then like when you grew up in a community there’s always the same people there every summer when you’re over the park playing and like you kind o’ always grew up wi’ the same, you grew up wi’ them eh, all the same people.

(Female 22, Raploch)

Being about during the day, looking after, dropping off and picking up children created numerous opportunities for small day-to-day social interaction within the immediate area. It could be simply a matter of groups of women ‘blethering’, as was often mentioned. Or, as one woman recalled of her school days, ‘And eh, a’ the mothers, if you lived near enough – and most of us did live near enough – they used to come up to the school gates and that wi’ a play-piece fur ye [laughs]’ (female 73, Raploch). The importance of women not working and bringing up their children to developing a local sense of community was put clearly by one Riverside resident:

Also, the whole thing about women working, there is a difference there. I think there is a big difference at the playgroups … it’s not men that make communities it’s the women … [Now] women are going from their house to the cars and never being part of the community and arrive back when everybody is in the house.

(Female 46, Riverside)

One of our respondents was a very long-term resident of Randolph Road and her memories of neighbourliness are very similar to the women in the other two areas:

Yes in the past it was a very, very friendly road. Everybody knew everybody else, it was much shorter than it is now and everybody knew everybody and everybody was friendly. It was really very, very nice. We used to play games out, although we were grown you know, we were married and had children but we used to play games out on the street.

(Female 92, Randolph Road)

This ability to play was clearly linked to the absence of cars in the street and to the fact that they, as women, had an excuse, as they were all mothers with young children:

The mothers, we all met, everybody was so friendly you had coffee with this one today and coffee with that one tomorrow, you know. Then you had them all here and I used to bring six women home with me from the church on a Sunday.

(Female 92, Randolph Road)
At a more organised level, though still self-generated, were events such as gala days and trips to the seaside. Again, it was the women who were core, as they were the ones who organised and attended these events. The gala is no longer held in Raploch, but it is remembered with great affection by respondents as very much a true community event, organised by and for the local population. In fact, as one respondent pointed out, there were at one time two galas in Raploch:

Two sort of events, yes the big gala was the one on the other side of the road, that was really big ... but Ochil Crescent area wi' its park and all that, we held various events like street parties in there as well when I was younger ... I remember a time when ... they had these street parties and things like that for all the different occasions ... Raploch was split, as you probably identified, the two sides and never the twain shall meet. And I was on the Ochil Crescent ... down Hay Gardens, near the old bridge ... That was the posher bit. So, but I mean we did mix and we would go to the galas over the other side. The galas were the mark of it, there was a big Raploch gala every year you know and there was an awful lot of organisation needed to run the galas. People from the big families you know [organised them].

(Male key actor 5, Stirling)

Of a similar nature, was the role of one of our respondents in organising a children's bus trip to Burntisland in Fife. The rationale was that this was ‘the only time that some o’ the bairns got onywhere’ out of the Raploch’ (Female 63, Raploch). Families would pay for the trip by giving her so much per week. Although our respondent spoke about the ‘people in the Raploch’, it is clear that this was very much a female and family event, as she went on to say that the ‘grannies and aunties came on the trips as well’ (female, 63, Raploch).

All of the women interviewed had direct experience of paid employment. This was expected of them immediately they finished school. The length of time in employment varied according to when their first child was born. Most women would return to work once their families were ‘up’, and how long this period lasted would depend on the number of children they had and the age at which they had their last born. That pattern is, of course, quite different to many of their daughters. In each of our three areas, many younger women now continue in paid employment while they bring up their children. One couple, who have recently purchased an ex-council property and moved into Riverside, are illustrative of this. They can be described as ‘professional’, the husband being an architect, the wife working for a bank, and their employment demands that they commute to Edinburgh on a daily basis. Both are in
their mid 30s and they started their own family just a couple of years ago. The wife was on maternity leave, but intended to return to her job. At one level, they seem to have a typical ‘individualised’ existence, but they are still partially reliant on family support. Rather than enrol their eldest child in a nursery in Edinburgh, they chose Stirling ‘because of the presence of a family “support network” nearby’ (female 35, Riverside). What is particularly revealing in this case is that the woman’s mother had also worked for the same bank, but had been told directly by the management when she had her first child that she would have to leave her job. As a middle-class mother, living in the King’s Park district of Stirling, she never went out to work in paid employment again.

While there is a wistfulness about this loss of community, which is ascribed to women’s changing roles, there is no blame attached to younger women, rather a recognition that the world has changed and economic circumstances now demand different family arrangements. At the same time, there appeared to be little sense of resentment on the part of our older female respondents that they had missed out on possible careers. Those women who had married and had children were happy that they had become full-time housewives. They were ‘there’ for their children, as their mothers had been for them.

I was quite glad to stay at home with the kids when they were growing up. And it wasn’t that, I mean, Tom was jist a labourer in the Precast, but you got there jist the same. We had our holidays every year, it might only be a caravan at St Andrews, chalet at Burntisland, but we had super holidays and, as ah say, you were here for your children. Cos I had the same experience, ma mum was always there for me, but then ma mum was in a different situation too, because I have a brother, David, there who is mentally handicapped and eh, he’s actually in a home down the Borders, a superb place. So ma mum had David, but she also looked after ma grandfather and her brother and sister who had never married. They were in the house so [laughs] ma mum was more or less a carer, you know, all her days. So, but as I say, she was always there.

(Female 63, Raploch)

The decline in the actual size of families may also have contributed to the decline in such events because there were fewer children to cater for and less women about in the community during the day to do the work. One respondent remembered that it was at one time very odd to see a small family. Coming from a family of ten himself, he recalled that there were:
Bigger families than us. The Laffertys had about 15 or 16. The Lennons were the biggest, ah think they were 22, but they had twins an’ that tae. Ay the Lennons fae Raploch road. It wis funny tae see a wee family, ye’d say ‘that’s a queer family, only two bairns’. Cos it wis a’ big families.
(Male 63, Raploch)

While families generally may be smaller than before, Raploch still has a reputation for larger families than is the norm elsewhere, as the following quote from a younger respondent reveals:

Well, when I was at school, it was like there was more like three or four in the family, but like it was quite common to have two as well, but obviously my next, my mum and dad’s next-door neighbours, they’ve got ten kids eh, so that was a big family and like I wasn’t really aware of like that big a family like when I was younger and like their youngest, their baby, is only really like 2, so like they’ve had a big family like most o’ my life really and even like the now they’ve got a big family, but just quite young, but I wouldn’t really say that like I knew a lot o’ people that had like eight or nine kids or more. It was more really similar to what, what my family was.
(Female 22: Raploch)

However, while their mothers had large families, they themselves did not. The older cohort of women interviewed were part of a very significant demographic transition, in that they themselves had only a few children and some none at all. One respondent, who was one of nine children born at the ‘tap o’ toun’, pointed out that neither she nor any of her siblings had large families:

Well none o’ us have had big families. Ma sister Carrie had four. An’ Margaret had five. Frank had two. Harry and George had two. David had two an’ ah had two.
(Female 86, Raploch)

With fewer children, then, the time women spent looking after them reduced and the opportunity to return to work increased. This was greatly aided by the major changes occurring in the labour market in the 1960s onwards for women.

The perceived change from a situation where everyone knew everyone else to the more anonymous interaction of today was clearly linked to these social changes, and in particular to the growth of women’s paid employment. As one woman said in response to a question on community life, ‘There’s not the community there was, there’s not the community feeling there was years ago’. She went on to explain, ‘I think it’s because the women are out working … So that’s changed the whole
aspect of living in a community because they're not there during the day' (female 75, Riverside).

So, it would again appear that it is not so much large or grandiose gestures, such as building a sports hall or creating a play park, that creates a community; rather, as was noted in the previous chapter, community is generated by an infinitesimal number of small, at times almost invisible, gestures and transactions. In the recent past, women stayed at home to bring up the children, and consequently were a major source and conduit for such gestures and transactions. It was, and still is, mothers with children who engage actively with the other members of the community they meet going about their daily business. Thus was created that sense of community. Contemporary practices and social arrangements – in particular, the economic necessity for women to be working – are seen by many of the respondents to be squeezing out the available time to have these interactions. As a consequence, a shared and tangible community ‘feeling’ is less intense.

**Men and employment**

For working-class men, the world of employment was always a major determinant of both their status and identity. From this study it can be seen most clearly among the miners. While Stirling had no mines within the immediate boundaries of the royal burgh, there were various pits lying adjacent to the town, such as Bannockburn and Plean. In the early twentieth century, the coal industry expanded, with new pits being sunk at Bandeath and Polmaise. Since the pit owners refused to build new houses, large numbers of miners migrated into Stirling itself – most usually to the slum district at the ‘tap o’ toun’ – in search of cheap lodgings (Stirling District Council, no date). They also moved into the village of Raploch, which was long regarded as a labouring, and in time became a mining, community. The influx to the ‘tap o’ toun’ only worsened what was already a severe slum problem in Stirling’s medieval old town and, in the late 1920s and early 1930s, many of these men and their families found themselves rehoused in the Raploch.

