

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY BASED
HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS IN GLASGOW:
AN EXPERIMENT IN THE SOCIAL CONTROL OF HOUSING

Ann Rosengard

Vol II

Presented in fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Department of Administration, University of
Strathclyde, 1984.

PART FOUR

TWO NEIGHBOURHOODS AND THEIR

HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS

CHAPTER TEN

THE TWO LOCALITIES AND THE ORIGINS OF THE HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS

1. Introduction

Govanhill and Reidvale housing associations were formed in 1973 and 1976 respectively, as voluntary organisations initially aiming to improve the condition of tenement housing. These agencies from their inception have been controlled by Management Committees of mainly local residents. The localities within which the associations operate are two mainly working class areas of the city, both situated within a two mile radius of the city centre of Glasgow. Govanhill is located to the South of the city centre and has a population of approximately 13,600.⁽¹⁾ Reidvale is a smaller area to the East of the centre of Glasgow and forms a relatively discrete Southern zone of the neighbourhood of Dennistoun. By the late 1970s the population of Dennistoun was 4,860, while that of Reidvale was less than 3,000.⁽²⁾

The physical and social character of each neighbourhood was significantly shaped by the pattern of urban and industrial development which took place in the latter half of the 19th century. In Chapter Four, I considered the interacting influences of economic and political changes and of urban planning developments on Glasgow's inner areas. In this chapter I shall examine

specific factors influencing developments in Govanhill and Reidvale.

Prior to the inception of the housing associations, both localities shared certain social and economic characteristics. The population of both areas by the early 1970s contained a high proportion of unskilled workers whose security of employment was brought increasingly into question by the growing recession of the following decade. Also, neither area reflected the extremities of unemployment and deprivation which had characterised certain council housing schemes, or other areas of predominantly sub-tolerable pre-1914 tenement housing in the private sector.⁽³⁾ However, both South Dennistoun and Govanhill have been defined by the planners as significant 'areas of need'.⁽⁴⁾

The population of both areas included a significant proportion of elderly, a lower proportion than average of families with older children, and an increasing proportion of families with young children. Local government studies have described the residents of both areas as relatively disadvantaged in terms of school and open space provision and have identified the areas as involving a high take-up of social service provision in health and welfare.⁽⁵⁾

As suggested above, the physical layouts and sizes of Govanhill and Reidvale differ considerably. Govanhill is a widespread, mainly tenemented area which is skirted by three main

shopping streets. The quality of tenement housing varies considerably in structural and aesthetic terms, but in general it would appear that much of Govanhill's housing was developed to a higher standard in terms of size, amenity and structure, than was the pattern in several other areas of the city (e.g. in the East End). Today, although one end of Govanhill has most clearly been affected by considerable neglect, decay, the misfortune of subsidence (poor ground conditions) and the unsightly gaps left by demolition, the majority of the area remains largely intact. The austerity and density of the tenement buildings are relieved by Govanhill Park, as well as by the bustle, colour and interest of the main shopping streets of the area.

Govanhill's neighbouring areas are varied. The new Gorbals, nearer the City Centre, is comprised mainly of council housing which has replaced the privately-owned tenement housing of the older Gorbals. Crosshill to the South, and Pollockshields to the South West of Govanhill, are 'better housing areas' - the market position of their tenement housing reflecting its higher standards of size and internal amenity, and its environment which includes tree-lined streets, grandly constructed tenements and stone villas sought after by Glasgow's middle class residents.

Reidvale on the other hand, as a sub-area of Dennistoun, is small, densely-built and compact. Its physical aspect is dominated to the South by the two large high-rise blocks which

are part of a council scheme neighbouring upon the tenemented area. The Southern boundary of Reidvale runs along a railway line and to the North its main landmark is the very busy shopping street, Duke Street, which divides the area from the rest of Dennistoun.

Both Govanhill and Reidvale therefore have central shopping areas which serve Glaswegians from considerably further afield.⁽⁶⁾ Yet, largely because of the character of social life on the main shopping streets, both areas present an image of bustle, neighbourliness and long-standing social interconnections.

In these respects Govanhill and Reidvale reflect the characteristics of many of Glasgow's inner areas in which CBHAs were formed during the 1970s. Since the formation of CBHAs in some areas there has been some further deterioration in tenement buildings as well as spasmodic demolition. Far more significant, however, have been the marked signs of environmental improvement and stonecleaning, and of the repair and improvement of tenement housing. By 1979 it was apparent that the scale and pace of the improvement programme were expanding in these areas, and that public investment, partly channeled through the work of local associations, was paying dividends. However, by the early 1980s there was growing local uncertainty about the future pace of the tenement improvement programme. In the case studies we shall see how residents' expectations in CBHA localities changed from general pessimism and uncertainty about the future of tenement

housing and of the character of their neighbourhood (late 1960s and early 1970s); to expectations of comprehensive area improvement over a five to ten year period (mid 1970s); and eventually to a mixture of growing cynicism, resignation and concern about the slow pace of the improvement programme. It will be evident that an important development affecting these two areas has been the programme of area rehabilitation largely implemented by local housing agencies pursuing both social and housing-related objectives. Also, we shall see how the formation and development of these local associations have reflected, on the one hand, the political commitment and resource allocation of state agencies and, on the other, the actions of local residents which were aimed at tackling local housing obsolescence and at improving housing opportunities and social conditions in their areas.

A recent SDD-commissioned report concluded from a survey of CBHA tenants that CBHA rehabilitation has in fact benefitted groups significantly in need. Two-thirds of those surveyed had been local residents for over ten years and 95% of households had previously received no public housing subsidy; almost 50% of the sample were pensioners and 18% of heads of households were unemployed, while the majority of those employed worked in manual and unskilled occupations and only 1% were in professional or managerial occupations. (7)

In terms of the practical achievements of Glasgow's associations, at March 1982, associations had improved 6,100 houses; 1,710 houses were on site and a further 3,550 houses were acquired and awaiting improvement. In addition at that time it was estimated that approximately 6,900 houses outwith the existing Action Area programme also required rehabilitation (6,650 of these properties represented housing which neighboured operative project areas).⁽⁸⁾ Further, several associations had received approval for area renewal new build schemes (24 at March 1982) and of these a minority have been completed in 1983. Finally, by mid-1984, associations in Strathclyde expect to have completed the rehabilitation of 10,000 inner area tenement houses.

Therefore, for the majority of CBHA localities, including the two on which this chapter concentrates, the general picture suggests their involvement in a rolling improvement programme which is open to further extension, and their effectiveness in extending opportunities of access to decent housing for local people. However, as we have seen in previous chapters, as well as their achievements, CBHAs also face wide-ranging constraints on their role as housing developers and as local landlords. Following this discussion of the more general, practical outcomes of CBHA development I shall now concentrate further on Govanhill and Reidvale, the two localities in which our case study associations developed.

2. Govanhill

2.a. The locality

Govanhill is a large, older tenemental residential area which can be reached by either of two main routes to the South from the city centre of Glasgow. The area has as neighbours the districts of the Gorbals, Crosshill and Pollockshields. Since 1971 the local population of Govanhill has declined by over 6,000 to 13,600.⁽⁹⁾ Population loss has been the outcome of demolition by the local authority and of emigration to the suburbs in the search for housing with more rooms and better amenities than have been accessible within the area. However, population decline has also been affected by the housing improvement programme administered since 1974 by Govanhill Housing Association Ltd. (GHA). In common with all CBHA rehabilitation, amalgamations have operated to reduce the number of housing units. Also residents have at times preferred to accept District Council housing or to sell to the association and acquire a house outwith the action areas.⁽¹⁰⁾

2.b. History

The existing residential area was developed following the establishment of heavy industry during the 19th century, with the majority of development taking place between 1878 and 1891.⁽¹¹⁾ Key aspects of Govanhill's history are illuminated in a document written by 19th century Commissioners of the Burgh,⁽¹²⁾ which

explained how during the 18th century the locality was known as Little Govan, a small village centred upon a cottage industry of weaving, and that during the 19th century industrial development stemmed primarily from the investment of the Dixon family - first in the Little Govan Colliery and the Calder ironworks and, secondly, by Dixon's grandson in the Dixon's Blazes, a brickfield and ironworks.

By the 19th century the locality was characterised by a strong sense of local identity. The Dixons fought with Govanhill residents to retain the area's burgh status and the Commissioners stated regarding the achievement of these aims in 1877 that:

The right to manage their own local affairs has been obtained and maintained by the ratepayers of Govanhill, by many a hard fought struggle with the Corporation both in Parliament and out of it.

Also during the 19th century there were divergent opinions regarding the appropriate administrative boundaries of the locality. The majority of local residents wanted Govanhill to be merged with Crosshill as a single burgh, while Glasgow Corporation gained support in Parliament for their administrative and political segregation. The Dixon family responded by donating funds for the Dixon Halls. These large halls, which are still much in use, were built so that they crossed the boundary of the two burghs of Govanhill and Crosshill. Rooms were set aside for meetings of the Commissioners of both burghs and at the opening ceremony of the

Dixon Halls, Dixon stated his hope that they would provide an 'indissoluble bond' between the burghs.⁽¹³⁾ However, we shall see that differences of views towards the relations between Govanhill and Crosshill persisted amongst local residents during the 1970s, and that Govanhill residents continued to engage in political action in order to further local interests.

As for the built environment, the residential area of Govanhill, which involves an extensive grid street formation of three to four storey tenement buildings, was financed by private developers. I have suggested that this housing was built to a relatively high standard in aesthetic, spatial and structural terms, although variations in standards are apparent within streets and between them. At one end of Govanhill, three tenement blocks surround a park and Crosshill lies on the edge of one of Glasgow's largest areas of parkland. Govanhill also incorporates three long, main shopping streets which interconnect and in which the majority of shops are positioned on the ground floor of tenement housing.

2.c. Planning intervention and local action

Prior to the intervention of planning in the locality, there were three main changes influencing Govanhill. First, while the 19th century strength of the industrial base of the locality had encouraged the development of small-scale industry and commerce (such as local building firms and traders), during the 20th

century local industry became increasingly obsolescent. By the mid-1970s, 70% of those employed worked in manufacturing and distribution, and 30% worked in construction, utility services or transport (a proportional distribution similar to Glasgow as a whole). Major employers in the local Plan area were a large bus depot and retail establishments, while there were also 24 small firms employing five or less, many of which operated from the backcourts of tenement blocks.⁽¹⁴⁾

Secondly, tenement housing had steadily deteriorated as repairs were not carried out by many private landlords who had increasingly sold off their property to their tenants and on the open market. Multiple ownership of tenement property carried with it further problems in co-ordinating the funding of repairs.

Thirdly, there were changes in the local population. Govanhill in its recent history has been an area which has attracted minority ethnic groups. Following the war it housed a significant proportion of Jews who were probably attracted to the area by the accessibility of private housing, by the potential for commercial activity, and by the hope that it would be a step on the way to the wealthier, more comfortable suburbs of the South, to which the majority of Jews eventually migrated from Gorbals and Govanhill. By the 1960s, Govanhill became one of the city's areas with a sizeable Asian community - a presence now demonstrated by a Sikh temple, a striking Sari shop and Asian food stores. We should note,

however, that the part of Govanhill with sub-tolerable housing stock (and in which Govanhill Housing Association operates) includes mainly two to three apartment houses, and in this part of the area Asians constitute a tiny minority of residents alongside Polish and Italian minority groups.

Therefore Govanhill (like parts of Pollockshields, Partick and Queens Cross), was a locality which offered access to low-income owner-occupation for groups which were mainly excluded from access to decent council housing. It is significant that the proportion of owner-occupation increased at a faster rate in Govanhill, between 1961 and 1971, than in Glasgow as a whole or in the wider Glasgow region.⁽¹⁵⁾ Such patterns have been highlighted as characteristic of 'twilight areas' or 'zones of transition' - areas which have only been recently affected by official policy and which have been affected by 'processes of obsolescence, exodus, displacement and social change'.⁽¹⁶⁾

In the early 1970s, tenement housing was almost equally divided into owner-occupied and privately rented property.⁽¹⁷⁾ Owner-occupation provided a means of access to housing for young families or couples who were low down on the council's allocation priorities. Also, during the 1960s, certain landlords had sold off their property on credit-sale transactions (rental purchase), the legal position of which gave a precarious form of ownership to the residents.

The mix of tenures resulted in inconsistent standards of repair. At times tenants were unsuccessful in pressuring landlords to carry out common repairs and individual owners or factors were reluctant to spend large sums on common repairs if the majority of owners showed no will in that direction. As a result the condition of roofs, stairwells and backcourts reflected poor maintenance and decay. However, it was notable that the common parts of many tenements had been well-maintained, and even where this was not the case, internal repair and improvements had frequently been carried out by landlords, tenants and owner-occupiers. This was particularly to be found in parts of the area which were at the higher end of the housing market.

Govanhill's council housing had been built during the inter-war period, under 1924 legislation. This development included over 1,200 houses East of Cathcart Road, mainly in tenemented buildings. This council housing with its rather grey and austere appearance has been continuously in high demand and local authority officials have described Govanhill as one of the most popular council housing schemes in the city.⁽¹⁸⁾ However, by the 1970s, this housing was recognised as requiring repair and renewal and in 1974 607 council houses were programmed for improvement, along with council housing in other areas in the city. Govanhill Residents' Association subsequently became active in pressuring the local authority to ensure its inclusion in the improvement programme in the face of local authority expenditure restraint during the late 1970s.

The older tenement housing in the private sector had become a focus of local authority planning intervention during the post-war period. By 1971, 6,548 out of 7,786 houses in the local Plan area were pre-1914 built tenements. In 1960, Govanhill had been defined as one of several Outline Comprehensive Development Areas by the Corporation. At that stage most of the private sector tenement housing was programmed for demolition with 1,514 dwellings proposed for clearance between 1966 and 1980. These plans also proposed the widening of two main shopping streets in the area, although they did not include any plan for commercial zoning to replace shopping facilities.

The Development Plan was therefore not intended to take physical effect until during the 1970s, and the relatively late programming of clearance would suggest that Govanhill's tenement housing was not given priority in terms of obsolescence, in comparison with other areas of the city. By 1970, only 80 households had been cleared by closing orders, and only 1,120 houses were proposed for clearance between 1970 and 1974. In fact, by 1974, only 794 houses had been included in approved Treatment Areas for clearance.

What actually happened was that in 1971 the Glasgow Corporation reviewed the proposals relating to several Outline Comprehensive Development Areas in the city. At this stage planners concluded that 'sporadic unco-ordinated clearance of the

worst housing would produce gap sites with little scope for comprehensive renewal'.⁽¹⁹⁾ The 1971 Review also favoured housing improvement as an alternative to clearance and redevelopment, and stressed a requirement for shopping proposals for the area.

In this context, by 1970, Govanhill residents had lived for many years with uncertainty surrounding the future of housing in their area. Dominating local people's expectation of future developments was awareness of the proposals for road widening and demolition to create a major traffic route through the city. These uncertainties surrounding the future of pre-1914 tenement property acted as a disincentive to investment in common repairs and improvements by owners and served to increase the attraction of acquiring a tenement house for young families or couples hoping for a council house. The Director of Planning commented in his 1974 Report, under a section termed 'Unresolved Factors', as follows:

The core of Govanhill can be conveniently described as a twilight area. Physical decline has inevitably been accompanied by a significant change in the formerly stable social structure which is now in transition. The area is experiencing a decay spiral, which as it intensifies, encourages the more deprived sections of the City's community to move in. As a result, the incentive for private improvement and maintenance diminishes. However, the area is not a slum, because the worst decay has been confined to the northern part of the OCDA and the area retains many positive environmental qualities. (20)

During the 1970s, however, the plans were changed considerably. While in 1960 Cathcart Road had been programmed for development as

a Principal Traffic Route, in 1970 the Greater Glasgow Transport Service amended this proposal. The new route was to be the Aikenhead Expressway which would no longer be aligned along Cathcart Road. The Expressway, in 1971, was tentatively planned for 1974-76, and it was these road proposals which resulted in local opposition and gave stimulus to the formation of new neighbourhood groups. The activities of these groups provided a basis for education in political skills and for the establishment of connections which were drawn on in later developments. These groups therefore also constituted a significant aspect of the local political environment of the housing association.

Finally on the subject of local politics, Govanhill has been predominantly a Labour area, although at one stage during the 1970s the three wards of which boundaries meet in Govanhill elected simultaneously Labour, Conservative and SNP candidates. However, since the late 1970s Labour has controlled two out of three wards. Outside mainstream politics, the Communist party has traditionally been active in neighbourhood organisations in Govanhill.

In Chapter Five I referred to the origins of GHA, the second CBHA formed in Glasgow, and suggested that GHA's formation stemmed from the following inter-related influences. First, a local authority planning initiative, the declaration of Treatment Areas for improvement in June and August of 1973, aimed to stimulate voluntary improvement by residents of the two affected tenement

blocks, although we saw that local residents possessed neither the relevant knowledge nor the confidence to take up the improvement option. Secondly, there was the search by local residents for an effective response which led to contacts with local authority officials, the Ward Committee and finally to requests for advice from certain professionals who were perceived as likely to be supportive, politically aware and as holding relevant expertise (the community workers at The View and the architects at Assist).

In Chapter Eleven we shall see that GHA developed into a significantly influential local planning and housing agency which, alongside private and governmental agencies, channeled growing resources towards tackling the local problem of housing obsolescence. However, it should be noted that since 1978 the local authority has actively promoted Repairs Area Schemes outwith the Action Areas in Govanhill within which GHA operates. Also, since the late 1970s, building societies have been increasingly willing to lend in the area, and since the 1981 Local Government Act private developers have been attracted by more favourable conditions of grant to acquire and improve properties in Govanhill. In Govanhill, therefore, different investment patterns have affected immediately neighbouring tenement blocks, which vary in condition and amenity and have been subject to differing planning strategies. We shall see that Reidvale, to a greater extent than Govanhill, has been characterised by housing and planning uniformity. In this

context Reidvale has more affinity with other CBHA areas like Elderspark, while the varied aspects of housing, planning and social structure in Govanhill are more akin to CBHA localities like Partick and Queens Cross.