Before the council housing was built, Raploch was in large part a mining village. An older woman, brought up in the ‘tap o’ toun’ before moving to Raploch, recalled that miners were the most numerous workers, ‘Oh aye, they were a’ miners. Most o’ them were miners’ (female 86, Raploch). When she was asked if the miners were looked upon, or regarded themselves, as different, her reply was firmly in the negative, yet contained a description that could apply only to miners, ‘No, no, no, no different no. They were grafters. Ah kin mind o’ them comin’ wi’ their faces a’ black an’ everything ye know’ (female 86, Raploch).
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It is clear from the documentary sources that certain streets in Raploch contained heavy concentrations of miners, as was evident from the valuation roll employment information discussed in the previous chapter. At the time of the initial tenancies being taken up, it was clear that there was a distinction in the rents charged and this produced, at least initially, a concentration of miners in certain streets. In our interviews, however, no one recognised this spatial segregation. Every Raploch respondent recalled the many miners who resided within the area, but all insisted that they lived interspersed throughout the whole scheme and not in specific clusters or streets. One man, a miner himself who was born in the 1940s, was quite insistent about this:

In they days ah wid say the biggest majority, but don’t call it a mining village, but the biggest majority were miners, cos there used tae be two buses came in the mornin’. One at 20 to six an’ one at ten to six. Was miners cos there are a awful lot of miners.
(Male 63, Raploch)

When the same man was asked if the miners lived in distinct streets:

Naw, naw it wis a’ mixed. Naw there were nane o’ that, naw. Oh naw, naw, naw, naw, it wisnae. It wis jist a typical place ay? Ah loved it, ah loved every minute.
(Male 63, Raploch)

It is not clear to us whether this response was simply due to the memory an individual had of the street he was brought up in or whether there was a desire to somehow defend the community, or his memory of it, to insist on the essential unity of that past community. Nonetheless, it is clear that the miners were seen as, if not separate, at least possessing a special or distinct identity. It may have been the case that, as the economic power of miners increased and as rent levels became more uniform across council housing as a result of the introduction of rent ‘pooling’ after the 1935 Housing Act, the initial spatial clustering dissipated.

The local folklore in respect of the miners was not necessarily linked just to solidarity or respectability:

Ma memory o’ miners wis that they liked a good bevy. Gamblin’. Ye had the gamblin’ school doon the water tae. Ye used tae go doon there an’ watch it. Hundreds o’ men!
(Male 63, Raploch)
Another respondent, a woman born in the early 1930s with no direct mining connections, had very similar memories:

There were a lot o’ miners in the area, because there were a lot o’ pits round about Plean, Manorpowis, an’ whatever, Fallin, and eh, there wis always a pitch and toss school goin’ on … And eh, they a’ wore you know thon white knitted silk mufflers wi’ the fringes on, they a’ had them and bunnets, an’ they had their lookouts. So eh, cos the police must have sort of, ah don’t know, it was gamblin’ because there used to be quite a lot o’ money could be won an’ lost in these pitch and toss schools. Ye never hear aboot pitch and toss noo!
(Female 73: Raploch)

This woman was aware of miners being different, especially in the way they dressed:

… ah used tae wonder, come tae think on it, ah used tae wonder why ma dad didnae wear a white muffler, an’ you know the two-tone shoes that they used tae wear, ken how you got thon white an’ whatever. Ma dad must’ve been quite conservative ah suppose [laughs].
(Female 73, Raploch)

While mining was the dominant employer in Raploch for a long period, it died a very rapid death following the miners’ strike in 1984. This was a particularly hard period for many in Raploch and this couple remembered it as the worst time in their lives:

\[M:\] Ken if ye’re on strike fur a year ye’ve got nothin’ mind. Ye’ve got nothin’ tae feed yer bairns.

\[F:\] We got nothin’ fae naebody.

\[M:\] Naebody gave us nothin’. An a had a family, naebody came tae ma door.

\[F:\] A’ year we never had nothin’ comin’ in.

\[M:\] Ah mean ye had. Actually, ye got a wee bit butcher meat on a Friday.

\[F:\] Oh it wis horrendous. Whit dae ye dae when ye’ve got three o’ family?

\[M:\] Ah but the other two were up Liz. But Donald, 14 year old, he’s ma
youngest, ye see ah’d say, ‘There’s nothin’ tae eat the day’. An’ he widnae bother. Bairns wid scream ay? He wid turn roon an say, ‘That’s a’ right’.

F: If ah made a pot o’ soup that’d needed tae dae us two, three days ay? Somethin’ like that. Oh it wis terrible, terrible.

(Male/female 63, Raploch)

It was also the case that Raploch had long been supported by a range of labouring employment. While the coal mines provided the mainstay of male employment for two generations, the other places of largely manual work were located at the rubber factory at Cornton, just across the river, Kildean Market, to the north, Duncan’s lemonade works, Alexander’s coach works, the cooperage and the small linoleum works in Riverside, as well as the Player’s tobacco factory and the royal ordnance works. As the economic situation changed, local opportunities for this type of work quickly died out, leaving the estate long recognised as a poverty blackspot (as was noted in Chapter 2) with one of the highest unemployment rates in Scotland, and in turn, one of the most deprived communities in Scotland.

The employment patterns in the other areas were not defined by large-scale single employment. There were, however, marked social distinctions between these areas. Riverside, as was illustrated in the previous chapter in relation to initial housing allocations, was very much skilled blue collar and white collar, although there was locally based labouring work, as was noted above. This pattern continued throughout the twentieth century. As such, the male workers here were considered a cut above those in Raploch, who were in the main unskilled and semi-skilled labourers. The real distinction was, however, in terms of social class, in that there were no stories emerging of heavy drinking, violence and gambling in Riverside, nor for that matter in Randolph Road. The identity articulated in the Riverside interviews was of respectable, sober, hard-working, churchgoing Presbyterian members of the working class. Over the years, this pattern has changed as this age cohort has died off and a new group of young middle-class professionals, largely employed in the local public sector, has moved in. Again, they were respectable stalwarts of the community. As one of the key actors put it:

Riverside [had] a large number of people who are of a similar age, I’m thinking about what we may call the urban professional elsewhere, and they’ve gone into the area, they’ve made contact initially through maybe their children, maybe their work. A lot of them have overlapping professional contacts and they’ve very often bonded very strongly … I’ve
been out at evening functions with groups of people from Riverside and you realise what a strong bond that is. I mean you know of people who lived there for a long period of time … always have 30, 40 … friends and neighbours around and very clearly it was an important part of [their] life to have that sort of friendship … the children started it, but what cemented it is that interest in whether it was the environment, whether it was outdoor activities, whether it was a type of music or … what newspapers you read … [or] going to the cinema.

(Key actor male 3, Stirling)

Randolph Road, for its part, differed from Riverside, as this was a professional area with a significant number of the men commuting to Glasgow to work. So, while employment in Riverside was still largely locally based (although this has changed in the last 20 years), employment for men living in Randolph Road was generally further afield. Initially, as was noted in the valuation roll analysis of the employment of the original residents, Randolph Road housed Stirling’s local professionals, including bank managers, doctors and lawyers, as well as shop owners. With the demise of local professions, there is now far more outward commuting and this has become a predominant feature of the local economy. As one of the female respondents observed, in commenting on the local employment pattern in Randolph Road, the men worked hard and were not really about, but generally died young. The women, by contrast, after they had children, never really worked and in her opinion lived far longer. The evidence challenges the generalisation that single women always worked, whereas married women in Randolph Road did jump in and out of work at different times after the children had left school, but rarely on a full-time basis.

The more contemporary situation for the three areas has seen much less reliance on particular types of employment, such as mining, for giving an area a particular identity. This was always more pronounced historically for Raploch in any case. That said, the social class differentiation in respect of employment status has not really altered. Yes, the types of employment pursued in both Riverside and Randolph Road may now be more similar, but, given the marked difference in house prices between the two areas, Randolph Road is still very much higher status in both employment and housing terms. And, for Raploch, there has been a marked deterioration in its employment status, with the neighbourhood still having the poorest unemployment record in Central Scotland (see Table 1 in Chapter 2).

So, it would appear from the evidence provided by this study that all generalised social identities of these areas still bear the stamp of their particular historic male employment histories. As one interviewee put it in relation to Raploch:
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Raploch was and still is seen as a rough, tough place, a ‘cowboy area’ in the same way as Fallin, Cowie and Cornton. Interesting that these are all old mining communities.
(Male key actor 3, Stirling)

The social identity and status of these neighbourhoods is defined largely by historic and consequently outmoded male employment patterns. The employment and consequently social status attributed to these areas is male. While there clearly was a long history of female employment, and especially within Raploch, this does not feature in the construction of neighbourhood identity. Where women feature is in the creation, nurturing and sustaining of notions of community. Social identity and community are, therefore, gendered. While women may play the key role in creating, nurturing and sustaining community, it is male employment that goes a long way to construct the externally and internally perceived social identity of the neighbourhoods, and consequently their relative status.

Social class and social stigma

From the interview data we can see that, even within the context of physically distinct areas, a complex and long-standing process of internal differentiation can occur and be maintained. For some Raploch residents, the ‘real’ Raploch area was that which is situated west of the Drip Road, and one woman interviewee kept to a close geographical limit around her house, ‘We never went beyond this street, I never went to that side o’ the Raploch. I had no cause to go there, it was always up the town we went’ (female 86, Raploch). For other respondents, the recent construction of new houses and flats in the Randolph Road area was not seen to pose a problem for the continuation of a community feeling, although this woman felt there seemed to be little prospect of the old, well-established residents and the newer population integrating:

I think it has probably improved, cos that was just a lane [before], you know quite a dark dingy lane, now it’s all well lit. It’s quite a moving population … you can tell by the mothers walking their children up to school … at the beginning of the winter term it’s different people that are walking, they have obviously moved.
(Female 76, Randolph)

To be seen to ‘come from’ one of the three areas under study clearly carries with it connotations that you are a particular type of person, with a particular lifestyle, set of
dispositions and attitudes. For most it seems that to ‘come from’ Riverside generally meets with a familiar and predictable response. A Riverside resident of 12 years’ standing outlines this by now familiar (to her) response:

I think people think of it as being a respectable part of the town, you know, King’s Park snobby posh, but Riverside you’re that sort of respectable middle-class professional, but not too posh do you know what I mean, you’ve still got your feet on the ground. I think people would look at you quite favourably knowing you come from the Riverside.