2.d. Neighbourhood groups in Govanhill during the 1970s

Govanhill has traditionally been an area in which neighbourhood groups pursuing a range of interests and objectives, short and longer-term, have flourished and survived. Yet on closer examination, the actions and interactions of such groups, patterns of mutual support and of conflict (locally and in relation to government agencies), have not generally reflected consistency or cohesion of purpose amongst local interests.

Govanhill Residents' Association and Govanhill Tenants' Association were formed around 50 years ago - the Residents' Association representing Local Authority tenants, mainly in the North East sector, and the Tenants' Association representing a mixture of tenants in public and private housing and owner-occupiers. Both groups have focused on issues affecting the interests of local residents, such as the condition of housing, factoring, traffic, environment, vandalism, local voluntary services, etc. Over the 1970s they consistently pressed MPs and councillors to support them in confronting issues. During their more recent history the groups have been led by strong personalities and at one stage the chairmen of both groups were

long-established Communist party members, who frequently held divergent views.

Govanhill Action Group, on the other hand, was a pressure group formed in 1971 as a response to the fear of demolition and increasing blight in the North East of Govanhill. To a large extent it was out of this group that other groups emerged to fight on a range of issues during the 1970s. Govanhill Action Group was formed at a public meeting held at Dixon Halls which had been called by the Ward Committee to discuss rumours and fears relating to the road proposals. Amongst its members were two people who were later to become influential in the formative stage of GHA.

The aims of the group were to exert pressure on officials and councillors, to persuade them that the Road Plan with its consequences for housing in the area was against the interests of Govanhill residents. While between 1972 and 1973 the Action Group generally felt that their efforts had made little impression on 'the powers that be in the City Chambers', by 1978 the Aikenhead Expressway proposal was shelved by the Council. Further, by 1980, the modified Local Plan for the area included proposals for 'traffic management' and 'minor bend improvement' which would not affect any of the houses in the area.⁽²¹⁾

Therefore, during the 1970s, the issues focused on by local groups reflected changes in planning strategies relating to

the area. They ranged from road proposals to the future of private sector housing and possibilities for improvement; from the formation and development of a locally-based housing association to questions of restricted resources, the standards and pace of the improvement programme; and later to the implications of unstable ground conditions (caused by undermining) for both the improvement of older housing and for new house building on vacant sites.

The role of the Govanhill Housing Association (GHA), formed during 1973, gained in prominence over these years and the Association was represented on different residents' groups. The formation of GHA can be seen as the outcome of cumulative experience and the development of contacts by individuals, from both within and without the area, during their involvement in local issues and residents' action in the early 1970s. However, before examining the development of GHA more closely I shall finish describing the other interest groups operating within Govanhill, in order to identify further the confused local political context within which GHA developed during the 1970s.

First, we have seen that two professional agencies which were committed to community development, to supporting community action and to the retention and improvement of the older tenement housing stock, played a significant role in developments during the early 1970s. Assist, a unit of Strathclyde University's Department of Architecture, provided considerable advice and support to Govanhill

people who were confused by the changing planning context, and members of Assist were influential in the early years of GHA.⁽²²⁾ Secondly, Crossroads, a Youth and Community Work Training agency (attached to Glasgow University Social Work Department and funded by Urban Aid) ran a newspaper, 'The View', from the Gorbals. Community workers from Crossroads became actively involved in the formative stage of GHA, and later an advisory and community development service was established within Govanhill.

The role of both these agencies changed in relation to the housing association over time. By 1976, the role of Assist architects had almost been reduced to that of conventional consultants by the association, in contrast with their internal role in GHA's early years. Also, by the time GHA had become a major landlord in Govanhill, workers from The View had withdrawn from direct participation. From their small shop on Cathcart Road the community workers concentrated on developing and supporting local groups and on retaining a more detached role in relation to GHA. Also, between 1974 and 1979, several local Action Groups were formed with the support of The View workers. These were groups such as the 300 Block (housing programmed for demolition), and the Park Square, Inglefield Street and Daisy Chain groups, who represented blocks which were initially outwith the association's zone of operation but following pressure became included within GHA's improvement programme with the approval of the Housing Corporation and the Scottish Development Department. These groups

met within The View to discuss pressure group tactics aimed at influencing the policies of the association, the local authority and central government agencies.

Around 1974 two other groups were formed in the area. First, Glasgow District Council established an Official Working Party to discuss the Local Plan for the area. This Working Party involved District and Regional officials and elected members, the MP, and representation from local residents' groups. After a time some local members felt that, given the number of agencies represented at meetings, there was some difficulty in discussing issues systematically and openly. The Govanhill Community Working Party was therefore formed to fill this role. This group, which included local councillors and representatives from local groups, met fortnightly prior to the Official Working Party meetings.

2.e. The Community Councils and local perceptions of 'community'

Finally, during 1974 the Glasgow District Council gave local residents in several areas of the city the opportunity to determine the boundaries of local community councils. These councils were intended to represent between 200 and 40,000 residents, and Glasgow District Council's approach to their establishment was a clear departure from a historic pattern of arbitrarily establishing planning boundaries. The story of community council formation in

Govanhill is interesting because it throws some light on how local residents perceived their locality in terms of 'community'.

At a public meeting in 1977 in Govanhill a Steering Group was formed. This group defined its zone of representation as covering the whole of Govanhill and Crosshill. However, it soon became evident that Crosshill residents wanted a separate Community Council on the grounds that they did not face the same issues as the people of Govanhill and that the two zones reflected differences in the market position and status of their respective housing. Govanhill Steering Group was disappointed but revised its proposal regarding the constituency boundary. The new boundary was to reflect that of the Local Plan and of the Association's area of operation, incorporating Alison Street, a main shopping street which bordered the two zones.

The outcome was, therefore, an overlap in the boundaries proposed by the two Steering Groups. Glasgow District Council Community Council Resource Centre workers proposed to administer a survey of the 'grey area', which happened to include amongst its residents some members of the Govanhill Steering Committee. Initially Crosshill Steering Group favoured the survey while Govanhill's did not. However, in the end the survey showed that over 90% of residents of the grey area identified themselves as part of Crosshill rather than Govanhill and certain disillusioned members of Govanhill's Steering Group dropped out.

In the end there were two Community Councils, Govanhill's getting off to a poor start. Some residents returned to their prior involvement in the Tenants' and Residents' Associations. Others believed that the Community Council had limited powers and that it primarily served as a consultative forum (e.g. for the Region, on the Structure Plan and its implications; and for Glasgow District Council on issues such as planning applications and local houses for Vietnamese refugees). However, later Govanhill used its guaranteed income to fund a small shop as a base for meetings in the area. (23)

It should be said that for some participants the boundaries of responsibilities and of focus of the Community Council and the Working Party have at times become confused. For instance, one local activist at one point served as the Chairman of Govanhill Tenants' Association, the Community Council and the Working Party, during a period when each agency was at times critical of the other! Also many individuals were members of different groups in Govanhill, either simultaneously or changing their affiliations over time. In relation to the boundaries of interests of the different groups, some representatives on the Community Council believed that this agency was the most appropriate forum for discussing the Local Plan, and they therefore questioned the requirement for the unofficial Working Party. However, those who were disappointed by the formation of the two separate Community Councils later became involved and the two councils have developed in parallel, with

decreasing hostility between them. Nonetheless, one might wonder how W. Dixon, who clearly expressed his hopes for the unity of the two areas a century earlier, might have reacted on discovering the significance of social status differences in influencing local political divisions.

The above discussion should serve to highlight the complexity of relations and identifications between local groups aiming to represent residents' interests in Govanhill. Govanhill Housing Association was formed within the context of a pre-established local political environment, and it evolved into an independent agency focused on the interests of residents in the private tenemental sector. While GHA was represented on different local groups, overlapping involvements were not necessarily associated with patterns of co-operation and consensus. Rather, we shall see that underlying tensions and suspicions between local agencies were prevalent, and that conflicting perceptions of appropriate strategies constituted a normal pattern of relations between agencies which were all concerned with representing local interests and improving local conditions.

The example of Community Council formation in both areas under examination would suggest these points: first, that local perceptions of geographic and status divisions and of common interests inform residents' definitions of, and identification with, their local community. Secondly, they would imply that

initiators of local divisions may be likely to be groups perceiving their housing zones as either of higher or lower status than a neighbouring area. In general, the pattern of events in Dennistoun, described in the following section, would suggest the influence of similar underlying processes, despite dissimilar outcomes.

The main thrust of this section has been to demonstrate that the major factors influencing the political, social and economic characteristics of Govanhill have changed considerably over time. While during the last century the area was significantly shaped by the influence of capitalist entrepreneurial development, by the mid to late 20th century local interests were predominantly influenced by planning agencies, and by the bureaucratic allocation of resources within a changing economic and political context. Against this background a complex range of local interest groups have sought to influence policy-making and the process of distribution. Today GHA is one such local agency. However, it will become apparent that the difference between the local Housing Association and other local agencies is that the Housing Association over time has become to an important extent an agency responsible for distributing scarce resources within the locality. It is this particular characteristic which has had important implications for the role of the 'community-based' housing association.

I shall return to Govanhill in the following chapter where I shall focus on the complex influences on the development of

Govanhill Housing Association Ltd. (GHA). In the rest of this chapter I shall examine more closely the area within which Reidvale Housing Association (RHA) was formed in 1975.

3. Reidvale

3.a. The locality

The area which has been termed Reidvale by many of its residents is not generally known by this name by most longstanding inhabitants of Glasgow. Nor has the name of Reidvale been referred to in official documents pertaining to the area - at least not prior to the inception of Reidvale Residents' Association in 1974, and of Reidvale Housing Association Ltd. in 1976.

Reidvale is a working class tenement housing area, which is more commonly known as South Dennistoun, and Dennistoun is a mainly residential area in the East End of Glasgow. South Dennistoun in 1971 had a population of just over 4,000 living in 1,500 houses.⁽²⁴⁾ By 1980, however, only 1,148 houses had been included in Action Areas for Improvement and, in 1980, Glasgow District Council planners were working on the assumption that, after amalgamations and demolition of property in poorest condition, by 1985 Reidvale would include 900 improved tenement houses and some new housing.⁽²⁵⁾

South and North Dennistoun are divided by Duke Street, a busy shopping thoroughfare laid out in the Scottish tradition of shops on the ground floor of tenement housing. The East of the area

is bounded by Millerston Street which houses a scaffolding company, a scrapyard, a church, a bingo hall and some tenement housing; to the South the area boundary is Reidvale Street which runs parallel to the Airdrie Railway line; and to the West the boundary is Bellgrove Street, a main route to the South East. The area is neighboured by several areas of distinct historical identity in the East End of the city, with its largely working class population and its now decimated industrial base of heavy engineering. These areas (Bridgeton, Parkhead and the Gallowgate) have experienced some of the most extensive demolition, industrial obsolescence and population decline in the city.

3.b. History

Unlike most of its neighbouring areas, Dennistoun was built as a suburb of Glasgow in the late 19th century. However, prior to this development during the 18th and 19th centuries, Dennistoun had consisted of a number of country estates owned by rich Glasgow merchant families.⁽²⁶⁾ During the mid 19th century local industry had included a tannery, glass manufacture and a dyeworks. (The dyeworks was owned by a highlander who imported solely Gaelic speaking workers who were all sworn to secrecy about the dye process which they operated within the confines of a high wall!) Later a large brewery was established in the area.

As with Govanhill, the pattern of late 19th century development of the locality was significantly influenced by the intentions of wealthy entrepreneurial families. However, while Govanhill was developed as a residential area to service heavy industrial development (similar to areas which neighboured Dennistoun), Dennistoun was conceived of as a suburb of Glasgow.

In 1838, John Reid, a successful merchant, began to acquire land and improve the existing streets in the area. Reid aimed for the area to be developed as a select suburb of the city and he employed an architect to draw plans to that end. The suburb of Dennistoun, according to these plans, was to incorporate intersecting streets and crescents of large stone built terraced and villa housing, similar to the layout of the West End of the city, which later became the fashionable suburb of the intelligentsia and upper middle classes. However, Reid died in 1851, before his plans were put into effect. Alexander Dennistoun, the son of a wealthy merchant banker who lived on an estate in the area, acquired Reid's property and his plans for developing the area. Work started in 1857 on the striking Victorian terraces and crescents of North Dennistoun which, during the post-war period, fell into multiple and commercial ownership. Despite considerable deterioration the aesthetic quality of buildings is well-recognised and parts of the area have been zoned a Conservation Area.

Dennistoun eventually altered the original plans for South Dennistoun to allow for lower cost and more profitable housing development at a time of a rapidly expanding urban population. Changes were initially to build large-size, good standard, red sandstone tenements, but by 1877 a pattern of higher density tenement housing, mainly 2-3 apartments, was established in the South of Dennistoun. Apart from cost reasons for the change of plans, the presence of small potteries and chemical works in the area made it less attractive as a base for investment in middle class housing by builders who increasingly concentrated such provision to the West and South of the city.

As a result, social and status differences between North and South Dennistoun were apparent by the turn of the century. They were marked by the size and character of housing and by the greener environment of housing characterised by tree-lined streets and the Alexandra Park, donated by Dennistoun and situated in the North. In comparison the atmosphere of the South suggested its higher density, its more functional building and proximity to industry.

As well as these differences in housing and environment between the two sides of Duke Street, there were variations in standards of educational provision. Dennistoun residents have long taken pride in the standard of schooling in the area and the Scottish Education Department commented in a 1900 report that 'the status and function

of Whitehill (the secondary in North Dennistoun) should be that of a high class public school for the East End of the city'. However, it was said of the headmaster who was leaving the South Dennistoun primary to become the first headmaster of the secondary in 1891, that he came from 'a comparatively humble school in the East End'. (27)

The present character of the area is represented by several other landmarks and sources of local employment. An old hospital and obsolescent prison are positioned at the North West corner, and these face a large, rather ugly, animal slaughter house. To the far North, neighbouring the park, is a large tobacco factory complex and somewhere in the middle is the old, much frequented Dennistoun Palais, a dance hall turned Bingo Hall, which has recently been converted into a supermarket. To the East are mainly small firms, but further East was Beardmore's, a large heavy engineering firm, which until the early 1980s was a major source of local employment. To the South of the area is a large chemical works which, prior to the effects of a local campaign, regularly blew its fumes directly onto the high-rise blocks positioned next to it. Finally, as in Govanhill, there are a few very small firms operating in the backcourts. These include a garage, a firm making wooden boards and a firm producing fishing tackle.

3.c. Changes in housing and work

As with the pattern described in Govanhill, industrial employment has contracted steadily in the East End since 1945. In Dennistoun today, employment opportunities are dominated by the distribution and service trades (87%) although, perhaps surprisingly, unemployment levels for Dennistoun as a whole have been found to be lower than the Scottish average.⁽²⁸⁾ While there are no recent figures available for the South Dennistoun (Reidvale) area, we should note that planners have recognised that South Dennistoun has more in common - in terms of lack of amenity and environmental and social disadvantages - with other parts of the East End than with the majority of North Dennistoun. For example, in 1977 GEAR, a co-ordinating agency aiming to improve conditions in Glasgow's East End, agreed to include areas adjacent to its boundary, like South Dennistoun, within its zone of operation following local pressure aimed at influencing GEAR's resource allocation.⁽²⁹⁾

As for housing and its physical environment in South Dennistoun, the pattern reflects changes affecting Govanhill as well as other working class tenemented areas in Glasgow. By the mid 1970s, almost half the tenement housing had changed hands from landlords to private individuals. Also the local authority had acquired a few houses in the area, generally from purchasers who had not been able to meet loan repayments. Owner-occupiers were

generally either former local authority tenants from the peripheral schemes who wanted to live near the city centre or young couples or families who saw limited opportunity of access to council houses in an area of their choice, some of whom hoped that ownership of a tenement house in Reidvale, during a period of inflating house prices, might provide a first step towards ownership of a larger house with better facilities. (30)

The condition of housing and the backcourts by the late 1960s, was showing considerable decay and disrepair, in the form of flaking stonework and grimy buildings. The backcourts frequently had broken paving stones, grass growing wild, and the collective bin-shelters were often broken through either vandalism or lack of repair and were, therefore, insanitary. However, in Reidvale there were variations in housing standards. Of the nine side streets in Reidvale only one street possessed tenements with outside toilets. Also, while the larger houses built with internal bathrooms were concentrated in one side street and on Duke Street, the main shopping street, the tenement houses in one side street to the West of the area had decayed to the extent that their demolition was inevitable. (31)

Within Dennistoun generally, such housing was concentrated in the Reidvale area, although to the far North end, and in one street in the North West, some tenement housing lacked basic amenities and was in a similar state of disrepair. However, by the 1970s, housing in North Dennistoun reflected a different set of problems. Its

larger housing, which had been built to a higher standard than in the South, had not attracted sufficient people with the stable and higher income levels required to maintain such property. Large houses were, therefore, gradually sub-let or sub-divided, and many were converted into lodging houses. These developments were reflected in poor standards of property maintenance.

In addition, North Dennistoun has been affected by the problem of subsidence, which has been prevalent in many parts of Glasgow. In the late 1960s, structural faults were apparent in certain buildings and Building Societies were refusing to lend in North Dennistoun to prospective owners. In a pattern similar to that in Govanhill, the cycle of blight had set in. However, this pattern was reversed during the 1970s. Following growing political commitment to subsidise private sector housing repairs (1978) and to sustain owner-occupation (1980 onwards), building societies have become more favourably disposed to lending capital in such areas.

Finally, Dennistoun like other inner areas in Glasgow, has been characterised by an ageing population and associated problems of dependency during the post-war period. By 1977, approximately 20% of houses occupied in South Dennistoun included pensioners amongst their inhabitants.⁽³²⁾ Also during this period there was a growing rate of population movement, although it would appear that such movement had never matched the pace of outward movement characterising areas like Elderpark, on the periphery of Govan or other parts of the East End.⁽³³⁾

However, despite these marked changes which have affected South Dennistoun, or 'Reidvale' as it has increasingly been termed, there are several local residents who have lived for over 50 years within the area, sometimes in the same 'close' for all their years, and who refer to the past in nostalgic terms. They speak of how housing in the Reidvale area used to be well-maintained but how, over time, several ground floor houses had become damp and uninhabitable; how Reidvale used to be a 'good area' and a 'good community' within which people were socially interconnected; how landlords and 'factors' used to ask prospective tenants to provide references from relatives or friends in the area or from local notables; how family and neighbours were an important aspect of life in the area and how children had been well-cared for and supervised, to a greater extent than in the present day.⁽³⁴⁾

In general, then, vandalism and disrepair and social problems, such as drugs, are viewed by local residents as part of the area's recent history. Social changes (such as the breakdown of family networks, inadequate supervision of children and a lessening of pride) are perceived by many local residents as having operated alongside economic factors (rising unemployment, and the decline of investment in property maintenance by owners and property factors) and local planning uncertainties (particularly the threat of demolition) to influence the decline of the area. These perceptions have similarly been expressed by many long-standing residents in Govanhill, as well as in other older working class tenement areas in Glasgow.