(Female 46B, Riverside)

A resident of 50 years echoed similar sentiments, ‘The first thing they say is “that’s a lovely place”, “what a nice area” and the people that live here wouldn’t like to live anywhere else (male 85, Riverside).

Such notions of social hierarchy, based on place and belonging, are of course well established (Roberts, 1971) and seem to have great longevity within and between the areas under study. As a Riverside resident recalls of her and her sister’s experiences, and as the quote illustrates, their children still experience the same:

When we were at school [1960s and 1970s] if you came from the Riverside you were a snob … you suffered from it, from people from the Raploch, Fallin, Cornton. It still happens.

(Female 51, Riverside)

The particular social and economic histories of each area clearly impact on their contemporary identities, and this is manifest in understandings of class and status labels ascribed to each area. In this way, the historical and the contemporary, via the individual and social memories of the interviewees, are collapsed together in individuals’ characterisations and accounts of these particular areas. This is illustrated in the following quote:

Well the Raploch was basically working class you know, from one end to the other, and I would say there was a fair, a fairly high percentage unemployable, you know … where Huntly Crescent, Duff Street, Atholl Place, that sort of area you know, I think that was sometimes the people that went into these houses were the first in and I don’t think they behaved you know, you would hear of people storing coal in the bath.

(Male 79, Raploch and Riverside)
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Such comments regarding the lawlessness of its denizens echoed earlier press reports from the nineteenth century and, in selecting Raploch as a site for council house development, councillors were almost certainly aware of this existing reputation. It is perhaps revealing that Sheriff Moores, in proposing the site in 1924 to the Housing Committee for erection of housing for the ‘working classes’, recommended Raploch by name and less specifically ‘other lands’.

Raploch’s pre-existing reputation before the advent of council housing meant that the area and its inhabitants would almost certainly be labelled with a particular sort of reputation. The local press, as far back as the mid-nineteenth century, could make unflattering comments about Raploch such as the ‘most disgraceful stench around the dwellings of the poor (principally the lower class of Irish)’ (Stirling Observer, 10 September 1857). While there were some local figures prepared to see the inhabitants, including the Irish, in a more positive light, negative accounts were always more usual, such as the following from the 1870s:

Raploch – labourers to hire – not standing but lying all the day idle. In these days it is said that labour is abundant and labourers few and difficult to be had, either for love or money. If any one should take a walk along the Raploch any of these good days he will be led to think that surely matters must be far otherwise, as he will find there at all times of the day a number of able-bodied men squatting on the green sward on the road side, some lying on back, some on belly, some on side, some half-sitting with pipe in mouth and all glabbering away in the Connaught brogue. And yet this is the class of people on whose behalf the Rev Paul McLachlan pleads with so much zeal and eloquence at our parochial board, and who are so kindly supplied from the soup kitchen by the generous ladies of Stirling, when their day of need comes. (Stirling Observer, 1 August 1872)

A trawl through the local press of the 1920s and 1930s betrays deep-seated attitudes to this area and, by the 1930s, crime reporting draws attention to the miscreant’s address before the crime itself – for example, ‘Raploch young men appear before the Sheriff’ (Stirling Journal and Advertiser, 16 January 1936). That there was considerable crime in the area is not in dispute; sheriff court records as well as press reports provide ample evidence of this. However, the very name Raploch brings with it certain assumptions and almost determines a response from outsiders. Even though the Chief Inspector at Central Police currently regards Raploch as low down on his list of problem areas, it remains the community within Stirling most associated with crime and anti-social behaviour.
The inhabitants of Raploch are aware of this reputation and regard it as unjust. As one of the younger respondents noted:

I suppose it means like people have got a lot of expectations on you when they find that you come frae the Raploch and people think that you're hard and that you'll fight them and that you're … from a rough area and … people think it's a really bad area but like it isnae really as bad as people think. I think it's just had a lot of hype behind it but I suppose people just assume that you, you're kind of unemployed or in a rubbish job or … you've got three weans tae four different, well three different guys or whatever … It's no' the place I want to spend the rest of my life like but it's no' that I think it's a really bad place to live, it's just that like I've grew up there all my life and it's no' the best place in the world to live either so …
(Female 22, Raploch)

As is hinted at in the above interview, there is at the same time a sense of pride in having been brought up in a rough area. One woman, in recalling her school days, noted:

You had tae learn tae stick up fur yersel' doon there, ye really had. Em, but aye, it wis happy, it was em, good memories o' that. Ah mean they talk aboot bullyin' and that in schools, it always went on! And everybody sorta says they don't agree wi' the belt and you read a' these things that the academics think that corporal punishment it, but ah don't think it did us, ah really don't think it did us any harm! It was sore!
(Female 73, Raploch)

Another couple recalled that they regarded the rougher bit of Raploch as more friendly, but the following is a more general comment:

Ah think whit made it a rough area, they had nothin'. An' ah think they shoved a' the rubbish doon there. Ah mean a lot o' them used tae live up the top o' the toon at one time. An ah think it wis because people had nothin' – they's hae their wee fights an' that, ay, but it wis like an auld minin' community. Ye'd hae yer wee battles, they werenae bad.
(Male 63, Raploch)

Another respondent clearly thought that the embattled self-image and negative perceptions of others was a key way in which Raploch's strong sense of self and community was developed and maintained:
Friends, neighbours and family all play a part in creating a sense of community. It’s often about creating links, relations with the small block of people around you. In a new estate it can be a case of getting out a bottle of wine and finding some common cause. Within Raploch the common cause is the stigma that attaches to the place, it tends to bind people together. People have a tendency to stick to their own. We get trainees in here doing school or college placements, most know little about Stirling, but every one of them has heard about Raploch, Mags Hainey, drugs and it being a rough place. I listen for a while and then tell them I was born and brought up there. Their reactions are interesting.

(Male key actor 1, Stirling)

The identity ascribed to Randolph Road was entirely different. Another of the key actor respondents emphasised what he saw as the ‘private’, individualised and somewhat atomised nature of social relations in the Randolph Road area:

You do see that in Randolph Road. I was speaking to a guy just recently ... he was selling a house in Randolph Road and advertised it, eight schedules went out that day and it was bought sight unseen by a doctor who was coming in from Hong Kong I think it was ... even the part of Raploch that’s remaining, it’s not as transient a community ... They’ve been brought up with each other, they know each other. They tend to yes, whereas Randolph Road is more, I hate to say it but the sort of middle-class, fairly private, not that huge sense of interaction.

(Male key actor 2, Stirling)

Riverside also has a historically tenacious reputation for being a solid and respectable area. When asked whether there would be strong views about ‘Riversiders’, a key respondent said, ‘well there might well be, that snooty lot’. Another key respondent had a more detailed account of the images of Riverside and Raploch, which again revolved around constructions based in class imagery and referents:

My attitude when people say they’re from the Riverside is that I do conjure up this image of ... I always think of the Riverside as being sort of a slightly left of centre community you know, a place where, you know, people will car share and cycle and sort of eat organic food and sort of go on holiday swaps to a house in Denmark and things. I’m deliberately picking these because I’ve actually heard of them and you know ... it’s a, you know, it’s a Guardian reader sort of mentality a little bit when you go somewhere like that.

(Male key actor 2, Stirling)
A slightly different angle on area generalisations was taken by another key actor who worked in property sales:

Well Randolph Road you would certainly think of someone as being, for want of a better word, middle class, house-owner, a reasonably affluent person quite frankly and that would be the initial perception off the cuff. Riverside, it's hard to generalise in that way because there is such a mix of housing, from little flats, where one person can live on their own, to quite large and expensive properties, so you wouldn't be able to generalise.
(Male key actor 5, Stirling)

Interestingly, when discussing Raploch, rather than adopting the characteristic negative attitude, this respondent saw much that was positive:

When it comes to the Raploch I mean maybe, well maybe you don't know me well enough but, as someone who's worked on social deprivation in Glasgow and Strathclyde for many years, I mean my take on something like that is that here are the people who have got opportunities to actually go places and the fact they come from the Raploch should not be seen as a constraint at all, it should actually be seen as something which has probably held them back because of the education that was available in the past and because of the poor housing and various things like that, but actually they've probably got far more potential than they're delivering at the moment and therefore they're people who can go on in the future. So, when someone says they're from the Raploch, I usually take a view that, you know, here's someone who potentially can do probably a lot more than what they're doing at the moment.
(Male key actor 2, Stirling)

Whereas housing tenure was always taken as a clear indicator of social class, this has become far more pronounced in recent years. The Right to Buy provides a clear example of this, in that it ensured the better-quality council houses were sold off to sitting tenants. Because of the housing allocations system, those residing in the better stock were best placed to take advantage of these discounted house purchases. This process was noted by one of the key actors interviewed:

Well it's discontinuity in the housing market. I mean Riverside over a period of time has had a very similar housing market. Take off the flats that have been built in the last five or six years and it's just been the same housing available over that period of time so, inevitably, a house becomes
available, it's going to be sold to people from similar backgrounds. In Riverside, the council houses that were there were highly sought after council houses going back 20 years when homelessness was not such an issue in the allocation of council houses. The people who went to Riverside are people who’d served 25 years elsewhere and they got to Riverside as almost a reward for having done, you know, the previous 15 years in Cornton, or Culton Hove, or wherever it was … here are people who are moving in who are of a similar social status to those who have been moving out … The biggest … discontinuity is in the social rented sector … comes from Thatcher and house sales. I mean what happened as a result of that is that, in areas like the Raploch, houses were not going to be bought and therefore it was always going to be used as a place to allocate the needy groups … whether they were single-parent families … people with learning difficulties … people who’d previously been evicted who were coming back into the system, or … people who couldn’t be bothered waiting … 15 years to get a good house in Riverside, when we know we can get a house in Raploch today. So it’s people whose aspirations were either lower or who had no choice in this. This was all that was available and they were the people who ended up there.

(Male key actor 2, Stirling)

The Right to Buy has seen Riverside move from being largely a council area to one that is now dominated by home-ownership. Whereas, in the past, you secured the majority of Riverside houses through the council allocations system, which was regarded as a reward, now it is the market that allocates through individual purchasing power. This change has impacted, and will continue to impact, on the social identity of Riverside. It is still respectable, but the social construction of respectability has altered so it is now more middle class than working class. As one of the key actors who was professionally involved in the property market noted, Riverside is now his key market in Stirling:

Well certainly Riverside is a large area in Stirling, so therefore we do a reasonably large percentage of our business in the Riverside area. Randolph Road’s a specific road so we deal with property there, Raploch too, although the mix of housing in Raploch has never been traditionally private ownership, so we maybe don’t do as much down there as you would do say … in Riverside … since council house purchases came in, obviously there’s been a lot of them bought and sold down there too, so again it’s a big percentage of our business.

(Male key actor 4, Stirling)
But, although Riverside through this process may have altered some of the long-standing components that made up its social identity, its relative position has not changed. Similarly, Raploch, if anything, has got poorer and more socially marginalised. It too has not altered its relative social position. It is just that now, given the recent sustained and substantial boost in relative property values, both nationally and locally, Raploch has probably even less social status and Riverside more. High house prices, with the average for Stirling now being £125,000, ensures that there is a closer relationship between earning ability, personal wealth, housing, neighbourhoods and social status. Housing within particular neighbourhoods is now more of a commodity, given its perceived social status and social cache.

From the interview material collected, it seems that the difference in relative social positioning between the three neighbourhoods is often expressed via explicit reference to representations of class, the language of class and the imagery of class. In Scotland today, more than ever before, class identity can be linked directly to housing tenure and local house prices. The working-class nature of Raploch is defined by its high level of public rented housing (76 per cent – see Table 2 in Chapter 2) and the small number actively engaged full-time in the labour market (25 per cent – see Table 1 in Chapter 2). The distinction between the latter two owner-occupied neighbourhoods is by social status, and thus house price, with Randolph Road higher up the pecking order.

**Religious identities**

As was noted in earlier chapters, Raploch had always had something of an Irish identity, in that seasonal migrant farming labour was long linked to the settlement. With the massive growth of mining in the nineteenth century and its demand for labourers, this provided new employment opportunities. Irish labourers were also encouraged in mining areas throughout Scotland, as they were cheaper to employ and the mine owners often used them to break strikes during the many periods of industrial unrest. This, in part, explains why there was, and to a degree still is, long-held antipathy expressed about Irish workers in the various ‘Scots’ mining communities (Campbell, 1979). It also explains how there are distinct Catholic Irish and Scots Protestant mining communities existing cheek by jowl throughout central Scotland. Stirling is no exception, with Raploch and the nearby village of Cowie having an Irish identity, whereas Plean and Fallin have a Scots Protestant one. Given this history, the issue of religious identity, such that it is, was explored in some detail in this study.
The antagonism between Catholics and Protestants appears to have been more muted in Stirling than in other parts of Scotland. Sectarianism has been a non-issue in Riverside and Randolph Road partly because there have been so few Catholics in these areas (see Table 3 in Chapter 2); neither has ever had a Catholic Church or school. As a predominantly poor, labouring population, Catholics in Scotland did not begin to make inroads into white-collar or professional occupations until the 1960s. Where one might have expected sectarian tension to exist is Raploch and it is clear that there is a degree of tribal rivalry here. Yet, the actual incidence of sectarian hostility seems to have been low. This might best be explained by the fact that the Irish community had been so long established and had given the area much of its identity; the old pre-council village of Raploch was locally referred to as ‘Little Ireland’. As one respondent who was brought up in Raploch described it:

You weren’t part and you felt you weren’t part of the [Presbyterian] club you know. So you had it in two ways, I mean you were, you were stigmatised by where you stayed and you were stigmatised by your religion as well you know.
(Male key actor 5, Stirling)

Yet none of our respondents accepted that there had been religious strife in Raploch. They recalled name-calling between the children at the respective non-denominational and Catholic schools, but they chose to present this as essentially humorous and without any violent intent. Reflecting on what she saw as a lack of ‘bitterness’ in relations between Catholics and Protestants in the Raploch of her childhood (the 1940s and 1950s), one woman explained it thus:

But it was all fun. There was none of, you know, this bitterness. I think that probably stemmed from the old Raploch, where everybody, you had your Irish Catholics, you also had your Orangemen and what have you, but everybody mingled and mixed and helped each other out. And that was passed down to the children. Because you went out and you all played together and you never asked, you know, ‘Where do you go?’ And ‘Where do you go?’ because you knew everyone! And everybody’s parents knew each other, the grandparents all knew each other.
(Female 63, Raploch)

Another respondent recalled that, if anything, Raploch had experienced less overtly sectarian issues than other smaller mining communities:

Looking back I mean religion never figured very much. There was two schools next to each other and that was a shame as well, you know, that
they were close together, that we needed two schools, but at that time I mean I wasn’t strongly aware of religion … I went to church and all that till I was about 15, you know, what we all do till you get the chance to make your mind up yourself then decide for yourself, but I wasn’t strongly aware of the religious separation in Raploch. Raploch is one of these villages … where there’s a, I think the balance is about right, was about right in those days. There was an awful lot of Catholics as well you know. As I say it’s hard to guess, 35 to 40 per cent of the families were Catholic you know. It’s about the same in Cowie and yet you get much worse religious intolerance in Plean and Fallin on each side because it massively goes the other way if you like, the balance.

(Male key actor 5, Stirling)

An implicit tension within Raploch was indicated by one man who believed that, ‘ye were better thought o’ if ye were a Catholic’ (male 62, Raploch). At the same time, he had relatives and friends who were Catholics and he seems to have been perfectly able to distinguish between individuals and their religion.

Riverside, it seems, tends to be seen as a relatively homogeneous Protestant place, with little internal differentiation. Some respondents do, however, recall being aware of some sources of division, or at least difference, when they were younger:

One thing I was very aware of, there was a couple of families in the Riverside went to St Mary’s [school] in the Raploch because they were Catholic … you just knew who they were and they went to a different school but you still played with them.

(Female 46, Riverside)

Although no one interviewed made mention of current discriminatory practices being experienced if you were a Catholic, it clearly had been the case in the past. One woman interviewed, for example, recalled that she had been extremely surprised that she had secured her first job in a local lawyer’s office, because it was the practice of such firms to interview all the non-denominational schools first for such starting positions. By the time they got to St Mary’s, which was always last, most if not all the jobs had been filled.

I went and left [school] when I was 15 silly enough because I got a job in a lawyer’s office and at that time the Catholics did not get first choice. They interviewed all the girls from the High School in the other areas and we were last to get interviewed. They weren’t, the lawyers’ offices were all quite …
Q: Presbyterian?

Mmm mmm, so but anyway I got a job there and I worked ... for three years and I liked it, it was good and then I got a job in the Coal Board in the scientific department.

(Female 68, Randolph Road)

Another interviewee recounted how she and her husband were regarded as something of a curiosity by one of their neighbours, as they were middle-class professionals and Catholic:

We had one neighbour we were particularly friendly with, one family, and he was always having discussions with me about religion, but I didn’t make them, I’m not argumentative. He was always, he wanted to find out more about Catholicism and our strange arcane practices. But that was it. I don’t engage in arguments.

(Female 67, Randolph)

At the same time, from the interviews, it is not clear whether the tension is strictly religious any more. There are reasons for believing that religious rivalry has been displaced by football, or that the two have become so intertwined as to be inseparable. The racial tensions of England are not replicated to the same degree in Scotland, partly because of a much smaller recent migrant population but also because of the ritualistic antagonism between Catholics and Protestants displayed on regular occasions at the football matches between Rangers and Celtic, the so-called ‘Old Firm’. Though both these teams are Glasgow based, their support covers all of Scotland and abroad and, in Stirling, support for the ‘Old Firm’ completely swamps that for the local football team, Stirling Albion. The following extract from an interview with a married couple from Raploch may help explain why football and religion get intertwined:

M: The Raploch was always classed as a Celtic stronghold. But we McKinlays were always Protestant. Ah walked across that park in the 60s the only person wi’ a Rangers scarf! Ma neebour was an Irishman but we got on great thegither.

F: See one o’ oor best neebours? Oh they had the photoaes o’ the Pope an’ the rosary beads. Greatest neebours in the world.
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\[M:\] See in the Raploch there's maybe 100 families that's turned, a' Protestants at school wi' me an' everythin', that's turned Celtic supporters. Ah believe in ma religion but you shouldnae hae it displayed in the hoose ah don't think.

\[F:\] Noo, ma wee grandson, noo, he's got a season ticket fur Ibrox. He goes a' the time. See that laddie ower there, he's got shares in Celtic an' everythin', he'll no put his Celtic top on. He goes oot an' intae his car. That's what ah call a gentleman.

\[M:\] He's no wantin' tae offend onyone.

\[F:\] That's whit ah call a good Celtic supporter.

\[M:\] Ah asked him why he didnae dae it, he said 'ah didnae like offendin' ma neighbours'.

\[F:\] That's how it should be ay. Ah mean we're no gonnae kill one another because o' a silly fitba' team.