I shall now concentrate on the effects of post 1945 planning on Reidvale.

3.d. The effects of planning

As we have seen to be the case in Govanhill, since 1960 planning changes and related uncertainties have affected the residents of South Dennistoun. Moreover, the development of an explicitly localised and separate identity of the area can be viewed as partly stemming from increasing local awareness of planning strategies and their implications during the early 1970s.

In the early 1960s, South Dennistoun was included as part of the Gallowgate Outline Comprehensive Development Area. Demolition was programmed for between 1966 and 1980, and redevelopment was planned for residential purposes. A new school was planned to replace the very old local primary which by the 1960s already carried an image of obsolescence. In a later planning report a Working Party emphasised the differences in amenity and character between North and South Dennistoun, which had led to the inclusion of the South in redevelopment plans. As the 1976 Report stated:

The North side of Duke Street is very different in character, the tenements being constructed to higher external standards than those in South Dennistoun, and they have survived in better condition for historical, social and economic reasons. (35)

In the South, residents were aware of the uncertainty surrounding the future of the area. However, despite the fact that many residents accepted rehousing offers, there was a steady movement of young families into the area, as well as the occasional large family who had been evicted from local authority housing for non-payment of rent. Other recent newcomers were some who had returned to the area in order to be near relatives or closer to their work. As in Govanhill, there was a stable population of many families, whose members crossed generations, living in the area. In parallel with these patterns, the number of empty houses in tenements increased during the 1960s.

3.e. The community worker as catalyst

In 1973, Ashok Ohri, a community worker employed by the Young Volunteer Force (which later became the Community Projects Foundation), came to live and work in South Dennistoun. Ohri selected South Dennistoun as a locality which might benefit from community development on these grounds: the area was a locality affected by planning proposals; it had a relatively stable population whose interests were adversely affected by these proposals; it had reasonably definable geographical boundaries; and finally it seemed to carry a likelihood of homogeneity of interests despite involving a mix of house size and tenure. The community worker initially concentrated on the residential zone within the ward boundary of Camlachie and this covered South Dennistoun, the neighbouring high flats and the

Gallowgate. In general he described the area 'as facing a number of definable community issues and as undergoing a process of change'. (36)

At the start Ashok Ohri used the Ward Committee as a forum for discussion as it represented a range of local interests. He soon concluded that, while local leadership had developed in a tenants' association in the high flats, such leadership was lacking in South Dennistoun, where no residents' group was in existence. He, therefore, adopted the second of two current community work strategies, the first of which stressed that the community worker should concentrate on providing local services (for example by establishing an advice centre, playgroups or social facilities for the elderly), while the second suggested that he or she should act as a catalyst by focusing people's attention on the issues affecting their lives.

Opting for the second approach, Ashok Ohri established routine discussion groups with the intention of encouraging the development of both a growing awareness of common interests amongst local residents and a strong and stable local leadership. Later in 1973 Reidvale Residents' Association was formed, the group itself selecting a title which signified for them the boundary of their area. (37)

The first public meeting of the Association was held in December 1973 and, at this and subsequent meetings, a wide range of local issues were discussed. During 1974, the Reidvale Residents'

Association Gazette (RRAG) was published, and this lively local paper was produced until 1977, when the majority of those actively involved in its production felt they had insufficient support.

Housing and planning were quickly confronted as major issues, both at public meetings and in the Gazette. At one public meeting attended by the local Labour councillor, residents started to argue strongly in favour of the retention of housing to the South of Duke Street. Through Ashok they were aware of developments in Govan and Govanhill, as well as of the change in government policy towards improvement. The councillor, however, was not likeminded. He stated publicly that it would be best for the area 'if a bulldozer was driven from Millerston Street to Bellgrove'. (38)

Despite this lack of support, local sentiment was sufficiently strong to form a Housing Action Group aiming to persuade the local authority to improve housing in Reidvale. The group was educated by Ashok as to the 1974 legislation and its implications; about the role of the Housing Corporation; and about the potential for a locally-based housing association on the Central Govan and Govanhill model, under the control of local residents. The central aims of this group were to ensure an early start to an improvement programme and to have improvements co-ordinated by a locally-based housing association. By August 1975 an advert in RRAG stated that housing was the common issue facing Reidvale residents:

It will take considerable effort to improve even our good buildings to the tolerable standard. If alterations are going to take place, we want to control how, when and where. One of the best ways of exercising this control is through a local housing association. If you live in Reidvale and if you are interested in any aspect of housing - renting, buying, selling, improving, preserving or factoring - please join our Housing Action Committee.

Other topics discussed at public meetings and in the local paper included housing and planning issues such as the concern of council tenants about the high-rise blocks affected by fumes from the neighbouring chemical factory;⁽³⁹⁾ the implications of planning proposals for South Dennistoun;⁽⁴⁰⁾ problems of increasing dereliction and disrepair in North Dennistoun and the implications of impending demolition for certain tenements in the South;⁽⁴¹⁾ and the chronic condition of some of the housing requiring improvement.⁽⁴²⁾ Other topics included the opening of Reidvale Residents' Centre (6 May 1975), its provision of a legal and advisory service, a Senior Citizens club and a Youth Club; and finally, local concerns about crime and the need for more police patrols in the area.⁽⁴³⁾

Between 1974 and 1975 the Action Committee had been introduced to architects from Assist, as well as to other professionals who advised them about varying aspects of voluntary improvement and about the role of housing associations. Ashok had learnt, through a community workers' forum in the city, that the Housing Corporation and the local authority were jointly proposing to support the formation of six locally-based housing associations

as part of the first phase of a city-wide improvement programme. The Housing Action Committee was determined to ensure Reidvale's inclusion amongst the 'first six'. They succeeded in obtaining a hearing with local authority officials in the Clearance and Improvement section, and the group representatives argued strongly for Reidvale's inclusion. Following these discussions representatives concluded that the 'authorities' had not intended initially that Reidvale Housing Association should be one of the first phase. However, the formation of a Steering Group for Reidvale Housing Association was approved during 1975.⁽⁴⁴⁾

While this group had consistently favoured locally co-ordinated improvement as opposed to redevelopment, this was largely because they saw housing improvement and a locally-based housing association as the best option for the residents of Reidvale in the context of existing and feasible alternatives. The aims of the group had developed out of discussions and out of growing awareness of the planning context and the possibilities of action. When the Steering Group was formed with the approval and support of relevant authorities, those who had been involved in the prior phase of self-education and involvement in the urban political arena felt a considerable sense of achievement. Certain members of the group described how events to a large extent seemed 'unreal', particularly given their prior cynicism regarding the likely effects of local pressure on the 'bureaucracy' of the local authority and on the convoluted planning system. Bureaucrats and

professionals had never before had a 'human face' and the bureaucracy was an immovable object. Set against this background, one prominent member of the group described how their achievements and experience 'all seemed like a modern fairy tale'.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Similar incredulity was reported as part of the experience of early participants in Govanhill.

While the majority of residents outside the Action Group were unaware of details of the planning context and of locally-based rehabilitation, the news that the area was to be zoned for improvement quickly spread throughout the area. Even for those who attended public meetings at which developments and intentions were explained, it was difficult to comprehend the complex planning context and details of implementation. The general response was favourable, although many were cynical, and some did not believe it would happen at all. The vast majority at the least wondered how these developments would affect them personally.

However, there were some who saw rehabilitation as being more beneficial to their interests than the other housing options available to them, but who questioned whether it made sense to invest public resources in the improvement of tenement housing at all. One such critic was the Chairman of the Reidvale Residents' Association who believed that, if local residents had been given a realistic alternative of demolition and local rehousing or one of speedy new building alongside gradual phased demolition within the area, then rehabilitation would have been less likely as a favoured option.⁽⁴⁶⁾

3.f. Perceptions of community: the case of Community Council formation

Unlike the pattern in Govanhill and Govan, neighbourhood organisation and collective action in Reidvale was a phenomenon of the mid 1970s. Between 1974 and 1975, the Residents' Association developed in strength and a Steering Group was formed for Reidvale Housing Association Ltd. (RHA). At that time the only other local groups were the Ward Committees for Dennistoun and Camlachie, of which the boundaries met on Duke Street, and some voluntary groups in the North, which were concerned with providing social facilities for different ages and interests. Also, in the neighbouring council housing scheme, tenants in the high flats had formed the Whitevale and Bluevale Tenants' Association.

In June 1975 Dennistoun Ward Committee (a traditionally Labour ward) was invited by the Corporation to generate public debate over the formation and structure of a Community Council which would act as a forum on local issues and a point of contact with the local authority. On 8th July 1975 a Steering Committee was formed.

This Steering Committee envisaged a Community Council which would represent residents throughout Dennistoun. However, Reidvale residents were concerned that such a large agency might not provide the most effective vehicle for representing their area which they believed had specific problems. They, therefore, formed a Steering Group with representatives from the high flats and new council housing development - in line with their old ward boundary. The

outcome was that Reidvale joined with the North Camlachie Community Council, against the wishes of the Dennistoun Steering Committee which had proposed a structure of sub-area representation on to a broad area committee. A report in RRAG commented:

Many of the Steering Committee were disappointed that Reidvale or North Camlachie, as they now wish to be called, did not come in as part of Dennistoun, as we had always considered that area to be part of Dennistoun. (47)

Between 1975 and 1979 the Reidvale Residents' Association and the North Camlachie Community Council, both led by strong and locally respected chairmen, met regularly, both independently and jointly to discuss common issues. At public meetings, a broad range of topics, including the development and progress of RHA were discussed. While RHA was the subject of considerable criticism and was frequently called to account at public meetings, between 1977 and 1978 the three agencies worked in partnership to gain Urban Aid funding and official support for joint leasing of a large vacant college annexe within Reidvale. However, in 1979, the Residents' Association and the Community Council argued that their overlapping membership and interests no longer justified the continuation of separate public meetings.

By 1981 the Building College Annexe had become a focal point in the locality. Its large buildings had been altered to provide space for RHA's offices, a workshop and community halls, as well as a doctors' surgery. The landscaped area to its front had positioned

in its midst a rather progressive sculpture which had been commissioned by the Neighbourhood Centre Committee, and which provided a source of local debate.

In conclusion, between 1973 and 1975, neighbourhood representation and action were firmly established in Reidvale. A significant influence on this development had been the community education and development, initiated by the YVF community worker and supported by a small number of young professionals whose interests were tied to the area by work and/or residence. For example, a young planner who lived in North Dennistoun had regularly attended Residents' Association meetings and, together with members of Assist, had frequently advised local people on housing and planning issues.

Finally, Reidvale people opted for a Community Council separate from their neighbours in North Dennistoun. This would suggest that differences in the social and housing characteristics of the two sides of Duke Street were perceived by Reidvale residents as involving too complex an interest basis to allow for effective representation on locally specific issues. Secondly, it would suggest that Reidvale people saw themselves as having more significant interests in common with council housing residents across the railway line, than with other private housing residents in the area locally termed 'Up the Drives', especially in relation to housing, education, open space and neighbourhood facilities.

Therefore, despite differences in the origins of neighbourhood action in both Govanhill and Reidvale, their locally-based housing associations (CBHAs) were formed on the basis of local residents' active commitment to the retention and improvement of local housing, during a period of changing government policy concerning the issue of housing obsolescence and decay. This was not the pattern in all areas in the West of Scotland where CBHAs were formed. For example, while four of the 'first phase' associations were formed following consistent local pressure on the local authority, some CBHAs were formed through the initiative of the Housing Corporation regional office in partnership with the local authority. (48)

Also, in both areas under focus, at times their different neighbourhood organisations pooled their efforts. However, in the case studies we shall see that, in parallel with joint activities and achievements by the housing associations in partnership with local residents' groups, there were underlying tensions and manifest conflicts which at times focused on the housing association. In some areas, tenants' associations were formed or resurrected after the establishment of their local association, and these tenants' associations became a focal point both for liaison on common issues and for the articulation of local conflicts. (49)

In others, the residents' group which had pressured for a locally-co-ordinated improvement programme, dissipated at the point of housing association establishment. (50)

We shall see how varying patterns of local leadership and neighbourhood organisation, and of established status divisions, have been reflected in different stages of development of both the local housing associations on which I shall focus in the following chapters. The case studies of Reidvale and Govanhill Housing Associations will illustrate changes in their relations with other local residents' groups. Also the case studies should serve to highlight how some aspects of the development of individual CBHAs are influenced by historically established social characteristics of the localities in which they are based; while other aspects may be seen to reflect the influence of local leadership, personalities and of specific local conditions; and finally others will be shown to stem from wider political and economic developments affecting inner area residents and the activities of their local housing association.

To conclude this chapter on the two localities I shall now consider some of the theoretical questions which have been raised about the concept of community and about the idea of community control.

4. A Note on Community and Community Control

4.a. Community

I shall suggest here that the terms 'community' and 'community-based' imply certain assumptions - first, about the qualitative

aspects of social relations in the inner areas in which CBHAs are based; secondly, about the control that CBHA participants have over the development of their organisations; and, thirdly, about the role of CBHAs in representing local interests.

These varied assumptions which are implicit in the concept of community have been a focus of considerable discussion in the social sciences.⁽⁵¹⁾ For example, sociologists have pointed to a multiplicity of meanings which have been associated with the term community and Hillery⁽⁵²⁾ has identified 94 different definitions of the concept. The term has been applied in relation to different types of social groups (professional communities, occupational communities and geographically defined social communities),⁽⁵³⁾ although it has been argued that the main elements which these definitions have in common are those of area (geographical boundary), common ties or mutual interests, and social interaction.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Also, Clark argues that the two fundamental communal aspects of any social system are a sense of solidarity and a sense of significance.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Against this background of terminological confusion, some writers have argued that we should forego the term community altogether and substitute concepts such as 'locality social system' or 'neighbourhood'.⁽⁵⁶⁾

It will be evident that I have used the terms neighbourhood and locality rather than community in discussing my two areas. In many respects the social characteristics of Reidvale and Govanhill, and of the other inner areas in which CBHAs are based

would support the findings of many sociological studies of neighbourhoods; namely that patterns of social relations have differed between localities and over time within them, and that there are social status divisions within neighbourhoods, as well as divisions of interest and of area identification which would challenge any assumptions about consensual relations.⁽⁵⁷⁾ Also, it has been emphasised that communities may have different degrees and forms of control over events and activities which take place inside their boundaries.⁽⁵⁸⁾

I shall suggest here that Clark has provided us with a working definition of the minimum characteristics of neighbourhoods which can be termed communities. It is, therefore, relevant to ask whether the CBHA neighbourhoods, on which this study concentrates, are characterised by social relations which suggest both a sense of solidarity and a sense of significance. We have seen that the majority of CBHA areas had experienced planning blight and related resident uncertainty about housing, and in parallel since the late 1950s, the Council's comprehensive redevelopment strategy had affected both movement and decline in local populations. By the early and mid 1970s, in many such areas, patterns of resident protest about local authority planning co-existed alongside local residents' preferences for moving to a house in local authority schemes, or into neighbouring tenement areas where their personal investment in a house would be more secure. Therefore, for some residents the neighbourhood had declined in significance, while

others became committed to fighting the planners and to ensuring the retention of their neighbourhood. In areas like Govanhill and Reidvale, the collective action which was oriented towards retaining and improving local housing has illustrated, on the one hand, a growing awareness of common interests (solidarity) and, on the other, both moral and political concerns about 'making the area a better place to live in' and about pressing government agencies to support that intention and to recognise the 'significance' of the neighbourhood for the lives of local residents. Therefore, I would conclude that, at the time of CBHA formation, aspects of community were present in such neighbourhoods.

4.b. The ideology of community development and participation

Having discussed these aspects of community in relation to Glasgow's inner areas, I shall now raise a further point which has been emphasised about the concept of community - namely the ideological assumptions which are generally implicit when the concept is applied with reference to both neighbourhood social relationships and to social policy.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Regarding neighbourhood social relationships, it has been argued that the term community should be seen as implying moral notions about what neighbourhood relations should involve (common values, supportive social relations). Clearly such values may be found to be more or less present in the ongoing life of existing neighbourhoods, or of wider social systems, which are termed communities (such as nations, the

European Economic Community).