(Male/female 63, Raploch)

In sum, religious identities proved to be not particularly pronounced in the three neighbourhoods under study. Only in Raploch has religious identity proved to be an issue and this has been prominent in the long-held ethnic and religious perceptions that outsiders hold in relation to this area. The long-standing external and internal construction of Raploch as a 'Little Ireland' helps to explain part of its enduring social separateness from the rest of Stirling. However, such an identity is slowly losing its potency and relevance within a more secular society. Religion is no longer a core component of individual identity, as it once was, and is thus less significant in defining community identity. As a key respondent put it when asked if the church played any part in the community:

Not now, but probably did so in the past. The Evangelicals play a part in Riverside, and St Mark's and St Mary's in the Raploch, but not in a way that they did in the past. The Salvation Army has always played a role in Raploch and that has not changed for years.

(Male key actor 1, Stirling)
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Summary

This chapter has explored the ways in which gender, class and religion have impacted on the wider understandings and perceptions of the three neighbourhoods, and the constructions of identity and attachment to place of those who live in the areas. Clearly, each of these issues can and does have different effects at different times on the specific identity of the neighbourhoods and they also interact in complex ways. Gender has been shown to be an important element. For many respondents, their understanding of places and communities is interlinked to their families and particularly to women. Women were seen to be crucial to the creation and sustaining of notions of community. At the same time, it was shown that male employment was central to constructions of these neighbourhoods’ social identity and status. As a result, class – as expressed through income, wealth, employment opportunities, lifestyle and now increasingly through housing tenure and house price – still also retains a central role in the construction of the social identity in each of these neighbourhoods. Religion and ethnicity had an important role in the past in the shaping of Raploch’s identity and how the area was viewed externally, but it certainly did not emerge as an important issue for either Randolph Road or Riverside, perhaps because these communities were historically secure in their respectable Protestant identity. It was also evident that religion overall was now less significant as a social identifier and that being a Catholic was not as socially problematic as it had been for so long in the past. This illustrates that identities and their significance can alter and change. That said, it is also the case that particular historical associations with certain neighbourhoods still resonate and can surface in a ritualistic way through the agency of football. It was also clear that the relative social position of these neighbourhoods has not altered over the last 80 years, again determining the ways in which social identity shows great tenacity and resilience.
5 Conclusions

The social identities of neighbourhoods are clearly complex and subtle phenomena that exist in a dynamic state and exhibit elements of both historical continuity and change. There is no assumption on our part that ‘coming from’ a particular locality is the most important part of a person’s sense of self or the key to understanding any form of collective mobilisation, rather, these are issues for further investigation. This study, however, was concerned with the dynamic nature of neighbourhood and individual identity, and understandings of belonging and community. Thus, while each of the three neighbourhoods studied has undergone significant social changes, its relative social position has not altered greatly over the last 80 years. All of the three neighbourhoods do differ, of course, and they do so historically, economically, socially and culturally. Viewed in relation to each other, these areas have maintained a relatively stable position in terms of how they are generally perceived, how people understand what it means to ‘come fae’ these places and how the areas are understood by those who do not. Our research demonstrates that among the more important factors in the development of a particular neighbourhood identity were: the early historical trajectory of each locale; the initial idea behind the inception and construction of the neighbourhood; the housing type and tenure and, consequently, the associated prevalence of particular occupational types; the resulting socio-economic profiles; and the existence of long-standing and stable families and family networks.

The three neighbourhoods, which were built in the inter-war period, were effectively ‘planned communities’. Riverside was built with ‘homes for heroes’ ambitions, heralding a new start for the working classes. Given construction standards and the then subsidy arrangements, the resulting rent levels ensured that this housing would be relatively expensive and thus geared towards the lower middle classes and ‘respectable’ working classes. Raploch, by contrast, was always directed towards the poorer working class though, initially at least, not the very poorest or ‘residuum’. To ensure the rents were ‘affordable’, that is cheaper than Riverside, smaller two-bedroom houses were built to a lower specification. Randolph Road, by contrast, was a classic example of a suburban ‘bungalow-land’ development and was always conceived of by those developing it as ‘exclusive’. This was a purely private estate built during the Great Depression when those with money could secure a lot for relatively little. That said, at the time of construction, there was certainly not a mass provision of such private housing, hence Randolph Road represented the bulk of inter-war private housing built in Stirling at this time. These houses were, and still remain, aspirational and highly sought after.
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Each neighbourhood should not of course be understood as being internally homogeneous and isolated from its immediate surrounding. We found much evidence in each area of subtle and complex notions of socio-spatial differentiation alongside clearer demarcations of difference within Raploch, Riverside and Randolph Road. This internal movement between similarity and difference ebbed and flowed over time in each of the three neighbourhoods. For example, different parts of Raploch were variously seen as the ‘real’ or ‘genuine’ Raploch, while the development of new flats in Riverside was viewed by many there as an incursion of either ‘Raploch’ in the case of Cooperage Quay or yuppies in the case of the private flats in Riverside.

The Freudian notion of the ‘narcissism of minor difference’ is helpful in both acknowledging and understanding why such differences bear large within and between communities. This finding is of social significance in that the study found that the residents of these communities had a clear idea of who they considered to be an ‘insider’ and an ‘outsider’, and they were able to see social boundaries between their ‘community’ and other ‘communities’. Internal differences may have been more pronounced in both Riverside and Raploch, but they were also evident in Randolph Road. All were clear that their neighbourhood was different from the others.

Residents had a consistent conception of how they were viewed from outside of each area. Those from Riverside and Randolph Road acknowledged that they were regularly viewed from the outside as ‘toffee-nosed’ and ‘snobbish’, whereas the view of those from Raploch was that their neighbourhood was generally seen to be ‘rough’. These generalised identities of each area have shown a remarkable tenacity over a number of generations. The fact that the ‘course’ and ‘rough’ label has existed for Raploch over 550 years is quite startling. Such portrayals often revolved around constructions of a class-based nature and obviously can be related to income levels, occupational groupings and status, as well as to the housing tenures of each neighbourhood. For example, the historical concentration of miners in Raploch was a key way in which its male, ‘macho’, ‘rough’, working-class image was established and still resonates today. It was also evident that the external perception of a neighbourhood identity was stronger and more of a caricature than those perceptions held by people who lived there themselves. Residents perceived greater internal social diversity than the homogeneity portrayed by ‘outsiders’. There was, however, a convergence of opinions between the ‘outsiders’ and ‘insiders’ about the social gradation between the three different neighbourhoods.

While Stirling could never be regarded as a ‘working-class’ town, it did have a number of industries that were also relatively large employers, and several of these were near to or within Raploch. This propensity for labouring work was core
to Raploch’s working-class identity. Over a large part of the 20th century, this had ensured employment in large numbers to local inhabitants. These jobs have now all gone, with Duncan’s lemonade works, Alexander’s coach works and the Kildean market the last to go. Both Duncan’s and Alexander’s were demolished to make way for a new Sainsbury’s supermarket, which, although credited with having a significant number of employees from Raploch, is completely unable to make up for the substantial losses brought about by the recent and rapid de-industrialisation of this small Scottish town. These jobs are in the main part-time and female, whereas the jobs lost were full-time and male. Neither does the newly built Castleview Business Park provide employment opportunities for Raploch people, given the mismatch of skills between office work and labouring. This pattern of change illustrates the more localised impacts of broader economic changes.

Neighbourhood identity is associated primarily with employment patterns and these are masculine. In Raploch, women were employed at the ordnance and the cigarette factory, as well as at a small woollen mill. In addition, they would travel by bus and bicycle out to the cotton mill at Deanston. There was also a long tradition of seasonal work in agriculture, carried out in the main by women and children. Yet it is interesting how, despite the significance of these jobs in supporting Raploch’s economy, that distinct working-class feminine identity does not help in determining the area’s social identity.

By contrast, women’s core role in both home and family is critical to sustaining community. Their employment role does not, however, help fix a neighbourhood’s social identity. Clearly, this aspect of social identity is highly gendered and appears not to change over time, despite the massive transformation in the structure of the labour market and in women’s participation in that labour market. It is still the historic male employment pattern that fixes the dominant social identity of a neighbourhood, an identity that is currently inaccurate given long-standing structural changes in the local labour markets.

In this way gender – very often being synonymous with women – played a key role in the consideration of notions of community. The role of playgroups, schools and the visible presence of women and children around particular areas were key catalysts for giving at least the ‘feel’ of a community within particular areas. Given this, there was a sense of regret about the increasing numbers of working women displayed by many of the respondents. Not having women about during the day undertaking domestic and family chores diminished the feeling of community.

Family was also a phrase that was often synonymous with the role of women. The identity that developed in relation to the Raploch was one in which large, and in the
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main geographically stable, families were key to the development of particular kinds of community. Raploch still retained significant family networks, many of which had not altered greatly over generations, as revealed by the archival work undertaken for this study. Despite this stability, there was also evidence of extensive internal movement within Raploch by members of these families. This, in part, reflects the predominant role played by the council in allocating housing, as opposed to the market.

Riverside, by contrast, was an area where families were smaller. Although they were spatially close, they did not in the main live within the immediate neighbourhood. Rather, the family was spread throughout Stirling and its surrounding area. It was also evident that the Riverside community was more stable in that there was not the same degree of internal movement.

Randolph Road was similar to and at the same time different from Riverside. Family size was small, but the links to the wider family were more distant. Unlike Riverside, they were national rather than local. What this reveals is another social trend – increased personal wealth leading to a more individualised or atomised family existence. This adds a new dimension to the work of Tonnies (1963) in that the move from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft, from the evidence of this study, is a continuous gradation rather than a major cleavage brought about by industrialisation. Given current policy moves to try and engender community, this finding does represent a significant challenge. With greater affluence, people migrate to more individualised living arrangements, which show less regard for collective or community interactions at the neighbourhood level.

Housing was also found to be core in defining a neighbourhood’s social identity. Housing is now more than ever a function of personal wealth. Of particular interest was how the advent of the Right to Buy effectively maintained, and then over time exaggerated, the social segregation between what were the two large council estates of Riverside and Raploch. In Riverside, discounted sales to sitting tenants proved very popular, given its established tenant profile. Long-standing allocations practices had ensured those deemed ‘respectable’ and on steady incomes had dominated Riverside, and this group were able to purchase their home under this initiative. Only those with a degree of financial security, both in terms of wealth and regular income, could exercise the Right to Buy. In addition, the long-standing physical and social respectability of Riverside encouraged such purchases.

All but a handful of council houses in Riverside have now been sold and all those interviewed who had stayed in what was an ex-council house had either bought it themselves under the Right to Buy or had purchased it from someone who had done
so earlier. Given the demographic profile of Riverside, which is clearly illustrated by our interviews, ex-council houses will become increasingly available on the open market and it is likely they will now be bought by relatively wealthy ‘outsiders’, as in the case of the professional couple interviewed in Riverside. One part of Riverside was always part of the local housing market and recent policy changes have ensured just about all of it is now in that market. Given the relationship between income and housing, this will bring about sustained social change in Riverside.

Contrast this with Raploch where its social reputation and tenemental physical structure discouraged purchase under these provisions. While some Raploch respondents had indeed bought their own homes, most of those interviewed had not. When they were asked about this, they said they were now too old, had insufficient income or regarded a purchase in Raploch as a waste of money. The introduction of the homeless persons’ legislation dramatically altered the social dynamics of the Raploch. Rather than being just a ‘poor’ and stigmatised neighbourhood, its general unpopularity ensured it became a ‘dumping ground’ for those previously excluded from council housing. The ‘dumping’ of problem tenants in Raploch in the 1980s through the seriously ill conceived Glendevon housing allocations initiative served to further confirm its status and certainly, in the view of local inhabitants, caused many of the problems the area still suffers from today.

So the parallel operation of two sets of housing policies ensured that, on the one hand, Riverside became more popular, more ‘respectable’, more middle class and more private; Raploch, by contrast, through broadening housing allocations, became less popular, even less ‘respectable’ and still council owned. Although it can be argued that ex-council house property prices in Raploch are now rising, as recent market research work conducted for the Raploch Urban Regeneration Company Ltd suggests, this is still unlikely to be sufficient to ensure this locality becomes an area where people with more choice and income aspire to live. Further, the market differential in rising property prices between Raploch and other ex-council areas, and between ex-council stock and the ‘private’ market, will serve only to maintain the relative social differentiation between the three neighbourhoods.

Another prominent theme that emerged explicitly and more implicitly from across the research was the often tenuous and fragile nature of what constituted, created and maintained community. Very often, this seemed to be based on innumerable, outwardly almost insignificant, fleeting and ephemeral interactions between individuals within the general context and infrastructure of each locality. It seems that what was understood as ‘community’ was often rooted in this realm of the familiar but mundane and everyday – chatting at the post office, regular meetings at the hairdresser’s and conversations related to the school and suchlike. As noted
above, women in pursuing family and child-rearing roles contribute greatly to this communications traffic. This can often best be understood as a consequence of an infinitesimal number of small, almost invisible gestures and human transactions.

This was also evident in relation to the fluid links that exist between family, friends and neighbours. While different people gave a differing emphasis to the importance of these three categories, there was a general recognition that their presence does help sustain a sense of community and their own sense of involvement in that community. There was also a clear spatial dimension to this. Even where some individuals might deny the importance of any or all of these categories, further discussion in the interviews tended to reveal a more complex picture.

The role played by older people in relation to construction of community is important, given that they often provide a degree of continuity for an area. Because their social world was often focused at the local scale, both in the past and currently, they played a role similar to women with young children. They are about during the day to make the routine and mundane interactions with other residents. Unsurprisingly, it was also the older residents who routinely drew comparisons with the past as a way to understand the present. Neighbourhood identity was in part constructed internally through their reminiscing and understanding of local changes within the area.

At the same time, they were also more aware of the demise of what they understood to be community, which is not the same as the demise of community *per se*. Many of the older residents in each of the three neighbourhoods felt there had been a move from a fondly remembered golden age of community of the past to a more atomised and individualised present. As noted above, this does suggest a re-examination of the Tonnies definition based on social structure of pre- and post-industrial societies. Rather than a major cleavage brought about by industrialisation, the demise of community is a longer-term and constant phenomenon that is very much tied to how increasing personal wealth affects family and social relations. It also relates to broader social changes occurring within the wider society.

One of the most obvious social changes that participants believe has had a major impact on social and community relations is the increasing reliance on cars. Because people can now travel further to shop, socialise or work, the car has, in the opinion of most respondents, reduced and constrained everyday opportunities for social interaction within the local neighbourhood. The car is also seen to have taken away public space, thus denying the opportunity for children to play in the street, which had been common in all neighbourhoods in years gone by. It was also clear from the interview evidence that public transport facilities were perceived to promote better social interaction. That said, it is hard to see how the car can be done away with.
Related to the above point is another finding, namely the demise of a distinct and in some instances vibrant ‘street life’. Each of the neighbourhoods displayed a different historical propensity for ‘street life’. Within Raploch, there was a long, and for some, cherished tradition involving children and adults of street games, back-court entertainment, communal singing, as well as illegal gambling and ‘pitch and toss’. Then there were the galas. Riverside by contrast had street games, organised entertainment, but no history of the more boisterous activities that existed in the Raploch. The notion of ‘respectability’ comes to the fore. Again, this illustrates the local impact of broader social changes occurring within society. Where once entertainment had to be created and crafted locally, it is now largely provided directly into the home via the television with a multitude of channels. The findings in relation to street life ably illustrate the value of the methods adopted by this study, in that it brings a historical dimension to bear on the topic, particularly when comparisons are made by respondents to the earlier histories of these neighbourhoods.

Finally, pseudo-religious labelling of one community was shown to be evident, although the underpinning anti-Irish discrimination never seems to have been of the overt style seen elsewhere in Scotland. The long-standing nature of the Irish population in Raploch may have helped community relations simply by the fact that they had, in a sense, ‘always been there’ and a core part of Raploch’s identity (at least in living memory). Moreover, the decline of churchgoing, first evidenced among Protestant denominations, is also now a reality for the Catholic Church. St Mary’s Roman Catholic Church in Raploch gets many, possibly most, of its congregation from without Raploch, with Polish migrants making up a significant minority. As one of the Raploch interviewees illustrated, for many people, religious identity is now inseparable from their identification with the two big Glasgow football teams. Religious ‘tribalism’ has now been superseded by football ‘tribalism’. So religion is no longer core to defining one’s identity and, consequently, the identity of the neighbourhood one resides in. Economic discrimination on the basis of religion has also declined, so there is greater integration within society as a whole. That said, the discrimination of the past does take time to work itself through. So another key finding is that some social and cultural identifiers do change and have become less important, but at the same time they take a very long time to change completely.

Policy considerations

So what exactly are the policy issues that emerge from these findings? Consideration is now given to the urban and social policy context under four distinct but related headings.
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Planned and utopian communities

The original development ambitions set for each neighbourhood were largely achieved, suggesting that the initial thinking in planning a development is a key factor in determining their enduring identities. Despite there initially being two quite different housing allocation mechanisms, the overt social class ambitions articulated for both Riverside and Randolph Road were accomplished. Both localities remain popular and much sought after, thus aspirational. The housing style, size and its spatial layout, in addition to its relationship with the adjoining public open space, has helped contribute to that.

It is also the case that the limited social class ambitions set for Raploch have been achieved. As the archive evidence suggests, this was a grudging, low-cost, flatted council housing solution for Stirling’s poor slum dwellers. The guiding planning principal, as articulated by the councillors making the decisions, was that they should be grateful for what was being provided. Raploch was the product of quite conscious ‘social engineering’, a means to keep the different classes of people apart. The limitations of the original development and its many subsequent additions have played out generation after generation. Overcrowding was, and from the contemporary evidence still is, a problem in this area, because there have always been large families living in what were built as small flats. Further, the cut in the build specification, which produced thin single-brick walls, has always allowed sound transmission between flats, something that still causes neighbour problems. Given the audio capacity of TVs and hi-fis, and the noise generated by washing machines, dishwashers and dryers, if anything, this is perhaps a greater problem now. So the original ambitions for Raploch were limited and these still play out today.

So what would have happened if Raploch had been designed as a Riverside? Would many of the problems that Raploch has experienced over the years just not have materialised? The answer to that question seems to be yes and no because, while the construction of community has distinct physical dimensions, it also has, more crucially, social aspects.

How communities are planned, then established sets a physical template, which this study has shown to have a very long and sustained impact. Each of the three Stirling neighbourhoods had a pre-existing social and physical structure, which played through into these ‘new’ developments. The relative social hierarchy of these neighbourhoods in the 1900s, prior to the housing developments of the inter-war years, is still evident today. The pre-existing attitudes about the social make-up of each of these neighbourhoods determined the social ambitions set for the housing constructed and, therefore, what sort of people were considered appropriate to each
of these localities. Again, a Stirling councillor’s comments on Raploch in the 1930s provide clear evidence of this. Undoubtedly, part of the thinking here was that, in the councillor’s opinion, the tenants would not feel uncomfortable mixing in unfamiliar social milieaux – people then should know and understand their station. There was a pre-existing social ordering of Stirling neighbourhoods and these new developments were bound into that.