On the topic of social policy it has also been argued that the term community is frequently used by planners as a means of legitimating and defending planning policies.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Thomas and Cresswell state:

Community is a vital emotive word ... since the word is used as a claim both for support and for a particular state of being it is not just a version of reality but, in a condensed form a sociological charter. ⁽⁶¹⁾

And Heraud argues from his study of the planning advocates of New Towns that:

In general the concept of community can be seen as a code word or taken for certain states of being desired by particular groups and is part of the attempt to persuade others of the legitimacy of such aims. ⁽⁶²⁾

As well as pointing to the growing popularity of the idea of the neighbourhood community,⁽⁶³⁾ writers have examined the growing emphasis on neighbourhood control in different areas of social policy⁽⁶⁴⁾ - as, for example, in the Social Services (Seebohm Report, 1968),⁽⁶⁵⁾ Education (Schools Councils),⁽⁶⁶⁾ and in housing and planning (the Skeffington Report, 1969).⁽⁶⁷⁾ All these developments have involved a planning emphasis on community development and education, and on increasing public participation in planning. The Seebohm Report states:

There are many benefits to be gained for individuals and families from the sense of belonging to a community and of participating in its various activities, and the development of this identity and activity is important in securing an effective family service. (68)

Therefore, during the late 1960s, state agencies generally emphasised the values of community and of community development, as a means of both extending accountability to clients, and of increasing the effectiveness of state provision of services. These developments were also in part a response to growing demands for citizen participation, and to neighbourhood-based protest, in Britain and the United States during the 1960s. It is of interest, also, that state supported community development played a role in stimulating such demands and protest, which in turn led to the withdrawal of state funding from certain projects. (69)

Analyses of community development, community action, and public participation have suggested contradictory conclusions. For those writing from the perspective of liberal social science, such developments have all been viewed as positive extensions of a pluralist, democratic political system in which tendencies towards bureaucratic centralised planning can be balanced by pressure group demands for responsiveness and accountability to local demands and interests. (70) However, analyses by radical social scientists (radical Weberians and Marxists) suggest a greater ambivalence, by pointing to the contradictory implications of these developments. On the one hand, they argue that the emphasis on community is a

conservative influence, which stresses people's identification with local interests and local problems, rather than with the wider political and economic interests which they have in common with other urban residents who occupy a similar class position.⁽⁷¹⁾ Further, they remind us of historical and cross-cultural examples of how social reformers have emphasised 'the principle of community', and have stressed community regeneration as a significant means of establishing social consensus. For example, Glass⁽⁷²⁾ has traced the strategy of community regeneration back to Chalmers' proposals in 1912, while Dennis has referred to South African Apartheid (Separate Development) as an example of a political strategy which emphasises local social systems, and which aims to inhibit the development of a wider political and economic class consciousness.⁽⁷³⁾ Community development from this perspective is clearly a technique of social control and many studies of neighbourhood protest and of community development in Britain during the 1970s have presented a pessimistic view of their outcomes. For example, Dennis states that:

A potential trade union leader, or a potential member of the Communist party, is obviously less threatening if he is engaged in Community Association activities instead. The constitutions of Community Associations rigorously exclude politics from the range of their interests. Though Community Associations played little part in the ordinary life of the residents, they do occupy a good deal of the time of potential trouble-makers - the committee-likers. (74)

These critics of community action have suggested that community action and localised public participation have frequently resulted in the disillusionment of those who became involved largely 'to make their neighbourhood a friendly place to live in', or to improve their own housing opportunities. Also, Cockburn describes participatory democracy and the community approach as in keeping with corporate management strategies which have the intent and outcome of absorbing potential conflicts over urban resources. (75)

And on these contradictory tendencies of neighbourhood action and public participation Cockburn argues:

To think of community action places struggle on ground prepared, over a long historical period, by the state. It takes a shape that is expected, anticipated and even proposed by the state. (76)

The key point argued by these radical critics is that offers of participation and of community development by the state, cannot in themselves be realistically viewed as political gains by the working class urban residents to whom they are offered. On the other hand, it is argued that while such developments tend to incorporate urban residents within the overall framework of urban planning and administration, they may also result in new demands and linkages which serve to challenge the interests and intentions of state agencies.

I shall return to these questions about the contradictions of community involvement in the state planning system, after the

case studies which follow. However, I shall conclude this discussion on issues relating to community control and participation by clarifying some links between the establishment of CBHAs in Glasgow and certain of the points which have been discussed in this section.

4.c. CBHAs, community and community control

I shall suggest here that the idea of the 'community-based' housing association may have been as much influenced by the intentions of state agencies about community regeneration, as it was by any prior existence of community or of community action. We have seen that central and local government agencies, such as the SDD, the HC and the District Council, collectively played a significant role in determining the planning areas in which CBHAs operate. On the other hand, we have also seen how established patterns of social relations in CBHA localities, as well as community development, served to influence CBHA participants' perceptions of neighbourhood, housing and participation, and the formation of CBHAs.

Therefore, CBHAs can be seen to reflect some of the contradictions of public participation and of community development which I have discussed in this section. On the one hand, the formation of CBHAs was consistent with general trends in central state planning which included the extension of public participation, the area-based planning approach, the swing away from comprehensive

redevelopment towards rehabilitation, and the promotion of the voluntary housing movement as a means to those ends. Moreover, we have seen that the idea of 'community-based' housing associations reflected the intentions of planners who were committed to the extension of opportunities for participation in the context of a centralist and authoritarian local authority planning machine, and the related powerlessness of working class urban residents. Therefore, to a significant extent CBHAs were formed on 'ground prepared by' a partnership of local and central state agencies.

On the other hand, we have seen that residents' groups were strongly committed to the retention of housing in the inner areas and were positively disposed towards assuming responsibility for the rehabilitation of their areas. However, at the point of CBHA formation, local residents (and state agencies in the case of early-formed associations like Govanhill) had no real notion of how control would operate in practice. In the case studies I shall explore the range of uncertainties which affected CBHA participants in the early stages of CBHA development. Also, by focusing on the career of different policy issues facing Govanhill and Reidvale Housing Associations, we shall be able to understand better the nature of the experience of involvement for CBHA participants, the complex character of control, and the influence of internal, local, governmental, political and economic factors upon their development.

Notes and References to Chapter Ten

- (1) Govanhill Local Plan, Survey Report, City of Glasgow District Council, May 1979, p. 2, l.l.
- (2) The Dennistoun Local Plan, City of Glasgow District Council, June 1980, p. 5, 3.1 shows how the population of the Local Plan area fell from 5,848 in 1971 by loss of 17% to 4,860 in 1977, primarily due to the clearance of unfit properties in South Dennistoun.
- (3) For example, the Camlachie Local Plan Survey Report, December 1978, identified from the 1971 Census unemployment rates of 20% for males and 10% for females, as compared with unemployment rates of 16% (male) and 8% (female) in the GEAR area, (see GEAR, Household Survey, Scottish Development Agency, October 1978). Comparable unemployment rates for Govanhill and Reidvale were identified as near the Glasgow average of 11% male unemployment and 5% female unemployment. Obviously it is likely that all these figures have increased since the 1971 Census.
- (4) See Areas of Need in Glasgow, The Corporation of Glasgow, Second Review of the Development Plan, June 1972, Table 4, pp. 23-24. Also a 1976 planning study defined Govanhill as an intermediate area in terms of disadvantage. Govanhill Study, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Strathclyde, 1976, pp. 6-10.
- (5) Local Plans for Govanhill and Dennistoun, Glasgow District Council, June 1980.
- (6) For example, people travel from all parts of the South side of Glasgow to shop on Victoria Road and in Govanhill's delicatessens, while Duke Street's shops serve mainly East Enders.
- (7) D. MacLennan, M. Brailey and N. Lawrie, The Rehabilitation Activities and Effectiveness of Housing Associations in Scotland, a Report prepared for the Scottish Development Department, April 1983, pp. 74-75.
- (8) A Housing Association Programme for the 1980s, Scottish Federation of Housing Association, 1982, pp. 6-9.
- (9) The District Council's Local Plan area for Govanhill is wider than the housing association's area of operation.

- (10) See Govanhill Housing Association Survey by S. Mason, 1975. Also, M. Thornley, 'Assist Part I, A basis for tenement improvement' Housing Rehabilitation Section 3, Case Study 1, Architects Journal, Vol. 10, November 1976.
- (11) Govanhill Study, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, 1976, op. cit., p. 3.
- (12) Burgh of Govanhill, Lanarkshire, Historical Statement by Commissioners, Glasgow Room, Mitchell Library, November 1891, pp. 30-108.
- (13) Ibid.
- (14) Govanhill Local Plan Survey Report, Glasgow District Council Planning Department, May 1979, p. 9, paras. 3.3 and 3.4.
- (15) There are discrepancies in statements about the proportion of owner-occupation in Govanhill, The Local Plan Survey Report, 1979, specifying 40%, while the 1976 study specifies 35% - both from 1971 Census figures. However, the Govanhill Study, 1976, op. cit. states that between 1961 and 1971, owner-occupation in Govanhill increased from 22% to 35% as compared with an increase from 16% to 22% (Glasgow) and 21% to 25% (Glasgow Region).
- (16) See J. Rex and R. Moore, Race Community and Conflict, Oxford University Press, 1967, pp. 272-285, and J.R. Mellor, Urban Sociology in an Urbanised Society, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977, pp. 82-87.
- (17) Social surveys were carried out by GHA between 1974 and 1976.
- (18) The popularity of certain inner areas like Govanhill was mentioned in interview by a senior official of the Reletting Section, Glasgow District Council, January 1981. See also, Govanhill Study, 1976, op. cit., pp. 27-30.
- (19) Govanhill: Report and First Stage Recommendations for Planning Action and Local Consultation in the Govanhill Community, Report by the Director of Planning, Glasgow District Council, January 1974, Section 4:1.
- (20) Ibid.
- (21) Govanhill Local Plan, Glasgow District Council, June 1980, op. cit., pp. 21-22, Proposals 18-19.
- (22) See Chapters Five and Eight.

- (23) In May 1980, I interviewed a Development Officer in Govanhill who had previously worked for Strathclyde Area Survey, University of Strathclyde, on a project which was involved in assessing local residents' preferences about Community Council boundaries. Also, on this topic, I interviewed community workers at The View and activists in neighbourhood groups in the Summer of 1980.
- (24) Reidvale Papers No. 3, Environmental Improvement in Reidvale, Marian Jacobs, Young Volunteer Force Foundation (YVFF), June 1975, p. 4.
- (25) Dennistoun Local Plan, City of Glasgow District Council, June 1980, op. cit., p. 5.
- (26) See J. Baird, Dennistoun, Past and Present, (with a foreword by J. Barrie), The Dennistoun Press, Duke Street, 1922.
- (27) J. Black and H. Whyte, Dennistoun, A Brief History, Glasgow Room, Mitchell Library, 1973.
- (28) Dennistoun Local Plan, City of Glasgow District Council, June 1980, op. cit., p. 14, para. 4.1.
- (29) Correspondence between Reidvale Housing Association and Secretary to the Governing Committee, Urban Renewal Unit, 16 March 1977 and 5 May 1977 regarding East End Project Area Boundary; see also Minute of GEAR, Third Meeting of the Governing Committee, 25 April 1977, Item 12.
- (30) As a Development Officer, I interviewed owner-occupiers as part of the social survey to determine residents' preferences prior to improvement.
- (31) Several reports have included information on social and structural aspects of Reidvale's housing. For example, Dennistoun Local Plan, Report of Survey, Glasgow District Council, 1976; architectural surveys commissioned by Glasgow District Council prior to the improvement programme in 1975; and social surveys of new Action Areas, RHA, 1976, 1977 and 1978.
- (32) Development Report on 'Implications of Population and Housing Survey' to Reidvale Housing Association Management Committee, April 1977. See also Dennistoun Local Plan, City of Glasgow District Council, June 1980, op. cit., p. 5, para. 3.1.

- (33) See GEAR Household Survey, Scottish Development Agency, October 1978, p. 12, Sections 1.1 to 1.4. Also, I discussed variations in patterns of population movement with senior officials in six CBHAs between 1980 and 1981.
- (34) See Reidvale Housing Association, Annual Report, 1979 to 1980. Also, such perceptions were expressed, though unsolicited, during and outside interviews and meetings.
- (35) Dennistoun Local Plan, Report of Survey, The City of Glasgow District Council, September 1976, p. 2, 1.4.
- (36) I am grateful to Ashok Ohri, the YVFF Community Worker, who allowed me access to his work reports on the Mile End Neighbourhood Project, September and November 1973.
- (37) Interview with YVFF Community Worker, December 1978.
- (38) Interview with local residents who attended the Residents' Association Meeting, April 1975.
- (39) Reidvale Residents' Association Gazette (RRAG), November 1975.
- (40) RRAG, November 1974.
- (41) RRAG, August 1975.
- (42) RRAG, June 1975 and June 1976.
- (43) Minute of Reidvale Residents' Association Meeting, May 1975.
- (44) Other CBHAs included in the 'first phase' were Central Govan, 1972-3; Govanhill, 1974; Tollcross, 1973; Partick, 1975; Queens Cross, 1976; Elderpark, 1975; Linthouse, 1975.
- (45) Interview, November 1978, with past active member of Residents' Association (1973 to 1975), who became Chairman of Reidvale Housing Association and a nationally recognised figure in the housing association movement.
- (46) Interview May 1979 with Chairman of Reidvale Residents' Association.
- (47) RRAG, December 1975.
- (48) See Chapter Five.
- (49) For example, Central Govan, Reidvale and Govanhill.

- (50) For example, Rutherglen.
- (51) See D.E. Poplin, Communities, A Survey of Theories and Methods of Research, Macmillan, 1979; and R. Plant, H. Lesser and P. Taylor-Gooby, Political Philosophy and Social Welfare, Essays on the Normative Basis of Welfare Provision, Part III, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980, and C. Bell and H. Newby, Community Studies, An Introduction to the Sociology of the Local Community, George Allen and Unwin, 1971.
- (52) G.A. Hillery, 'Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement', Rural Sociology, Volume 20, 1955, pp. 117-118.
- (53) C. Bell and H. Newby, Community Studies, 1971, op. cit., p. 29, and M. Hill, 'Community Concepts and Applications', pp. 136-146 in Cities, Communities and the Young, Readings in Urban Education, Volume I, edited by J. Raynor and J. Harden, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul in association with Oxford University Press, 1973.
- (54) G.A. Hillery, 1955, op. cit., p. 118.
- (55) D.B. Clark, 'The Concept of Community: a Re-examination', Sociological Review, Volume 21, 1973, pp. 402-404.
- (56) M. Stacey, 'The Myth of Community Studies', British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 20, 1969.
- (57) See R. Pahl, Patterns of Urban Life, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970, pp. 69-82 and 100-113, and D.E. Poplin, Communities, 1979, op. cit., pp. 27-58.
- (58) D.E. Poplin, 1979, op. cit., pp. 149-150.
- (59) See B.J. Heraud, 'The New Towns: A Philosophy of Community', pp. 39-55 in The Sociology of Community Action, edited by P. Leonard, Sociological Review, Monograph No. 21, November 1975. Also, R. Plant, et al., 1980, op. cit., argue that community is an essentially contested concept in that it is evaluative or appraisive; it focuses on complex processes which invite different types of description; and it is vague and therefore subject to modification.
- (60) N. Dennis, 'The Popularity of the Neighbourhood Community Idea', pp. 74-94 in R.E. Pahl, Readings in Urban Sociology, Pergamon, 1978.
- (61) R. Thomas and P. Cresswell, The New Towns Idea, The Open University, 1973, quoted in B. Heraud, 'The New Towns: A Philosophy of Community', in The Sociology of Community Action, 1975, op. cit., p. 50.

- (62) B. Heraud, pp. 49-50, in The Sociology of Community Action, 1975, op. cit.
- (63) N. Dennis, Pergamon, 1978, op. cit. See also C. Cockburn, The Local State, Management of Cities and People, Pluto Press, 1978.
- (64) See J. Raynor and J. Harden (eds.), Cities, Communities and the Young, The Open University, 1973, op. cit., pp. 160-190; C. Cockburn, Pluto Press, 1978, op. cit., Chapter 4, pp. 97-131; and N. Boaden, et al., Public Participation in Local Services, Longman, 1982.
- (65) J. Raynor and J. Harden, Cities, Communities and the Young, The Open University, 1973, op. cit., pp. 160-163.
- (66) P. Raggatt and M. Evans (eds.), Urban Education, The Political Context, Ward Lock Educational and Open University Press, 1977, especially Part 3, pp. 269-359.
- (67) Raynor and Harden, op. cit., pp. 64-168.
- (68) Ibid., p. 161.
- (69) D. Donnison, 'Urban Development and Social Policies', in Health, Wealth and Housing, edited by R. and B. Leaper, Basil Blackwell, 1980, pp. 51-70.
- (70) For example, J. Rex's model of housing classes which compete in the urban housing market is representative of the Weberian perspective, as is R.E. Pahl's earlier work. See J. Rex and R. Moore, Race, Community and Conflict, Oxford University Press, 1967; N. Boaden, et al., Public Participation in Local Services, Longman, 1982, pp. 90-111. Also R.E. Pahl, Whose City, Longman, 1970; see also, P. Hall, Land, Parker and Webb, Change, Choice and Conflict in Social Policy, Heinemann, 1978, pp. 130-154.
- (71) See P. Saunders, Urban Politics, A Sociological Interpretation, Penguin, 1980, pp. 127-136; C.G. Pickvance, 'On the study of urban social movements', pp. 198-218 in Urban Sociology, Critical Essays, edited by C.G. Pickvance, Methuen and Co., 1979; P. Dunleavy, 'Protest and Quiescence in Urban Politics: A Critique of Pluralist and Structuralist Marxist Views', pp. 190-197 in A. Blowers, et al., (eds.), Urban Change and Conflict, An Interdisciplinary Reader, Harper and Row in association with the Open University Press, 1982; see also C. Cockburn, 'The New Terrain of Class Struggle', pp. 107-113 in Urban Change and Conflict, 1982, op. cit.

- (72) R. Glass, 'Urban Sociology in Great Britain', pp. 47-73 in R.E. Pahl, (ed.), Readings in Urban Sociology, Pergamon, 1978, especially pp. 71-73.
- (73) N. Dennis, 'The Popularity of the Neighbourhood Community Idea' in R.E. Pahl (ed.), Reading in Urban Sociology, 1978, op. cit., p. 90.
- (74) Ibid., p. 90.
- (75) C. Cockburn, The Local State, Pluto Press, 1978, op. cit., pp. 67-96 and 158-184.
- (76) Ibid., p. 159.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

A CASE STUDY OF GOVANHILL HOUSING ASSOCIATION LIMITED

This case study focuses on the development of Govanhill Housing Association Limited (GHA), between 1973 and 1982. In the first section I shall discuss how participants' early expectations and intentions were affected by their experience of establishing GHA, initiating the local improvement programme and developing as a local landlord. I shall focus on the following aspects of GHA's first phase of development between 1973 and 1976: committee composition, local accountability and GHA's role in the locality; early assumptions about the organisation and its approach; and relations with external groups and organisations. In the second section I shall concentrate thematically on developments affecting GHA's evolving role, first, as a local development agency involved in the improvement of housing and the environment; and secondly as a local landlord which is involved in allocating housing, in maintaining properties in its ownership and in negotiating its role in relation to the local authority. In the third section I shall concentrate on internal aspects of organisational development at GHA.