**Spatial planning, design and mixed communities**

The planning of any housing development should properly consider how layout and design can help foster the necessary social interactions that promote feelings of community. The evidence provided by this study would suggest much more thought needs to go into parks, play areas and open spaces, whether parkland or civic squares and such like. Housing needs always to be seen within its wider environment and not solely within the curtilage of the house, as so often happens today and has happened in the past. This, of course, is nothing new. The role and function of both local shops and social facilities in providing the opportunities for crucial small-scale social interaction also does need much more careful thought.

The finding about the intrusive nature of car traffic has clear implications for the design and planning of streets and public space. One means of encouraging better social interaction would be to ensure that some street environments are car free and that others, within residential neighbourhoods, adopt the home zone or continental *woonerf* design principles, which place the pedestrian and the car on an equal footing through the use of a single-level surface, with brightly coloured pavers to designate street areas where potential collision dangers exist. That said, the car culture is extremely strong and pervasive, and attempts to design out cars from housing developments have met with very limited success, and in some cases a great deal of hostility.

There are also policy implications in relation to build standards, as basic design and construction issues do play a key role here, given they play out over such a long trajectory. If a development, like so many being produced today, is ordinary and unimaginative then there should be little surprise if people do not value it as highly as other localities or places. Further, as was also evident, once the physical structure of a neighbourhood has been set down, it is very hard to change it over time. Raploch has been redeveloped and reshaped many times over the last 30 years, but the low status and stigma attached to that area has not been altered or eradicated. That said, such conclusions are not entirely new.
Neighbourhood identity

Housing build quality does have a long-term impact on an individual’s quality of life, as does the spatial layout relative to surrounding landscaping. So do we need to undertake more work on regaining our understanding of the best way to set down houses within spaces? And is there not also a case for reopening the age-old Scottish house design argument about whether houses with front and back doors and gardens are a more preferable design solution than tenemental property? Who in terms of age and family structure are best suited to live in which types of property, and should most local neighbourhoods have such diversity on offer? The evidence from this study would support the need to create more diversity in housing type and style within a single neighbourhood, and in doing so create more Riversides and fewer Raplochs. This pattern of diversity is also evident, to a degree, within Randolph Road, given past infill developments in the 1960s and 1970s, and the most recent flat developments. This should be a core consideration when discussing how ‘mixed communities’ can be created.

While this refers to promoting a physical mix of different house types in the different communities, the other more contentious issue is pursuing a greater social mixing as a result of this process. The finding of this work poses a real challenge to the current policy agenda on promoting socially ‘mixed communities’. The study revealed the existence and historical resilience of distinct social identities, which produced a clear perception of who are considered to be the ‘insiders’ and who are the ‘outsiders’ to that particular community. It appears that the greater the social distance, the harder it is to get a shared identity within a neighbourhood, as the new housing association development in Riverside so clearly illustrated.

However, this study also clearly illustrates what happens when this social mixing does not occur. The evidence for the alternative, the current normative approach, is that there is a high personal cost to both society and individuals in creating and then sustaining social ghettos. Continuing with the status quo is not cost neutral, rather it constitutes an unacceptably high cost on society and the individual. Raploch was, and is now even more so than in the past, a poor ghetto. Poverty has long had a place in Stirling and that place is Raploch. Given this backdrop, it is depressing that the current renewal plans for this area do not properly address the need to create a more socially mixed community. Rather, what is being presented is two social distinct and polarised communities that may share the same space, but will never be part of the same community.
Conclusions

Stigmatisation, renewal and place marketing

We need to stop thinking about renewal as essentially a physical activity. Stirling had slums at the ‘tap o’ toun’ and they were demolished and new houses provided in Raploch. These houses were small and grudging, and at the time the accusation was made that the slums of the future were being produced. That proved to be the case. After improving the houses, the builders, and eventually the bulldozer, returned again and again. Yet, the evidence of this study is that what we were dealing with has, all along, not been a physical housing problem, but rather an issue of social class and discrimination. We have seen, through adopting a historical, comparative and multidisciplinary approach to this research, that certain previously core dimensions of social identity, most notably religion, can alter and change although not quite be extinguished. Yet it seems that the other constituent parts of social class identity are far more robust and resilient. Until we find ways of addressing overt social class discrimination, in both planning and subsequent managing of certain communities, then renewal policies will continue to flounder and fail.

The current plans of the Raploch Urban Regeneration Project, which is set to redevelop the cleared Orlit council housing for new private housing, will not create a more socially mixed or diverse Raploch. Rather it will create two socially separate communities, divided by the physical and social boundary of Drip Road. Given what the study has said about perceptions and consequences of social distance, this will be a far more marked boundary than the one that previously existed on either side of this street. The current plans for Raploch reinforce social segregation, rather than challenge it. This is a common pattern for most regeneration projects that introduce an element of private housing to create more ‘mixed communities’. Only a more radical transformation and restructuring of Raploch would ensure it was made aspirational. As one young woman interviewee stated, while she did not regret for one minute being brought up in Raploch, she would not want to stay there in the future. Her views represent the real challenge for Raploch’s regeneration, and all other regeneration projects – how to retain young aspirant households who are the future lifeblood of an area. Creating a more socially polarised community is, from the evidence of this study, not the answer.

Finally, there is an apparent irony in all this work – the most aspirational neighbourhood in this study, Randolph Road, has itself no obvious community. As people get richer, they move into a more individualised or atomised setting – places, it would appear, where community is largely absent. These residents’ social networks and connections link to a much wider social world, not merely the local neighbourhood. Yet, despite all this, it appears that, although we are more individualised and atomised than in the past, we still hanker after some notion
of community and belonging. The study notes that, although we see it going or changing in the way we once understood it, we still feel that it is something important to hold on to. What we appear to want is the ‘familiar strain’ of ‘community’, rather than the more ‘intrusive form’ that existed in the past. The policy issues outlined above should help in achieving just that.
Notes

Chapter 2

1 For general historical background see the *Statistical Accounts of Scotland*, in particular Amess (1966).

2 A vennel is a Scots word for a passage or lane that leads from the main street linking through to other streets, thus accessing the ‘backlands’ of tenemental property.

3 The Cowane’s Trust was established by Stirling’s rich benefactor Robert Cowane. Cowane used his vast wealth to purchase a great deal of land surrounding the town and, on his death, this was transferred to a trust established to benefit the townspeople. The Cowane’s Trust still exists, and responsibility for its management and administration now lies with Stirling Council.

4 While there was a good fit with the four data zones for Raploch and the three for Riverside, the smaller Randolph area is not a close fit for the three selected data zones. A full description of the issues involved in data zone selection for these three areas is provided in Appendix 2.

5 This category refers to people who are willing to work but constrained by home/care responsibilities.

Chapter 3

1 The showground is a walled area within Riverside in which generations of show people have resided.
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Appendix 1: *Neighbourhood Identities*  
family histories

One of the objectives of the study is to explore the social structures and social dynamics of the selected neighbourhoods through detailed information about individuals and families. In pursuing this endeavour, we found that family histories lie between the data collected from the Valuation Rolls and other archive sources, and the recorded oral histories. The Valuation Rolls provide the study with basic data for every household, while the oral histories allow us to explore life and work histories, family relationships, and attitudes about community and social identity in some detail, at least for some individuals. The following family histories help extend the knowledge gleaned from the Valuation Rolls and related sources, and add an extra dimension to the oral histories.

The three family histories presented here were selected from the Valuation Rolls (as were most of the individuals we interviewed, as was noted previously). They are not, however, among those interviewed. This was because we were concerned that those people willing to be interviewed could be a self-selecting group and therefore not necessarily representative. A prior selection of family histories was intended to avoid both that potential pitfall and any issue of confidentiality with those individuals who were interviewed. The names of the three families listed here have been made anonymous by having their own surnames changed to the name of the area they resided in.

We have not chosen our families at random, but rather have made our selections based on date of tenancy, occupation, and gender. Because of the different time periods in which the three areas were established, our selections vary to some extent and are based on early, if not original, tenants from Riverside in 1922/23, from Raploch in 1932/33 and from Randolph Road in 1941/42. It needs to be pointed out that, while a very high level of linkage can be achieved in identifying individuals through the Civil Registers, the success rate is never 100 per cent. Very often, common names, such as John Hall, prove to be elusive.

Family trees can be traced almost to infinity as more and more siblings and relations are identified. Clearly, this is an impossible, if not to say unnecessary, task. Hopefully, the use of family histories within a wider research approach utilising archives, record linkage and oral testimonies will be shown to have significant value in understanding these communities and their identities. The following cases are offered as illustrations of the differing ‘typical’ family structures found in these three neighbourhoods. The sharpest contrast to be drawn is between the large extended family of Raploch with...
the much smaller families of the other two areas. The single woman of Riverside is indicative of a small but noticeable group of professional-type women (in this case a teacher) who have never married. Nonetheless, it is clear that a close family relationship was a significant part of her life. The small family of the businessman from Randolph Road is recognisably middle class, as is his retirement away from the area to the seaside resort of Largs.

Henry Randolph, Brentham Crescent, 1941

Henry Randolph was born in 1885 in Falkirk, the second child of Henry Randolph, a 26-year-old pattern maker, and Janet N., also 26 years, who prior to marriage had worked as a dressmaker. Henry's parents had seven children in all.

1. Elizabeth Dobbie N. Randolph, born 12 February 1880 at South Russell Street, Falkirk.
3. Helen Callander Randolph, born 20 October 1884 at South Russell Street, Falkirk.
5. Hugh Mclean Randolph, born 9 August 1891 at Falkirk.
7. Robert Finlayson Randolph, born 19 August 1897 at South Russell Street, Falkirk.

Henry's youngest brother Robert died tragically, aged 5, from internal injuries and shock as a result of an accident.

Henry's sister Helen married Charles S., a clerk, and died at the young age of 35 at James Street, Falkirk. The cause of death was tuberculosis.

Henry's other sister Elizabeth married a company secretary and died in Glasgow in 1965 aged 85. The cause of death, broncho-pneumonia, starvation and carcinoma of the oesophagus.
Henry's brother Alexander died aged 38 of gas poisoning in Dingwall, where he was the gas works manager. It was Henry, then living in Kelty, Fife, who signed his brother's death certificate.

Henry's remaining brothers could not be traced in the Civil Register.

Henry Randolph married his first wife Grace C.W. in 1910 at the Station Hotel in Larbert, near Falkirk according to the forms of the Church of Scotland. His address was given as Kelty, where he was working as the manager of the gas works.

Henry and Grace had two children, both born at Kelty, Fife.

1 Henry Randolph, born 18 June 1911.

Sadly, Jean died aged 8 of pneumonia and appendicitis.

Henry's only son, also Henry, married in 1940 at Cowdenbeath, Fife. His occupation was given as 'analytical chemist'.

Henry Randolph's first wife Grace died 4 September 1955 at Largs. Henry signed his wife's death certificate, where his stated occupation was 'retired coal salesman'.

Henry remarried the following year, aged 74, to his housekeeper Janet D.H. He lived a further 11 years, dying in 1967 aged 85 of myocarditis and aterio sclerosis. He had outlived his second wife.

Dolina Riverside, Shiphaugh, 1941

Dolina Riverside was born on 12 February 1883 at Tangwick Schoolhouse, Shetland to John Tweedie Riverside, schoolmaster, and Jessie, a speaker of both English and Gaelic. Dolina was their third child.

1 Jessie Mary Hughina Riverside, born 20 April 1879 at the Schoolhouse, Tangwick, Shetland.
2 James Riverside, born 28 April 1881 at the Schoolhouse, Tangwick, Shetland.
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3 Dolina Riverside, born 12 February 1883 at the Schoolhouse, Tangwick, Shetland.

4 Margaret Ann Riverside, born 15 May 1895 at the Schoolhouse, Tangwick, Shetland.

In 1891, the family comprised Dolina’s father and mother, her great-aunt Margaret M. (Gaelic speaker), her older sister Jessie and brother James, together with a boarder who originated from England and was living on his own means. They were living in spacious accommodation with ten windowed rooms.

In 1901, Dolina was 18 years old and employed as a school monitor. She was living at Tangwick Schoolhouse with her father, mother, younger sister Margaret (aged 6) and great-aunt Margaret (aged 85). Accommodation with five windowed rooms was still generous by the standards of the day.

Dolina’s older sister Jessie married in 1909 in Shetland. Her occupation was postmistress.

In 1920, Dolina’s younger sister Margaret, aged 25 and employed as a milliner, married Donald F., a draper’s assistant. In 1924, they had a daughter Jessie Mackay F. who was born at Ronald Place, Riverside. It was this daughter of Wellpark Crescent in Stirling who signed her mother’s death certificate; she died at Kildean hospital, Raploch of breast cancer. Her usual residence was Haig Avenue, Raploch.

Dolina’s mother Jessie died 11 January 1933 at Shiphaugh Place, aged 78 years. Her daughter Margaret was present and signed the death certificate. The cause of death was breast cancer.

Dolina died in 1951 aged 68 at Shiphaugh Place. Her occupation was recorded as ‘retired schoolteacher’ and her sister Margaret was present and signed the death certificate. The cause of death was breast cancer.

James Kerrigan Raploch, Haig Avenue, 1941

James Kerrigan Raploch was born on 26 August 1885 in Stirling to Thomas Raploch, a locomotive fireman, and Janet D.. In 1906, at the age of 23 and working as a labourer, he married his first wife Isabella H., a laundry worker aged 22, at St Mary’s Roman Catholic Church in Stirling. The couple had lived near each other in an infamously insanitary and overcrowded area of the town of Stirling referred to as ‘tap o’ toun’. They had nine children.
1 Thomas Raploch, born 18 February 1907 at Raploch. Father signed certificate and his occupation recorded as a mason journeyman.

2 George Henderson Raploch, born 6 July 1908 at Baker Street. Mother signed his certificate and father was recorded as a mason journeyman.

3 James Raploch, born 8 November 1910 at Baker Street. Father signed certificate and was recorded as a stoker in a gas works.

4 Marion Bateman Raploch, born 9 September 1912 at Baker Street. Father signed certificate and was recorded as a gas stoker.

5 Janet Drummond Raploch, born 9 February 1914 at Baker Street. Father signed certificate and was recorded as a miner.

6 William Raploch, born 30 March 1915 at Baker Street. Father signed certificate and was recorded both as a stone miner and as a Private of the 3rd Battalion Royal Highlanders.

7 Thomas Raploch, born 30 May 1917 at Baker Street. Father signed certificate (now adding his middle name spelled thus ‘Carrigan’) and was recorded as a coal miner.

8 John H. Raploch, born 9 July 1919 at Baker Street. Mother signed certificate. Father was recorded as a woodcutter.

9 Jessie H. Raploch, born 25 February 1922 at Baker Street. Father signed certificate and was recorded as a woodcutter.

James's first wife Isabella H. died in 1926 at Baker Street of tuberculosis.

A year after his first wife's death James remarried. He was then aged 46 and still living at Baker Street. His bride was Bella C.O. (spinster), a housekeeper aged 25 of Spittal Street, an address nearby. They had two children.

1 Margaret Roache Raploch born 8 December 1928 at a maternity hospital in Glasgow. Mother signed certificate. Father's occupation recorded as a bricklayer's labourer residing at Spittal Street.

2 William David Drummond Raploch, born 12 July 1931 at the Maternity Home in Stirling. Father's occupation recorded as foreman builder's labourer.
In 1928, a year after his first child by his second wife was born, James's son George Henderson Raploch had a daughter whom he named after his mother, Isabella. He was living at the same address as his father, i.e. Spittal Street. Since his father's occupation was given as bricklayer's labourer and he (George) was a bricklayer journeyman, it may be assumed that the father worked for the son. And, in 1931, within a month of each other, William David Drummond Raploch (see above paragraph) was born to James and his second wife Bella, and James Carrigan Raploch was born to George Henderson Raploch and Lena T.V.. So father and son had two children quite contemporaneously. George Henderson Raploch went on to have another child Georgina who was born in 1933 at Weir Street, Raploch but she did not survive infancy. George died in mysterious circumstances at the age of 25; his body was found in the River Forth near Raploch and his father signed his death certificate. His wife Lena went on to have a series of illegitimate children while living mainly at Drip Road, Raploch. The last two children were born back in the town at St John Street.

James Kerrigan Raploch’s son Thomas (the younger one – we assume the older one died in infancy) married Rosina S. in 1951 at St Mary’s Roman Catholic Church, Stirling. He was 33 years old, living at Haig Avenue, Raploch, and his occupation was bricklayer; his bride, a cork seal factory worker aged 31, lived at Menzies Drive, Raploch.

Another of James Kerrigan Raploch’s sons John Henderson Raploch, also a bricklayer, aged 32 and residing at Haig Avenue, Raploch, married Margaret D.M., a cashier aged 23 of Linden Avenue (another council housing scheme) on 21 November 1951. This couple had six children.

1 Mary Raploch, born 4 December 1953 at Stirling Maternity Home, usual residence, Queen Street, Stirling.

2 John Joseph Raploch, born 23 December 1954 at Menzies Drive, Raploch (house of John’s brother and sister-in-law).

3 John Henderson Raploch, born 8 February 1955 at Stirling Maternity Home, usual residence Queen Street, Stirling.

4 George Thomas Raploch, born 25 June 1956 at Stirling Maternity Home, usual residence Queen Street, Stirling.

5 Thomas James Raploch born 7 March 1957. Usual residence Barnsdale Road, Stirling.
6 James Raploch, born 31 October 1960 at Barnsdale Road, Stirling.

James Kerrigan Raploch died on 29 July 1951 at Haig Avenue, Raploch aged 62. He died of cardiovascular degeneration and the death certificate was signed by one of his sons James who was present at his death and gave his address as Ferguson Street, Raploch.

James Kerrigan Raploch’s second wife Bella C.O. survived him by more than 30 years, dying on 15 September 1982 of Parkinson’s disease at Union Street, Stirling. Her son William Raploch signed the certificate and his address was Haig Avenue, Raploch.
Appendix 2: Data zone selection and qualification

Data is readily available for each of the three study areas from census and Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics (SNS) sources. However, at the ward level, these sources contain both streets and housing that are beyond the focus of this study. The output areas used by SNS allow for a more focused data exercise to be collected for Raploch and Riverside and, to a lesser degree, the Randolph area. However, even at output area level, the SNS data does not align exactly with the selected study areas. Raploch is only weakened by one output area covering some rural ground in the vicinity of the Kildean market. Riverside is weakened by one of the output areas taking in streets outside of the Riverside district that are likely to contain student households and local authority stock that may dilute the Riverside data. Because of the limited size of the selected Randolph area for this study, the use of SNS output areas was problematic, as the output area included a number of less affluent properties than was the focus of the Randolph Road case study. That said, it still provided useful data for case study comparison purposes. The SNS output areas can be seen in Maps A2.1 and A2.2. More accurately targeted census output data using a selection of available census ‘output levels’ aligned through postcode identification is utilised throughout the three areas. It should also be noted that the more or less accurate targeting of the research areas by census and SNS data is likely to create slight variances between the data.
Map A2.1 SNS output areas – Raploch and Riverside

Map A2.2 SNS output areas – Randolph