Section One : GHA's Early Development, 1973 to 1976

1.a. Formation and the context of uncertainty

In the last chapter I referred to the complex circumstances which faced the local group which sought to form a housing

association in the Govanhill area during 1973. As one founder member commented in interview: 'It seems remarkable that GHA ever got off the ground. We negotiated our way through a sea of uncertainty'.⁽¹⁾

What were the major uncertainties? First, there was the planning uncertainty affecting a significant proportion of housing in the locality. Secondly, there was confusion as to which government agencies would provide funding and influence the scope of the association's role in co-ordinating the improvement programme. Thirdly, there was the forthcoming General Election and the knowledge that a change of government could alter legislation affecting housing improvement and the role of housing associations. Finally the group was unclear regarding the medium and long-term aims of the organisation it was seeking to create.

The Steering Group attempted to resolve such initial uncertainties through debate and negotiation.⁽²⁾ However, the group was precipitated into taking some action after it was rumoured in February 1974 that a national housing association was keen to operate in Govanhill. The final catalyst was that the Group heard of a Property Factor's interest in selling off some houses in the area. The Steering Group resolved to press hard for speedy registration of GHA.⁽³⁾

In Chapter Nine I pointed to the financial insecurity of new associations prior to and following registration. GHA registered both with the Housing Corporation and as a Friendly Society with the Registrar of Friendly Societies. The initial funds required for registration were loaned by two local residents and in May 1974, GHA held a jumble sale to repay the £50 loan.

There was considerable confusion during 1974 as to how and when new funding procedures under the Housing (Scotland) Act 1974 would operate. (4) However, the Steering Group received positive financial support in the interim from Glasgow Corporation and from the Housing Corporation, both paying half of a promotional grant to enable the association to establish its local office and to employ staff. Uncertainties about funding were evident in GHA's application to the HC for loan finance.

After discussions with the Housing Corporation which have been protracted by the continued uncertainty about new housing legislation, the Govanhill Housing Association has decided to apply to the Housing Corporation for loan finance under Section 2 of the Housing Act, 1964. The Housing Corporation is prepared to apply on its behalf for subsidy contribution under Section 57 of the Housing (Financial Provisions) (Scotland) Act, 1972, being the easiest route to further subsidy under the Housing Act, 1974. (5)

We have seen that all associations face a considerable gap between initial expenditure on the one hand, and income from loans and grants and rents on the other; and that this causes problems of cash-flow, constraints on staffing up and reliance on bank overdraft guaranteed by the HC. (6) However, associations

formed after GHA have not generally confronted procedural uncertainties on the scale of those which faced GHA in 1974.

GHA was formed against a background of changing strategies on the part of agencies within the planning context. While such changes added to the prevailing uncertainty, we should remember that GHA's early participants were strongly committed to providing an alternative to established strategies for tackling the issue of local housing obsolescence. As one member stated:

Basically the Steering Group in Govanhill was formed as a response to threats. Some believed Glasgow Corporation would do nothing to improve the area and others believed that the Corporation would implement house improvements autocratically. Both possibilities were seen as equally harmful to local residents as they would result in rehousing outwith the area or compulsory purchase. Also we viewed the presence of a national housing association operating in the area with equal apprehension. (7)

Against the background of these uncertainties, participants attempted to clarify GHA's policies, to establish and promote the association locally and to initiate the housing improvement programme.

1.b. Aims and early development, 1973-1976

Between 1973 and 1974 the Committee, its advisers and its first official met fortnightly to discuss GHA's main aims and the issues affecting its early development. Significant aims and expectations related to three main aspects of GHA's role and development:

1. Local accountability, GHA's role in the locality and Committee composition;
2. organisation structure, relations and central tasks; and
3. relations with other agencies and groups, internal and external to the locality.

We shall see that, after the lengthy debate on organisational aims and on appropriate strategies for their realisation which took place in the early years, GHA's organisational goals, structure and inter-relations have undergone significant changes over time.

1.b.1. Committee composition and aspects of local accountability

From the start, members of the Steering Group were in agreement that GHA's management body should incorporate both a broad-ranging representation of local interests and support from people with relevant expertise. By late 1973 the group included in its membership a sympathetic local councillor, representatives from Govanhill Action Group, from the Ward Committee, from the more recently formed residents' associations (Annandale Square and Calder Square), which were formed as a direct response to the local authority's planning intervention, and a representative from The View.

In addition to these representatives, certain individuals had been invited to attend because of their particular experience or skills. From the start the Committee's friendly architect from the Assist was taken on board as Technical Adviser. In March and May of 1974 the lawyer, who had previously acted for Crossroads, and a retired rents officer both accepted invitations to join the Committee. Shortly afterwards, when the first houses were due to go on site, a property factor who supported GHA's interest in rehabilitating the area agreed to participate. At the same time Glasgow Corporation appointed a local councillor as its official representative on GHA. (8)

It is worth noting here that the Committee's concern with incorporating both geographic representation and professional skills was not generally a characteristic of later CBHAs. In initially opting for such varied representation, GHA's early Committee involved a lively mix of personalities and backgrounds which by all accounts served to influence both the development of policy and Committee-staff relations. (9)

For example, during 1974, Committee members initiated debate on GHA's future role as a local landlord, on the need to develop a lettings policy and on possibilities for developing tenant-management co-operatives. This pattern clearly differs from one whereby organisational initiatives and control rests with paid officials. Also it appears that the combination of enthusiasm,

political awareness and wide-ranging experience and skills was associated with the growing confidence of Committee and staff at GHA. However, it is perhaps surprising that GHA's early Committee involved only one tenant.

The young GHA had its critics in the neighbourhood whose views at times reflected certain contradictory aspects of housing associations. One such local critic of GHA was the President of Govanhill Residents' Association, a long-standing member of the Communist Party who in his seventies was a notable activist on community issues.

At the start I was wary of the housing association. I was asked to attend in an advisory capacity because of my involvement in community groups. I did so for about 10 meetings I watched as the Committee invited a factor and a lawyer to join them. I felt these professionals would have a vested interest in the housing association and disapproved of their presence on the Committee. I saw the factor as one among many who were responsible for the decline of housing in the area. (10)

This local resident, however, was also critical of the local authority's planning and housing record in Govanhill, but stated that he would have preferred direct labour to have executed improvements rather than the private contractors employed by GHA.

Another very active CP member, who joined GHA's Steering Group shortly after its formation, became GHA's second chairperson in February 1975 and held that office until she retired due to illness in 1978. (11) She had been invited to serve on the Committee initially

because of her accounting experience, and it was later discovered that this experience was gained in doing the books for the local branch of the Party!⁽¹²⁾ Therefore, for some on the political left CBHAs had bourgeois tendencies and contradicted with the extension of state control over housing. Others, however, emphasised the advances they brought in terms of extending opportunities for better housing and for control over the housing process to working class residents of the inner areas.

An important point about GHA's early Committee is that while it was composed mainly of owner-occupiers, participants generally assumed that this pattern would change over time. In discussion the term 'tenant-management' was frequently used to refer to the intended difference between GHA as a locally-based housing association and other organisations operating in the housing field.

A tenant-managed housing association ... would take people's desires into consideration and would also keep an eye on old folk who may not want to contend with the disruption of improvement. (13)

Similarly in its original application for loan finance to the Housing Corporation GHA had stated:

The examination of the Valuation Roll revealed a complex pattern of ownership usually found in tenements. ... An alternative form of tenure, perhaps a tenant-managed housing association is required to purchase and improve these dwellings. A housing association could be set up to cover all the Govanhill Treatment Areas, as well as providing housing for special groups such as the elderly. (14)

Both these comments in the light of later decisions and developments, serve to illustrate that the early participants were not fully aware of the potential contradictions between different aspects of GHA's policy. For instance, early in its history, the Committee and its staff were concerned that GHA should provide an improvement service to owner-occupiers. The potential tensions between GHA as a future tenant-managed body and its accountability to a broad range of local interests, including owner-occupiers, was not confronted at that early stage. However, between mid-1975 and early 1976 GHA's longest serving official initiated discussions on the future role of GHA and on the appropriateness of the 'tenant-management' clause in its official statement of goals.⁽¹⁵⁾ It was resolved in 1976 that GHA should develop as a locally-based service agency, managed by a body representing local interests and serving client groups of owner-occupiers, tenants and residents' associations.⁽¹⁶⁾

Therefore between 1974 and 1976 participants debated GHA's role in the locality, and agreement was reached about GHA's longer term approach and area of operation. However the Committee had no guidelines to refer to on the implications of GHA's increasing scale and complexity of operation for the association's future organisational development.

1.b.2. Early assumptions regarding GHA's organisation and its approach

Participants generally assumed that GHA would be a small

locally-based organisation. Discussions highlighted the related assumption that smallness of scale would be conducive to a more personal approach than was characteristic of the government agencies which GHA's early participants perceived as bureaucracies which 'treated people as units'.⁽¹⁷⁾ Local accountability and a sensitive approach to implementing improvements, offering maximum choice and involvement to residents, were therefore emphasised as central aims of GHA in its early stages.

Regarding its area of operation, the Committee had been asked by the Housing Corporation to identify its 'area of interest' at an early stage. The Committee resolved that GHA should provide an administrative and professional service to clients wishing to carry out house improvement over the whole of Govanhill. However, it was also decided that, given the geographical spread of the area, the association should in the longer term form area sub-committees in order to increase opportunities for participation by localised interests.

In fact the Housing Corporation was frequently represented at GHA's Committee meetings in the early stages. At times, therefore, HC representatives influenced Committee expectations about GHA's organisational growth. For example, in February 1974 the HC official had pointed out that GHA would eventually require professional staff to carry out administrative, factoring and accounting functions, and to co-ordinate the improvement programme.

In general, however, participants have suggested that the early Committee held no clear concept of how the organisation might develop in terms of the scale and complexity of central tasks and of organisation structure, and in terms of relations with external groups and organisations.

1.b.3. Relations with external groups and organisations

I have described how early participants aimed to involve extensive representation by neighbourhood groups in GHA's organisation. GHA's formation was generally welcomed by such groups as a means of generating new housing opportunities, of removing some of the planning uncertainties which affected the area, and of halting the physical decline of the neighbourhood.

In earlier chapters I have outlined the main interest groups whose skills and/or support are significant to housing associations. These were urban professionals, property owners and factors, and local councillors. In general, GHA's approach in the early stages was to incorporate both technical expertise and political support on to the Committee - a strategic choice which has been found to characterise other innovative organisations which operate in a politically hostile or uncertain environment. (18)

How did GHA's early Committee relate to government agencies? In general participants appreciated the support they had received from local authority officials and councillors, and from the HC.

They were convinced of a change in approach by certain sections of the local authority towards local community interests. They found that their initiatives regarding meetings and their statements of concern and intent were taken seriously. Also, they received regular advice and support from the new Glasgow office of the HC. However, at the stage of putting their first contract on site, the Committee held no preference as to whether funding came from the local authority or the Housing Corporation - although funding by the local authority was never a real possibility. (19)

GHA's early participants therefore held no strong commitment to GHA's role as a voluntary organisation operating within the private, older housing sector and funded through the Housing Corporation. Their central aims were for rehabilitation in Govanhill to be supported and funded by any of the relevant public agencies, and for local accountability to be mediated through the involvement of local residents in policy-making. (20)

In fact the local residents involved in the Committee found the relations between different public agencies highly confusing. One local resident on the Committee recollected:

We assumed at one stage, after discussion with the local Housing Corporation office, that eventually the Housing Corporation would act as a 'housing association department' within the local authority. (21)

However over time the roles and relationships of the different agencies were stabilised and more clearly understood.

An important characteristic of GHA's early approach was an emphasis on 'not falling out' with any agency representatives who might affect the association's future work. The emphasis by staff and Committee was on tact and reasonableness in negotiations with external bodies. However, participants increasingly experienced contradictory aspects of their relations with government agencies. These contradictions and their connections with tensions and ambivalence at GHA will be illustrated in the following section.

Finally, GHA was perceived by its participants as markedly different from other associations operating in Scotland. A proposal for a liaison committee of housing associations was responded to with mixed feelings. In general, members believed that GHA had to work out its own problems and to learn from its own experience, although it was accepted that GHA required advice from both professionals and the Housing Corporation. There was also a generally held view that GHA was a different kind of animal from "conventional" housing associations.⁽²²⁾ However, by mid-1975 - by which time there were five such neighbourhood-based housing associations in the city - GHA's participants were more favourably disposed to involvement in joint discussions.

Having described some of the important aspects of GHA's early approach I want to stress here that soon after its formation, GHA acquired an organisational identity - both for participants and

for agencies operating in relation to it. In sociological terms GHA was reified. Participants and key external agencies spoke in terms of 'the best interests of GHA' and of 'GHA aims'.⁽²³⁾ Also within a relatively short time-scale, Committee decisions became 'GHA's policies' and GHA's role was firmly established within Glasgow's planning context. However GHA's innovative role and its small scale meant that the association's identity was personified in terms of its best-known participants, by the groups and agencies interacting with GHA. New housing associations, Housing Corporation (HC) officials and local residents frequently referred to GHA's first Development Officer, or to Committee members, in discussions about GHA. Also GHA's small-scale and pioneering role meant that the young association was significantly vulnerable, dependent on outside agencies, and liable to change with changes in its key participants.

Having described important aspects of GHA's formative stage of development I shall now attempt to outline what I consider to be significant and distinguishing characteristics of GHA's later growth, development, problems and achievements. Preceding chapters have pointed to the complexity of both CBHAs and the environment in which they operate. In the following section I shall illustrate GHA's main areas of policy and describe how different types of policy have evolved throughout GHA's history until 1983. Therefore, rather than provide a straight historical account of GHA's growth, change and increasing complexity, I have chosen to structure my account

both historically and thematically.

Section Two : The Evolution of Goals at GHA

I have described how the early aims of participants and the intentions of external agencies influenced GHA's official and stated goals. In this section I shall focus on three main sets of goals which have influenced activities, organisation structure, internal and external relations and central concerns within GHA.

I referred earlier to Perrow's analysis of organisational goals.⁽²⁴⁾ Perrow states that 'goals are multiple and conflicting, and thus the "character" of an organisation is never stable', and that goals are pursued 'sometimes in sequence, sometimes simultaneously'.⁽²⁵⁾ Also, I have suggested that the main goals of CBHAs imply a mixture of Perrow's societal, output system, product and derived goals.

We shall see that GHA's goals are similarly multiple and complex; that generally GHA's goals have been pursued simultaneously, although at certain times specific goals have been more problematic than others; and that certain objectives were a focus of internal conflicts, while others reflected a consensus of priorities amongst GHA's participants. Finally the following account will serve to illustrate the interplay of internal and external factors in influencing the evolution of GHA's goals, and the career of policy issues affecting the association.

We have seen that at the formative stage of their association GHA's early participants held no clear conception of how their early intentions would translate into either official or operative goals. Early aims were vague and abstract. GHA was perceived as an organisational means of stabilising the community by improving and extending housing options and conditions in Govanhill. Resident involvement on the managing body, and a participative approach to administering the improvement of sub-tolerable, private sector housing were in effect the ideological underpinnings of GHA's approach to housing provision.

GHA's role as landlord, though implied by the improvement programme, was not fully grasped by early participants. GHA acquired properties from owner-occupiers and landlords who did not wish, or could not afford, to bear the costs of improvement and thus GHA became a significant local landlord. As this role expanded the association assumed two further responsibilities: for the maintenance of improved and unimproved properties in its ownership, and for allocating housing - a scarce resource in high demand in the locality.

In pursuing goals relating to housing production and allocation in the locality GHA was involved in a changing and extending mesh of relations with local residents and external agencies. Further, these relationships were significantly shaped by the two forms of accountability implied by GHA's role and dominant goals, which emphasised accountability and service to local residents, as well

as accountability to statutory bodies and to the wider public.

Finally, by late 1975 GHA's Committee was managing an organisation which required considerable bank overdraft facility in order to develop. For some members, including the chairperson, this fact was a source of concern. As happened in later-formed associations, GHA's members did not bargain for the fact that their community-based association was in some respects like a small business. Until 1977, GHA's liabilities exceeded its assets. By 1979, however, although GHA still depended on a large bank overdraft guaranteed by the HC (over £35,000), its assets were almost thrice that amount as the result of accumulating government allowances paid for improvement and housing management work and increasing property ownership. (26)

I shall now focus both thematically and historically on the evolution of policy and practice at GHA. I shall concentrate on GHA's role as a housing producer, as a local landlord and finally on the organisational developments at GHA between 1974 and 1982.

2.a. The improvement of tenement housing in Govanhill, 1974-1977

2.a.1. Early influences and GHA's approach, 1974-1977

GHA's initial approach to co-ordinating the local housing improvement programme was influenced by the key role of the Assist architects in Govan, whose initial contacts with GHA were described earlier. In July 1974, the Committee had discussed the future

co-ordination of its provisional improvement programme. It was resolved at that stage that Assist's role would extend far beyond that of conventional architects, both in relation to the housing association as client and to local residents as 'users'.

Assist's functions in the early stages involved, first, community education (leafleting, advice, public meetings and exhibitions all aimed at increasing local understanding of GHA's role and operations); secondly, architectural work incorporating opportunities for resident consultation and influence on design; and thirdly, co-ordination, administration and liaison with external bodies. (27)

In the early stages, GHA concentrated on internal repairs and improvements to tenement houses. As was the pattern in Govan, the emphasis on extensive repairs and improvements to the common parts of tenement buildings increased steadily with growing experience of the state of disrepair of older tenements, and with increases in levels of grant. Thus GHA's standards of housing improvement were incrementally modified over the first four years of the association's development. Later-formed housing associations in the city frequently started co-ordinating improvements with explicit aims for a higher standard of common repairs and improvements than had been the case early in GHA's development. (28)

2.a.2. The experience of delays, 1974-1977

I have already described the bureaucratic delays which were common to the experience of associations, and I have suggested that these have been alleviated somewhat since 1980. Also Chapter Eight has illustrated various influences on delays in the improvement programme.

GHA's experience was no exception. First, there were constraints on the pace of acquisitions. Owner-occupiers were often disappointed by house prices offered by the District Valuer and landlords were generally slow in deciding whether to sell or stay.⁽²⁹⁾ Officially loan finance for improvement work was not available from the HC until association ownership was legally finalised, although HC officials would at times waive formalities in recognition of their effects on associations' programming of work on site.⁽³⁰⁾

Secondly, there were regular delays in scheme approval. As a result of rising building prices, schemes were regularly above cost limits, although this was less significant at GHA than in later-formed associations,⁽³¹⁾ and these resulted in delays due to the system of dual approval described in Chapter Seven, whereby schemes over cost limits had to be sent by the HC to SDD for approval. At times GHA received requests from SDD to make savings in a contract on site. During 1977, GHA lobbied the local MP, GDC, and the HC in Glasgow, Edinburgh and London, protesting about delays in approval by the SDD. The dominant view at GHA was that

such delays could largely have been prevented if the HC had been delegated full authority for approvals - a view which we have seen took effect some years later.⁽³²⁾ A third area in which delays were experienced was in the performance of contractors on site who frequently took longer to complete a scheme than either they or GHA had estimated.

2.a.3. Local influences on policy development, 1974-1977

In 1975 the Committee resolved that GHA would co-ordinate improvements in the Boyd Street area which was located at a different part of Govanhill from the original Treatment Areas. In 1976, a Development Officer and Secretary were employed to specifically service that area.

By 1977, major structural problems had been discovered in the first closes selected for improvement in the Boyd Street area. Simultaneously, a ten close contract in GHA's first area for improvement was the subject of continual delays on site. Delays were caused by a range of factors - unforeseen technical problems (e.g. extensive dry rot and woodworm); insufficient organisation and supervision on site by the contractor; disputes over contract documents between contractor and consultants. Finally, the association considered terminating the contract.

Following this experience there was increased awareness at GHA that unforeseen structural problems were an inevitable part of the work process of phased rehabilitation. The pattern of allocating residents decant houses, immediately prior to work going on site, meant that consultants generally did not have the opportunity to investigate fully the extent of rot etc. Also, even if this was possible, exposure and disturbance to buildings was always at a maximum while the builders were at work. (33)

In 1977 GHA entered into discussions with other Glasgow housing associations, aimed at establishing a general policy on standards, to be agreed with the Housing Corporation. (34) In general, GHA's actions aimed at increasing the organisation's control and at minimising the uncertainties relating to rehabilitation.

Revision of policy on improvement standards can be seen to reflect GHA's experience on a number of fronts. We have seen that the association's initial approach favoured repair rather than replacement of internal and common items. In several instances the 'patch and repair' approach to roofs had resulted in requirements for further work post-improvement, as well as in considerable inconvenience and distress to tenants, who for example returned to their improved house, only to continue to experience a leaking roof. During 1977, the association increased the level of specification of common repairs and by this stage a higher level of specification of repair was favoured by all agencies dealing in tenement rehabilitation.

GHA's notably growing commitment to improving its rehabilitation standards is not surprising given the association's experimental role. The Committee's considerations in raising common repair and improvement standards in general reflected the city-wide trend of rising expectations about social, physical and aesthetic qualities of tenement rehabilitation.

Space standards also increased after 1977. GHA's participants had from the start attempted to ensure that contract prices did not exceed cost limits so as to facilitate approval. This "strategic choice", together with the fact that in Govanhill a large proportion of owner-occupiers wished to remain in their original house and improve with the aid of grant, meant that GHA could not amalgamate flats as frequently as other CBHAs which owned more empty properties. One outcome was that GHA was faced with an excess of small (two apartment) improved top floor flats in relation to the level of demand within its immediate improvement programmes. It became evident that a higher proportion of three, four and five apartment houses was required to cater for local residents. As a result, GHA began to place greater emphasis on a policy of amalgamating tenement houses, wherever the existing pattern of occupancy and house layout made this a feasible option.⁽³⁵⁾ A further factor which served to influence increasing standards was the new entrants to GHA's Committee who assumed an active role in questioning and monitoring standards and in revising GHA's "product" goals. By September 1977, GHA had improved 100 houses out of a total of 835

houses in its approved Action Areas for Improvement. Its '100th house exhibition' was visited by the local councillors and many local residents. By late 1977, residents from other blocks were approaching The View and GHA's staff and Committee to press for the improvement of their blocks. GHA's participants were committed to extending the association's improvement programme. However, they had to respond to local demands by explaining that central government and HC procedures of approval and funding constituted preconditions for GHA's involvement, and that GDC's role in declaring Action Areas for Improvement was the first stage in enabling owner-occupiers' access to higher levels of grant.⁽³⁶⁾ As described in Chapters Six and Seven, without the support of these government agencies GHA had no access to either the authority or funds necessary to extend the improvement programme. Local residents were also made aware that the HC and the GDC might have higher priorities in other parts of the city, leading to delay for their own housing.

I shall now discuss some of the important influences on GHA's improvement programme between 1977 and 1983. I shall concentrate on the local issue of ground conditions - an environmental constraint, which has affected the pace of the programme and which meant that GHA required further support from government agencies. Secondly, I shall consider GHA's approach to co-ordinating improvements in the context of the different types of ownership of tenement housing. Thirdly I shall focus more generally on the impact of GHA's improvement programme on Govanhill.

2.b. GHA's improvement programme, 1977-1982

2.b.1. The issue of ground conditions

The District Council's architectural surveys of tenement housing in Govanhill had pointed to a number of significant structural problems affecting potential Action Areas.⁽³⁷⁾ The survey suggested signs of movement of buildings in different parts of Govanhill which required further investigation by structural engineers.

During 1976 and 1977 a major obstacle to Govanhill's improvement programme came to light when the association consulted the Mineral Valuer over ground conditions (sub-soil conditions) with respect to a tenement block whose residents had long pressed for its improvement.⁽³⁸⁾ The Mineral Valuer stressed that unstable ground conditions had been left by past mining and that this block faced the risk of future subsidence. Undermining is known to have left insufficient rock cover in many parts of Glasgow, and structural engineers in Glasgow District Council's department of Architecture and Related Services had been aware since the 1950s that ground conditions were suspect in parts of Govanhill.⁽³⁹⁾

The Mineral Valuer in fact doubted the appropriateness of public housing investment in several parts of Govanhill. So, following the protracted struggle against the Road Plan in the early 1970s, Govanhill people discovered in the late 1970s that the costs of negating the risk of future subsidence on cleared sites were a major factor inhibiting new building in the area. In

June 1977 the SDD stated in a letter to the Director of Planning at GDC that the very high costs of consolidation might make it difficult to justify new building 'in a potential housing surplus situation'.⁽⁴⁰⁾

The response was perhaps predictable given the past pattern of neighbourhood-based action, supported by sympathetic local politicians and professionals, on the planning issues affecting Govanhill during the early 1970s. The issue of ground conditions became the concern of GHA, the Community Council, other local residents' action groups and also the community workers at The View.⁽⁴¹⁾ Between 1977 and 1979, these organisations and groups became active in lobbying, and in consultation and negotiation with government agencies, in order to ensure their political commitment and financial support for the future of housing in the parts of Govanhill affected by subsidence.

The Community Plan Working Party, which involved representation from the different Action Groups in Govanhill, made local views known to the government agencies which had the power to affect the future of housing in Govanhill.

It is unacceptable in social and economic terms to perpetuate Govanhill as an area of deprivation. The confidence that would come with new investment would act as a catalyst to engender initiative, bring positive beneficial change and long-term confidence to the area.⁽⁴²⁾

And a major argument rested on the fact of the high demand for housing

of all types in the Govanhill area - a demand which was well recognised by the local authority.⁽⁴³⁾

While GHA's participants actively sought political support for area improvement they at times resolved not to publicise their strategies within the neighbourhood. Reasons for 'keeping things quiet' were so as not to unnecessarily disturb and confuse either local residents, or the process of negotiations with government agencies regarding a policy issue which was both politically contentious and fraught with uncertainties. However one outcome of this approach was that local people were often critical that GHA was 'not doing enough'.⁽⁴⁴⁾ The reality was that members of GHA and the Glasgow office of the HC were both concerned about the SDD response to both the ground conditions issue and its cost implications for the Project Area assessment under consideration at the SDD.

After lengthy consultations with the Mineral Valuer and the Coal Board regarding the extent of the problem and the question of liability during 1977, GHA had commissioned structural engineers to identify strategies for tackling the problem and their cost implications. Also GHA requested that the SDD should make a commitment to improvement, despite soil problems. At the same time local groups lobbied councillors and the MP.

Following certain less pessimistic reports by the structural engineers and by the Coal Board,⁽⁴⁵⁾ a solution emerged which was

assumed by all parties to be a suitable compromise in 1979. The solution represented a corporate strategy which was significantly influenced by the approach of the key SDD official involved in negotiations who resolved to bring together representatives of all interested parties in 'round table' discussions and to achieve a negotiated compromise solution.⁽⁴⁶⁾ The compromise reflected considerations of, on the one hand, the feasibility of technical solutions in terms of their cost and 'risk' implications, and of local demands and interests on the other. The resolution was therefore a political one.

The negotiations on ground conditions were influenced by these issues and developments. First, the mutually-agreed problem was that poor ground conditions and the potential risk of severe subsidence meant that no government agency would fund rehabilitation. However some local groups argued that 'the buildings had already survived around a century, so why would they not continue to stand?'. Secondly, there were variations in technical assessments of the problem; in the structural solutions recommended by agencies consulted by GHA, and in their cost implications.

The structural engineers had identified two alternative methods of ground stabilisation. The 'grouting' option involved the pumping of concrete into ground voids - a major, disruptive, but once and for all measure to counteract the risks carried by extremely poor ground cover. This option was costed significantly higher than steel

ties, which would not prevent movement if subsidence occurred, but which would prevent dramatic collapse and 'undue risk to persons'. Also steel ties were a less costly solution. (47)

In June and July 1978 there was evidence that the analysis by the Coal Board was more optimistic than that by the Mineral Valuer regarding two tenements in Govanhill. Further, GHA's structural engineers reinforced the optimism about the 'small risk of future settlement due to mineworkings', and stressed the feasibility of steel ties for the stabilisation of these buildings. (48)

Following this, GHA, other residents' groups and the local MP became committed to the solution of steel ties and pressed SDD to accept steel ties as a compromise strategy which would allow Govanhill people the chance to remain in Govanhill. In the morning prior to the February 'round table' meeting, (49) a structural engineer from the SDD, who was due to attend the meeting, was taken round the area by a DO from GHA. Before visiting GHA's improved tenements he said, 'I don't know why we're trying to keep tenements up'. However, luckily for GHA and Govanhill people he stated how impressed he was after seeing GHA's improved buildings. (50) The outcome of the February meeting was that there was unanimous support for the option of steel ties.

This compromise strategy was acceptable to a number of interest groups. GHA's participants and local residents were all aware that some properties located on suspect ground had been improved prior to recent knowledge about ground conditions, and that these

improvements had not included any stabilisation measures. However there were no doubts that recent information precluded continuing the improvement programme without any special precautions. Further, in the light of extreme differences in costings for steel ties and for grouting, there was an implicit and shared understanding that if rehabilitation in Govanhill was to continue to receive government support, then 'steel ties' offered the only feasible strategy. On 30 April 1979, the Secretary of State approved the solution of steel ties in Govanhill. Following this resolution, during 1979, GHA and residents' groups pressed for the declaration of three further Action Areas for Improvement.⁽⁵¹⁾

In parallel with the ground conditions and rehabilitation issue, Govanhill's unofficial community Working Party (which met between official Govanhill Planning Working Party meetings) had been lobbying to ensure new building in Govanhill. By 1979 Govanhill residents had won their case and GDC had Scottish Office approval to grout cleared sites and build new housing.⁽⁵²⁾ However this 'victory' was followed by the building slump of the 1980s.

The cumulative effects of such local pressure and its outcomes served to increase the sense of local cynicism and irony,⁽⁵³⁾ while at the same time to assert Govanhill's reputation as an area with a strong sense of local identity. This reputation was acknowledged by officials and politicians of government agencies. As one local councillor commented in interview, 'No-one would

question that Govanhill people have fought hard to ensure that their area continues to provide housing, or that their action has been effective'. (54)

We have seen that local pressure groups approached GHA in similar terms to government agencies, as an agency which they had to lobby in order to ensure fair treatment. For example, in terms of the phasing of their blocks for improvement, Carfin Street Residents' Association argued strongly in early 1979 that GHA should programme their block for approval prior to others under consideration. The residents pressed their case at public meetings and through all varieties of representation, to all types of relevant planning agency. The outcome of their lobbying was that they encouraged GHA and the HC to ensure the granting of planning approval for the Carfin Street area in advance of other blocks being assessed at the SDD. The Carfin Street Project Area was approved by SDD in mid-1979, prior to the other blocks under assessment.

Between 1979 and 1980 GHA further expanded its improvement programme, largely to accommodate the demands by residents in the area around Govanhill Park (the Park Square Blocks), that GHA should improve their blocks which were also affected by unstable ground conditions. At this stage in its development GHA was organisationally gearing up towards a major phase of expansion in its improvement programme. However, coincidentally the organisation experienced a high rate of turnover of its personnel during a period characterised by goal diversification (see Section Three and Appendix).

Also in parallel with these developments the 'career' of the ground conditions issue took a further and unexpected twist in 1980.

In the newly declared Action Area of Carfin Street a recently appointed member of staff commissioned a report by structural engineers on ground conditions for a specific improvement contract, on the recommendation of the consultant architects. The engineers contended strongly that grouting was essential in one corner of the area, due to the extremely poor quality of ground cover. On the basis of this recommendation, a GHA Development Officer reopened negotiations with the Housing Corporation.

The HC officials were initially nonplussed that a previously corporately agreed strategy for the area was not being treated as once-and-for-all policy. However, the variables in the equation had changed since 1979. First, the engineers stated that ground conditions in their view were not safe without grouting in this small area;⁽⁵⁵⁾ secondly, the local authority had already commissioned grouting in one of its improvement contracts; thirdly, another locally-based housing association had received approval for grouting recommended by the same structural engineers (so the argument that grouting would too greatly inconvenience local residents in Govanhill no longer held);⁽⁵⁶⁾ and finally, the costs of grouting identified by the engineers were significantly lower than in the estimate made at the time of the original survey. There were therefore changes in technical, economic and organisational influences on policy.

In mid-1980 GHA's Committee resolved to press for grouting in the relevant part of the contract.⁽⁵⁷⁾ In October 1981, following the Conservative Government's decision to allocate a further £7 million to Scottish associations beyond the predetermined cash limit for 1981/82, GHA received the go-ahead for grouting in part of its contract.

The grouting issue has illustrated the impact of technical uncertainties in CBHA rehabilitation; the dependence of CBHAs on the actions of government agencies and the influence of local residents' action. Further, it has shown how policy development is affected by the approach of CBHA participants, their professional consultants and by representatives of government agencies. Moreover, we saw that policy development has reflected the key role of state agencies in establishing the framework and outcomes of decision making and also aspects of corporatism and incorporation, which I shall discuss further in Part Five. Finally, it would suggest that government agencies are most likely to respond to localised pressure which is both strident and supported by systematic argument and by professional expertise. In general, policy changes on the ground conditions issue in Govanhill were significantly affected by changing interpretations of risk, by economic conditions and by the wider political commitment to rehabilitation.

I shall now focus on a different policy issue with implications for the local housing improvement programme.

2.b.2. GHA and the private owners of tenement properties

The approach of CBHAs to co-ordinating improvements, in the context of mixed ownership of tenement housing may have implications for the future housing tenure mix of different areas. I have emphasised earlier⁽⁵⁸⁾ that the main factors influencing the post-improvement housing tenure mix are the levels of grants accessible to private owners in Action Areas and their relationship to the costs of tenement improvement. Also, I have stressed that associations in other cities have not generally co-ordinated comprehensive tenement improvements for owner-occupiers, commercial owners and their tenants, as have Glasgow's CBHAs.

From an early stage GHA's Committee aimed to maximise owner-occupier choice and GHA's architects were encouraged to adopt a consultative approach with owner-occupiers so as to establish a level of improvement work which individuals could afford. By 31 March 1980, 79 out of 395 housing units improved by GHA (20%) remained in private ownership. GHA, along with certain other associations, was set up by the HC and the SDD as an example to others.⁽⁵⁹⁾ From the point of view of these government agencies, a major factor influencing the level of post-improvement owner-occupation in Govanhill was the approach of GHA's Committee and staff.

However while recognising GHA's general approach, other associations argued that their areas were different; that local

residents were less committed to retaining owner-occupation when faced with the option of higher improvement standards; and that property in some areas was built to a poorer standard thus resulting in higher costs of common works.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Despite such qualifications other CBHAs approached GHA's officials for advice and information about their intensive services to private owners.

It is reasonable to conclude that GHA's approach to owner-occupier improvements, together with the 'upmarket' status of parts of the locality, have served to influence the retention of owner-occupation after improvements. However in late 1980 there was growing concern at GHA as to whether the association could sustain this policy commitment, especially against the background of the association's increasing emphasis on higher standards. In 1980 GHA's DOs referred to the financial difficulties experienced by owner-occupiers when grant levels fell significantly behind the rising costs of building.⁽⁶¹⁾ However, since the 1981 building slump contractors' tender prices have been increasingly competitive. Also in general the gap between owners' costs and grant levels has decreased since the marked increase in grant levels in 1981. By December 1983, GHA had co-ordinated 169 owner-occupier improvements by the association. By this time, however, it was evident that the co-ordination problems associated with owner-occupier improvements, had financial repercussions for the association. The administrative complexities involved in the accounting and billing of owner-occupiers, and the reluctance of some owner-occupiers to settle,

had resulted in a significant accumulated historic interest debt to the Housing Corporation.

Finally I shall consider here GHA's response to the Conservative Government's emphasis on selling public sector housing, and on using public funds to produce housing for sale. GHA's initial response to the 1980 Tenants Rights, Etc. Act, which gave associations the Right to Sell, was to publicise a policy which emphasised GHA's continuing support for owner-occupation, but which did not support the sale of improved houses 'due to the high demand for rented property in the area and the number of houses still to undergo improvement works'.⁽⁶²⁾ However the association stated its commitment to taking account of local residents' views about Sales and to periodically reviewing this policy. Following some 30 to 40 enquiries about sales, and subsequent to policy statements by Government Ministers which criticised the 'negative stance' adopted by some associations, GHA revised its policy on Sales in September 1983. The revised policy allows for sales of improved properties to sitting tenants of three years standing, at vacant possession price or 'book debt value', whichever is the greater.⁽⁶³⁾ Since the revision, by December 1983, there had been only six enquiries, of which none has been pursued further by prospective owners.

Finally, regarding comprehensive tenement improvements and the implications of mixed ownership, I shall briefly consider the case of commercial properties. Chapter Eight documented that in 1979

loan facilities were made available to small shopkeepers for the first time by GDC. I emphasised that the practicalities of the scheme excluded the majority of applications despite the considerable efforts within the Council to alleviate the problem.

By October 1980, only five privately owned shops had participated in GHA's tenement rehabilitation schemes. There was growing concern that in future contracts with shops GHA was unlikely to have majority ownership and shopkeepers generally were unfavourably disposed to bearing the costs of common repairs to tenement properties.

While GHA had chosen to approach local shopkeepers sympathetically, rather than with a heavy hand, there was an increasing view that the DOs should take a firmer line when shopkeepers refused to co-operate. The alternative was to accept further delays in the programme and related financial loss to the association. In 1981 GHA took Court action against a shopkeeper who was refusing to co-operate. The association won the case when the shopkeeper failed to turn up. Since that time the association has met further problems relating to the high common repair costs facing commercial properties. GHA's approach has involved, first, the use of powers of majority ownership, and secondly, requests to the local authority to implement a Repairs Notice, which legally obliges owners to bear the costs of essential repairs. Therefore, as the grant levels accessible to shopkeepers are frequently inadequate to meet repair costs, the association is prepared to use compulsion where negotiation fails

with respect to commercial owners holding up tenement improvement schemes. By December 1983 GHA's rehabilitation programme had affected 39 shops, six of which had been acquired and improved by the association. (64)

Finally, in Chapter Ten I suggested that the public investment channeled through GHA's improvement programme has served to regenerate the private housing market in Govanhill. In one new Action Area declared in 1981 the uncertainties about funding and about the phasing of improvements, stimulated many residents to sell and move outwith the area. At that time the average price of a two room kitchen and bathroom flat was £7,000 to £8,000. However, by late 1983, following a limited repair scheme carried out by GHA in two blocks in the area, acquisition prices had risen to between £12,000 and £14,000. So obviously private confidence has been restored by the knowledge of impending public investment.

Regarding private developers we have seen that since 1981 grant levels have encouraged private developers to carry out improvements with the aid of grant. In 1982, GHA was unable to beat the acquisition price for a portfolio of tenement housing which had been offered by a private developer, thus reflecting the trend of increased speculative interest shown by private developers in inner area tenement housing in parts of Glasgow. (65)

The preceding account of the evolution of goals and practice in two areas of GHA's improvement programme has demonstrated the significance of both internal and external influences. Policy

development was affected by the approach of participants; by wider political and economic factors and by the actions of government agencies and local groups. The interplay of such influences was demonstrated both in the case of subsidence and of comprehensive rehabilitation in the context of mixed tenures.

In the case of the ground conditions issue I have focused on a particularly local dimension of GHA's experience after 1977. However, ground conditions were to become an issue affecting the development of several other CBHAs, for example Queens Cross HA, formed in 1976, and Parkhead HA, formed in 1977. Subsidence and ground conditions have important implications for the future of housing and planning in Govanhill, and for GHA's housing programme. I have emphasised that in GHA's case its outcomes so far have been influenced by the approach of GHA's participants and technical advisers; by the pressure of local interest groups on both GHA and local and central government agencies; and by the intentions and actions of participants in state agencies in the context of changing political and economic conditions.

The account so far has also illustrated the complexity of GHA's organisational goals. Moreover it has emphasised the inter-relationships and contradictions between GHA's official goals and operative goals (the ideas and intentions which influence current practices).⁽⁶⁶⁾ For example, we have seen that since 1977 there has been a growing emphasis by GHA's participants on increasing the standard of

specification of common works and that this has had obvious consequences for increasing costs to owner-occupiers. Further, I have suggested that this pattern may contradict with an emphasis on helping low-income owner-occupiers to retain ownership. I have argued, however, that the ultimate factors influencing the retention of owner-occupation in areas like Govanhill are external to associations and largely outwith their control. These include the political will to subsidise comprehensive area rehabilitation in tenement areas which is reflected in conditions of access to improvement grants and in grant levels; economic influences on the construction industry which affect competition between building firms and contract prices. I would also suggest that the employment circumstances of owner-occupiers may influence their choices about whether to retain ownership, when at times they are faced by the option of a higher standard of housing if they sell to the association, which has access to higher levels of grant.

To conclude this section on GHA's improvement programme I shall focus in the following section on outcomes of GHA's formation and its rehabilitation strategy for the locality, for local residents and interest groups.

2.b.3. The impact of GHA's improvement programme within Govanhill

We can identify several important ways in which GHA's improvement programme has influenced the locality. In general GHA's development has had physical, social, economic and political consequences for Govanhill.

In Chapter Ten I emphasised that GHA's improvement programme has had a marked physical impact on the area. I described how in the early 1970s, despite the popularity of its housing and its location, Govanhill appeared to be an area in the midst of physical decline. Also at that time prospective owners frequently experienced difficulty in acquiring loan finance from building societies for properties in some parts of Govanhill.

In Chapter Five we saw that during the period of severe public sector financial restraint in the late 1970s, the local authority actively sought partnership arrangements with private capital in both the private housing sector (repairs schemes) and in public housing schemes. In 1979 the Abbey National Building Society announced its commitment to lending the funds to service a repairs area programme in Govanhill.⁽⁶⁷⁾ Also, throughout its building programme GHA served as a significant channel of public funds into the locality (see Appendix).

These developments have been associated with increasing signs of confidence in the longer-term stability of Govanhill as a residential area. By the 1980s public investment had stimulated growing interest of private capital to invest in the area and in parallel there was a trend of marked housing price increases between 1979 and 1981. Owner-occupiers who improved with the aid of grant and who later opted to sell have often gained a considerable profit on their investment.⁽⁶⁸⁾

GHA's activities have also had social consequences for Govanhill people. In Section One I emphasised that GHA's formation served initially to alleviate local uncertainties. However, we have seen that GHA's improvement programme has had the effect of uncovering unforeseen technical problems. The local publicity about the ground conditions issue and about central government's restrictions on the flow of funding, and therefore on the pace of improvements, in effect served to increase local consciousness about political, economic and technical uncertainties.

GHA's building programme also had implications for the experience of those who became involved on the Management Committee and for their relations with local residents. Despite delays during contracts and snags causing inconvenience after improvement work, residents of improved houses were generally satisfied with the standard of house improvement and with the approach of staff and professional consultants. (69)

In common with other CBHAs, GHA's participants experienced local criticism of GHA's organisation and its performance. Some critics viewed GHA as 'just another public agency' and regarded the Committee as a local elite group with vested interests in protecting their organisation. However, it was evident at meetings that, despite GHA's regular attempts at publicising information about its aims, organisation, achievements and problems, many local people did not understand the role of local residents on the Committee. Nor did they appreciate that they might take up opportunities for

involvement at GHA. Some residents perceived GHA as a local agency whose participants had to be pressured to carry out the remedial action necessary to resolve their specific housing problems. (70)

The response to such criticism by GHA's Committee members reflected both disappointment and cynicism about the lack of understanding by local people, who were often their neighbours, about the constraints and difficulties experienced at GHA and about the low take-up of opportunities for participation in the association. A common response was that: 'People are always ready to criticise, but they refuse to consider the problems or to get involved in doing something about them'. (71) Also residents were regularly invited to become involved in GHA's structure of policy-making by joining GHA's sub-committees and by standing for election to the Committee (in newsletters, at public meetings and at times of protest).

It is interesting that before 1978 GHA's Committee members had generally been active in lobbying government agencies prior to their involvement at GHA. From 1978 onwards several Committee members had become involved following earlier participation in local groups which had attempted to influence GHA's housing programme. (72) This pattern was at times reflected in particular tensions within the Committee. For example, one new Committee member two months after joining the Committee, in interview, referred to GHA as 'them' and to the Management Committee as though she were not part of it. However some months later she commented that her views

had changed since she had learned more about GHA's difficulties and that she had become convinced of a high level of caring and commitment of both Committee and staff. (73)

The conflicting interests of individuals on the Management Committee - in terms of their concerns, first, as tenants or owner-occupiers affected by the improvement programme, and, secondly, their responsibilities as Committee members - at times produced tensions at GHA. For example one long-standing member of GHA's Management Committee resigned largely due to such pressures. In interview she described her reservations about pressing a personal complaint regarding the faulty ceiling in her flat after improvement work, while being an office-bearer on GHA's management body. (74)

Other criticisms of GHA by local residents generally focused on the slow pace of both tenement improvements and of GHA's incorporation of new areas to its housing programme. The local base of the community work agency (The View), and the local community newspaper, were two channels through which criticisms were voiced.

The View representative on GHA had resigned from the Committee in 1977, by which stage workers at The View defined their main role in relation to GHA in terms of providing support to local groups whose participants wanted to fight for their housing to be zoned for improvement. With support from The View, several residents actions groups have over time influenced GHA's improvement programme, by exerting pressure on both GHA and government agencies. (75)

One such example was the Park Square Action Committee formed by residents in the three blocks neighbouring Govanhill Park.

The substantial and attractive appearance of these red sandstone buildings had led many local people to assume that houses in this block were above the tolerable standard. In fact, just as in the Boyd Street area, many houses did not have bathrooms or internal WCs.

GHA's present Chairman, elected in 1979, was a founder member of the Park Square Action Committee. On approaching GHA in 1978, the group was informed of the different agencies involved in Project Area approval. One member described the group's independent lobbying activities:

We realised it might take some years to get improvements rolling. To exert pressure we contacted the Secretary of State and our local MP. In the meantime, we sought approval for Back Court improvements, in the hope that this might speed up Action Area declaration.

Another member described how the group became involved in GHA:

When the Secretary of State attended the '1000th' house celebration at GHA we nobbled him. He asked if we minded which body carried out improvement work. We said no - Our main concern was to get our houses improved. We got involved in GHA because we didn't like the way the Council had set about things in the past. (76)

Other residents' action groups similarly lobbied GHA to gain planning approval for the improvement of their blocks, and their representatives at different stages were elected on to GHA's

Committee. However, certain local critics of GHA, who have described GHA's Committee as a local elite, have argued that local activists should retain their independence of action rather than join 'a management body largely absorbed by responsibility for the details of policy'.⁽⁷⁷⁾

During the recent period of government cutbacks, however, there have been signs of declining local criticism of GHA's improvement programme. Articles in the local paper, public meetings and the rumour network, as well as GHA's own publicity, have all served to increase local awareness about the curtailments on GHA's programmes and about GHA's involvement in national lobbying. For example, at a public meeting (February 1981) which was attended by a senior representative of the HC, the association described the financial constraints on its operations and explained that due to the 'moratorium' GHA, like other Scottish associations, was unable to start new contracts between November 1980 and January 1981.⁽⁷⁸⁾ Further, in March 1981, GHA's financial allocation for 1981/82 was £2½ million - a shortfall of approximately £1 million on GHA's projected expenditure. Funding therefore operated to restrain the pace of GHA's improvement programme and served to delay an approved new building scheme to provide 18 general family units. Another scheme to provide 24 amenity housing units for the elderly was cancelled entirely.

Shortage of resources, therefore, meant that:

for the first time in the Association's history our Committee have had to decide priorities in terms of which closes would be improved this year at the expense of those which would have to be delayed for another year or two. Since closes which were to have been improved this year will have to be left to deteriorate even further, our Committee have had to look long and hard at our housing management, maintenance programme and policies. (79)

So the experience of financial restraint had led to an increased consciousness of GHA's role in distributing scarce resources.

In fact, throughout the improvement programme GHA's policy-making has implicitly operated to distribute scarce resources within the locality. For example, participants' decisions about the phasing of closes for improvement have had obvious implications for residents' access to decent housing with a stable planning future.

We have seen that the local influence of CBHAs is affected by both local and national developments. However these external constraints and influences are understood to greater or lesser degrees by local residents. In this context we can assume that, in the future, wariness and criticism will persist as a significant local orientation, alongside more positive attitudes to GHA. These positive attitudes, however, must be seen to reflect residents' experience of GHA's commitment to meeting local preferences and needs; and their recognition that GHA has effectively served to channel public funds into the locality, and to establish real improvements in local housing conditions and opportunities.

Seven years after formation (October 1980) GHA celebrated the completion of its 500th improved house. By Spring 1984 the association had completed its 1000th improved property, as well as its first New Build scheme - the first new building in Govanhill for 30 years! In that year approximately £3 million of HC loan finance was allocated to GHA. Finally, GHA's building programme has had a marked visual impact on the neighbourhood. Stonecleaning has illuminated the often aesthetically impressive pink and cream sandstone facades of rehabilitated tenement buildings. These buildings present a sharp contrast to the neighbouring dark and dilapidated buildings which await improvement, and are suggestive of the past attractiveness, impressiveness and character of Govanhill as a residential area. However, in 1983 this property still neighbours vast gap sites left by past demolition.

Having described key aspects of GHA's improvement programme, I shall now focus on a different aspect of GHA's activities, namely on GHA's role as a local landlord.

2.c. GHA as Landlord

As a landlord, GHA is responsible for the maintenance and management of properties in its ownership and for their allocation to tenants. Also, in this role GHA's participants relate to a variety of tenants' circumstances and problems. For example, some tenants have special needs (the elderly and the disabled), while others have difficulty in getting on with their neighbours, or in paying the rent.

In Chapter Seven I have identified some of the legislative controls relating to the role of associations as landlord. For example, under 1972 legislation rent levels are established independently by the Rent Officer. Also, 1980 legislation imposed obligations on public landlords to officially recognise the rights of their tenants by publishing tenancy agreements and their Allocations (Lettings) policies. It should be noted, however, that these practices were common to many CBHAs, prior to 1980. (80)

In the previous section I have emphasised GHA's role in allocating scarce resources within the locality through its improvement programme. This distributive aspect of GHA's work is also evident in GHA's role as local landlord which I shall illustrate by focusing on the development of GHA's Allocations policy - the body of official rules which define conditions of access to housing; which order allocation priorities for those affected by the improvement programmes; and which define criteria of entry and procedures of application to a Waiting List (for prospective tenants who are outwith the improvement programme). The Allocations policy therefore serves as a guide to prospective tenants regarding their immediate and longer-term housing opportunities, which are controlled by the association.

2.c.1. GHA's Allocations Policy

As M Brailey commented in an article on CBHA allocations policies:

The allocations policy adopted by an association is of critical importance not only in influencing the housing function and population mix of an area, but also in determining access for individual households. (81)

As early as 1975 allocations was recognised as a thorny issue at GHA. Early participants aimed for allocations to be handled according to principles of fairness, objectivity and sensitivity to individual needs. Also they were well aware that, unless rules and procedures were based on such principles, GHA's local credibility would be increasingly held in question.

During 1975, GHA operated what later became a standard approach of CBHAs to allocating empty improved houses. After a CBHA has programmed houses for improvement, the existing residents of these houses are offered these choices: (i) to remain owner-occupiers and to bear the costs of improvement; (ii) to sell to the association and to return to their present house as tenant; and (iii) to be rehoused to a more suitable house by the association or by the local authority, according to preferences, needs and possibilities. If a landlord sells to the CBHA his former tenants also have access to these options. (82)

CBHAs at different stages of development reach a stage when they have empty improved houses, which do not meet the requirements of residents of housing in the immediate programme, or which result from residents changing their mind while a contract is on site and choosing local authority housing or purchasing elsewhere. At this point empty houses are generally offered to residents who will

be affected by future contracts.

However at some stage participants have generally recognised that guidelines about allocations are not sufficiently specific or extensive to provide a credible framework on which to base fair and systematic allocative decisions. We shall see that it is in the area of allocations that the legitimacy of CBHAs is questioned most markedly within the locality. Further I would argue that it is in the area of allocations that CBHAs are most powerful, and recognising this power, the local authority has shown considerable interest in associations' Allocations policies and in the opportunities of access these imply.

Different factors influenced GHA's Committee to institutionalise GHA's Allocations policy earlier in its development than was the case for other associations.

First, GHA owned empty improved houses by 1976 which did not meet the requirements of residents within the improvement contract, some of whom had chosen rehousing by the Glasgow Corporation or had moved outwith the area. Some reasons for this I have described earlier: that in early improvement contracts GHA had limited the proportion of tenement house amalgamations in order to accommodate residents' preferences for returning to their own houses and for retaining owner-occupation; and that to amalgamate was relatively costly, and was limited by the structure of cost limits. Secondly, in 1975 Glasgow Corporation had initiated discussions with GHA

regarding the stage at which GHA would offer its empty improved houses to people on the Corporation's Waiting List.

Thirdly, some participants (Committee and staff) were concerned from the start that GHA could soon be confronted by massive demand for its houses and pressed the Committee to establish a policy of intent regarding those local residents whose only option was to be rehoused outwith the area due to impending demolition of their houses. (In 1974 there were fears of impending demolition in one part of the area.) There was therefore internal pressure on the Committee to develop an Allocations policy. (83)

Fourth, the unintended consequence of action by a GHA official in 1975 served to stress the advantages of establishing rules governing allocations. The GHA official concerned had allocated a house to the lodger of a tenant. Following this some residents complained and, as the official concerned described it, 'the Management Committee came down on me like a ton of bricks'. (84) Therefore, partly as a result of this incident, awareness increased that although guidelines existed there was a general absence of rules governing allocations. A sub-committee was established in November 1975 with the purpose of developing a Lettings Policy through a process of examining the implications of different cases.

During 1976 there were growing requests for GHA's houses by residents of the demolition area. The Lettings Sub-Committee in 1977 proposed a draft Lettings Policy to the main Committee.

After lengthy meetings and redrafting, GHA's Lettings policy was approved in March 1978 and, later that year, GHA opened its Waiting List.⁽⁸⁵⁾ The Lettings policy was reviewed in 1980 and again in Spring 1984. GHA has regularly publicised that a Waiting List is open to new applicants and, in common with other CBHAs, GHA has experienced applications far in excess of the properties available for letting. Between January 1981 and December 1983 GHA housed 226 applicants from its Waiting List.

Allocations in practice have proved to be a regular focus of local criticism and in this respect GHA's experience parallels that of other CBHAs. It is the contradictory aspects of this area of policy which imply the inevitability of tensions and criticism. For example, the emphasis on establishing standardised criteria is contradictory to the emphasis on sensitive assessment of individual cases according to special circumstances. At certain times people have felt that the association has not gone far enough in attempting to meet what they regard as their special circumstances, and such grievances have been put to the Management Committee on a number of occasions.

The issue of Allocations has also highlighted tensions between professionalism and local accountability. For example, professional housing management staff have at times stressed an impersonal approach to allocations, while the "local orientation" of members has at times been associated with Committee members' interest in knowing the names and personal circumstances of tenants'.⁽⁸⁶⁾

Special cases are frequently considered at Committee. For example in April 1979 a tenant of a private landlord who was selling up to the association requested that GHA should provide a one-off move (no decanting) after the transaction had been completed. The Property Management Sub-Committee agreed to this request. Subsequently the tenant requested that, due to her personal circumstances, GHA should allow her to move prior to legal ownership being finalised. The Management Committee resolved that, despite sympathy for her circumstances, they could not agree until she became GHA's tenant. They suggested that she should press her landlord to speed up the transaction. At the same meeting there was a request by a family who lived in overcrowded conditions and who intended to rent a larger improved house, that they should be permitted to rent an empty, larger house neighbouring theirs prior to improvement. The Committee agreed to this request. (87)

It is evident from these two cases that, at times, external bureaucratic or legal constraints influenced decision-making on allocations. In other instances, it was the fear of establishing a precedent which inhibited the Committee in meeting residents' requests. A further influence was the availability of housing of appropriate size and in reasonable condition.

Local residents' views of GHA were affected by the Committee's response to local housing emergencies. For example there were two fires in houses in GHA's Action Areas, in July 1978 and November 1979. In the first a tenement was destroyed by fire. Both staff

and Committee were actively involved in providing support to the residents affected. However, when they could not help in providing immediate rehousing for all concerned, GHA came in for extensive local criticism. In the event, GHA's decant houses were largely in use and so the association only rehoused a minority of the tenants - some of whom criticised the standard of house provided! The majority were rehoused by the District Council.

However, in November 1979, a similar situation arose, but with different outcomes. Following a fire, and the emergency requirement of rehousing residents, the association was able to respond speedily. Houses were provided for all residents and Committee members were actively involved in helping the residents affected by the explosion. One fairly new Committee member who had entered her new role after having been one of GHA's major critics, commented in interview that this experience had changed her attitude to the Committee. She described how it was easy to criticise from the outside and that she had been impressed with the commitment shown by staff and Committee. Another Committee member described how after she had helped out on the day of the fire some people asked 'How much did you get paid for helping?'⁽⁸⁸⁾ - a charge which has been commonly experienced by members in different CBHAs.

Having described some of the local responses to GHA's role as landlord I shall now focus on the local authority's interest in this aspect of GHA's work.

2.c.2. Allocations and accountability : the issue of
Nomination Rights

I have emphasised that, as landlords of inner area tenement housing, CBHAs control an urban resource in high demand. We have seen that central government, which funds acquisition by associations, had increasingly established guidelines and regulations on the landlord-tenant relationship for public housing agencies and housing associations.⁽⁸⁹⁾ Soon after the formation of Glasgow's first CBHAs the Glasgow Corporation became interested in their role in allocations, given the high demand for the Corporation's inner area housing stock. GHA, being the first CBHA to be registered in Glasgow, provided the local authority with a testing ground regarding its policy on CBHA Allocations in the city. A significant concern of officials and councillors was that the local involvement and base of CBHAs might result in extensive parochialism. They were concerned that an emphasis on 'local connection' in allocations might preclude entry to CBHA houses by those outwith CBHA areas, who were on local authority waiting lists, and who might be living in equally bad or worse conditions than local prospective tenants.

Also, there had been an 'understanding' between those representatives of the HC and the GDC who were involved in the formation of CBHAs. It was assumed that GDC would hold 100% nomination rights in relation to empty improved houses, in return for priority in Council allocations to Action Area residents whose

preference was for local authority rehousing.⁽⁹⁰⁾ The local authority therefore sought agreement that if associations did not fill empty improved houses from within their programmes, they would ask the local authority to nominate prospective tenants from its Waiting List. However it was not specified at what stage this policy should apply to empty improved houses.

By 1978 many associations were unhappy with the principle of 100% nominations rights and they argued that through the improvement programme they were providing a decent house to many families who had been on GDC Waiting Lists for a long time. Between 1978 and 1980, the local authority sought to reach a city-wide agreement with CBHAs, largely through a corporate strategy of consultation and bargaining with the Glasgow Forum.⁽⁹¹⁾

As for GHA's role as catalyst, during 1979 a local issue served to stimulate bargaining between GDC and GHA, and the outcome of negotiations influenced GDC's city-wide policy regarding allocations. One of the local councillors serving as a nominated GDC representative on GHA's Committee criticised a particular allocation made by the association. His aggressive questioning at GHA and at the local authority led to lengthy communications between the association and the local authority on the Nomination Rights issue.⁽⁹²⁾ GHA argued in dialogue with Housing Management Department officials that no agreement had ever been established on GDC's 100% Nomination Rights to GHA's empty improved houses, and this point was conceded. In 1979 agreement was reached

following discussions at the Glasgow Forum between the GDC and CBHAs that, provided associations' lettings policies were approved by the Housing Department, the GDC would retain nomination rights to 50% of the empty improved houses owned by CBHAs. I was told in interview by a senior Housing Department official that GDC officials would have preferred the Council to have 100% control over allocations. However there was all-party member agreement that associations should retain 50% nomination rights. (93)

Following this, many CBHAs formalised Allocations policies for the first time, and by 1982 most CBHAs had accepted the 50% agreement.

By late 1983, however, it was evident that take-up of the GDC's nomination arrangements was subject to varying interpretation by individual CBHAs and late in 1983 GHA had suspended nominations, until further clarification of the terms of agreement. It is therefore likely that local authority nominations will become a further subject of negotiations in 1984.

2.c.3. GHA's approach to factoring

Finally in this section on GHA as landlord, I shall consider some further aspects of GHA's approach to Housing Management. By Housing Management I am referring to the responsibilities of landlords for property maintenance, for establishing systems of rent and rates collection and for their relations with tenants. These functions in Glasgow's private tenement housing sector had long

been carried out by the Property Factors, and in Chapter Eight I emphasised that CBHAs adopted different strategies with respect to the employment of Factors.

GHA's development was influenced by a duality of approach.

On the one hand, there was the view that the Factors were the experts in property management, and that it was in the association's longer-term interest to harness such expertise to GHA's objectives. On the other, there was concern that, given the objective of a sensitive approach to housing management and the poor reputation of certain Factors, that GHA should influence and monitor their approach.

In 1975 certain individuals at GHA encouraged the Committee to draw up a Tenancy Agreement specifying the obligations of landlord and tenant. The Agreement was produced after consideration of Agreements operated by Glasgow Corporation and other associations. Implementation of GHA's agreement and rent registration required the co-operation of the Factors. GHA's staff approached Factors to explain the association's general aims and role, and the approach to tenants favoured by the Committee. While the Factors were generally found to be sceptical of GHA's interventionism, a minority offered their support to the association.

GHA's relations with the Factors moved through three phases between 1974/75 and 1984. In the first phase GHA's approach involved a commitment to 'working with the Factors' - to making effective use of their skills, by absorbing them in an advisory capacity

in relation to the Committee. As one GHA official commented:

The general view in GHA was that if GHA was to take housing management functions 'in-house' and to employ more staff, there was no guarantee that we could provide a more efficient service than experienced Factors. (94)

The second phase (1976-1978) involved a period of re-evaluation. During this stage GHA's ownership of houses had expanded considerably. (By May 1978 GHA owned 450 units and the association's properties were managed by 20 Property Factors' firms.)⁽⁹⁵⁾ In 1976, GHA along with other CBHAs began to reconsider their approach to housing management. GHA participants were aware that the performance of Property Factors was variable in speed and efficiency and the association resolved that the system of working with a number of Factors was too cumbersome and did not allow GHA sufficient control over the quality of the service provided to tenants.

GHA's experience was common to other area-based housing associations and in 1976 the Scottish Federation of Housing Associations became involved in the issue.⁽⁹⁶⁾ In that year it was proposed to the Property Factors' Association that it would benefit the service provided to CBHA's if they could rationalise their interests and operations on an area basis. In essence they were requested to put some form of zoning into effect. The Factors, however, resolved not to support this initiative. Clearly such a commitment would have had implications for the future income-earning potential of different factoring businesses.

While other housing associations opted to develop towards 'in-house' housing management by employing staff in this area, GHA consciously resolved to develop more tentatively in this direction. In December 1977 the association chose to terminate the services of four Factors and to mainly employ the three Property Factors' firms which GHA had identified as being the most efficient. (97)

GHA's approach differed from that of most other CBHAs. The associations had been informed that from 1st April 1978 Strathclyde Region would be taking over the collection of rates from the Factors. Housing associations were given the option of collecting rents and rates. Many at GHA were concerned that the conventional Glasgow pattern, involving the simultaneous collection of rents and rates by public and private landlords, had resulted in tenants referring to both items in terms of 'rents'. It was therefore resolved that GHA would not collect rates, but that the association should provide an information service on rents and rates collection. (98)

Other CBHAs chose the alternative of liaising between the Region and the Factors on rates collection. In absorbing this function together with other aspects of housing management, associations generally quickly developed a specialist Housing Management section. (99)

In GHA, until 1978, Development Officers had been liaising with tenants regarding maintenance problems and requests for

rehousing, and certain DOs wanted to retain housing management responsibilities. However, following the continuing expansion of the improvement programme, and increases in Factors' charges, the association resolved to employ a Housing Officer. The remit of the new post was, first, to cover tenant liaison over social aspects of relations between GHA and its tenants (e.g. tenant disputes and problems); secondly, to service the Property Management Sub-Committee; thirdly, to allocate houses within the framework of agreed policy; fourthly, to explore the feasibility of different strategies through which GHA could take factoring in-house; and, fifthly, to examine the potential for alternative approaches, such as Housing Co-operatives. (100)

The third stage (1979-84) in the development of GHA's Housing Management Service was mainly influenced by the association's decision in 1979 to bring housing management functions 'in-house'. This decision was the outcome of a lengthy process of internal debate and reflection on alternative approaches to housing management and their implications. Secondly, it was stimulated by conflicting views on the priorities for development at GHA, largely within the staff organisation (see following section). Thirdly, GHA's Finance staff emphasised to Committee that uncertainty about bringing housing management in-house could result in problems in financial control and budgeting. Also, they pointed out that SDD officials had suggested that in considering associations' claims for Revenue Deficit Grant, they would take account of their level

of expenditure on maintenance, and that GHA's expenditure on repairs was lower in relation to housing units in association ownership than in other CBHAs.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ The Committee was convinced by these arguments, and in July 1979, GHA resolved a programme for taking factoring in-house and for gearing up to its housing management responsibilities in relation to the 2000 plus houses which were expected to be included in its Action Areas by 1983. In February 1980 GHA concentrated on establishing a phased programme of cyclical maintenance in relation to its improved properties.⁽¹⁰²⁾ By 1983, the growth of GHA's Housing Management section and GHA's increasing expenditure on maintenance meant that Housing Management had evolved as a significant operational goal at GHA. By December 1983, GHA owned 1295 houses out of which it had improved 984 houses and GHA was responsible for factoring 1231 properties.⁽¹⁰³⁾ However by this time delays in the improvement programme had resulted in GHA owning a significant number of empty unimproved houses - a fact which led government agencies to refuse to declare any further Action Areas, between 1981 and 1983, in Govanhill. So, by December 1983, GHA operated in relation to 1663 houses in approved Project Areas, rather than the 2000 plus which had been projected in 1980.

Therefore, the evolution of GHA's housing management policies was influenced by participants' changing perceptions of GHA's responsibilities as local landlord, and of the most effective strategies for meeting these responsibilities; by the problems

experienced with controlling external factoring, including cost implications; by the conditions of funding established by government agencies; and by administrative problems experienced in the process of bringing housing management in-house. By 1982 to 1983 GHA's housing management systems had been institutionalised and Housing Management could no longer be described as GHA's 'grey area'.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Participants' concerns about housing management were to ensure sensitivity, fairness and accountability of allocations; to increase the effectiveness of GHA's maintenance service; to increase resident participation in housing; and more generally to ensure that GHA did not simply become 'just another landlord' in the locality.

Finally, in relation to GHA's role as local landlord, I shall outline below the outcomes of certain attempts by GHA to manage housing more participatively.

2.c.4. GHA's attempts to devolve and to increase tenant participation

GHA attempted to increase resident involvement in housing management in different ways. First, GHA from the start had worked in partnership with Assist in encouraging resident involvement in Back Court improvement schemes. Residents 'Block' Committees were promoted by the association. These Committees were consulted at the design stage and were responsible for liaising with the association about maintenance problems. Also, GHA offered support to the residents of one tenement who were interested in factoring the close after improvement. GHA encouraged the formation of

Block Committees as an important focus of contact with residents. Public meetings which were called by Block Committees on different issues, such as Project Area declaration, were regularly attended by GHA representatives. Also, apart from using The View (newspaper) as a channel of communication, GHA published its own newsletter at regular intervals.

One attempt by GHA to increase participation related to the geographical spread of its Action Areas. The Boyd Street Action Area, declared in late 1975, was distanced from GHA's original Action Areas both geographically and socially. Although Boyd Street was only 10 minutes walk, it was generally viewed as 'up market' in housing price and social status terms, despite the fact that many houses had outside WCs.

As have certain other CBHAs operating in Action Areas covering a wide geographical spread (Springburn and Possilpark, Bridgeton and Dalmarock), GHA resolved to establish a local office to co-ordinate the improvement programme in Boyd Street. A Development Officer and secretary were appointed to service that area in 1976. The DO promoted a Consultative Committee of Boyd Street residents, to monitor the improvement of their housing and to liaise with the main Committee, and a Boyd Street newsletter was started. (105)

By 1979 it was evident that the Consultative Committee lacked active support. However by this stage two of its members had joined GHA's main Committee. The Committee decided to make the

Boyd Street Committee into a sub-committee of GHA, and in doing so it was hoped to generate more interest by linking the local committee into the mainstream policy process. In late 1980, by the time GHA's improvement of housing and back-courts in the two streets of the Boyd Street area was heading towards completion, the Consultative Committee folded due to lack of support.

GHA's Committee members expressed their disappointment about Boyd Street residents' lack of interest in their local association. Typical comments were that: 'they aren't really interested in GHA or in the rest of Govanhill now that their area is largely improved'. However, GHA participants have suggested these reasons for the Consultative Committee's demise: that the Committee initially 'had no teeth', having no official role in GHA's policy-making process; liaison was mainly through staff who channeled complaints and suggestions to the main Committee; that population movement increased in the area between 1976 and 1979, largely as the result of the improvement programme; and finally that Boyd Street's residents perceived themselves as belonging to Crosshill, rather than Govanhill and frequently objected to temporary accommodation in Govanhill's other Action Areas during house improvement. (106)

In conclusion we are therefore left with the question as to whether GHA's attempt to devolve Housing Management in Boyd Street might have been more effective under different conditions - for example if GHA had had the resources to provide more extensive support and servicing of the area committee, or if the Committee had been

formed as a co-operative with devolved decision-making powers. I would suggest that the Boyd Street experience has illustrated the contradictions between aims of efficient administration and of community development, in the context of a low-demand for active participation by local residents, and of uncertainty about strategies and resources amongst key decision-makers at GHA.

Committee members were highly conscious of a generally low level of local residents' interest in participating in GHA's affairs, which was typified in this Boyd Street experiment. One member described the disappointing response of residents to a request by her Block Committee for donations of 50p to open an account, which included comments like, 'I don't look over the back green so why should I bother'. Another Committee member commented:

It isn't simply apathy that is the problem. When you approach people a shield goes up - it's as though you are faced by their silent refusal to be affected or to become involved. (107)

Despite participants' disappointment over the Boyd Street experiment which was aimed at increasing local participation in GHA's affairs, GHA has employed an increasing variety of strategies towards that end. Like many other CBHAs, GHA continues to hold close meetings and block meetings for residents whose houses or back courts are about to be improved, and residents are frequently encouraged to join and become active in GHA's affairs. Also, GHA produces a regular local newsletter, has helped promote a city-wide paper for housing association tenants and holds quarterly

public meetings about current issues at the current time. (108)

Prior to focusing on organisational relations and developments at GHA I shall point to certain implications of the issues I have discussed relating to GHA's role as local landlord.

2.d. Discussion

We have seen that GHA, as a local landlord, exercises significant control over allocations and access. For CBHAs in general this area of control is limited by those aspects of CBHA development programmes which influence the quantity and quality of housing which CBHAs are able to allocate. Also, we have seen that there are complex constraints operating on CBHA improvement programmes. The role of CBHAs as landlord is further delimited by their accountability to local and central government agencies, as well as by local pressure and by the dynamics of local accountability. Finally as landlord, CBHAs have virtually no control over rents.

In the case of GHA's Allocations policy we have seen that its evolution was influenced by participants' concerns about accountability and fairness; by local criticism; and the experience of administrative difficulties stemming from multifarious 'special cases', cumulative 'precedents' and growing demand for GHA's houses. All these factors influenced participants to favour clarification, standardisation and formalisation of the criteria on which allocative decisions are based. The evolution of the Allocations policy was also influenced by GDC's interest in GHA's control over allocations -

a factor which notably prompted other CBHAs into a preliminary formalisation of their Allocations systems. GHA in this respect was in advance of other CBHAs in Glasgow.

Regarding the issue of the local authority's Nomination Rights, GHA's participants fought to influence GHA's longer-term control over Allocations. Negotiations with GDC led the local authority to modify its original stance of 100% Nomination Rights to GHA's empty improved properties. Finally, with respect to technical housing management functions, after an experimental attempt at employing the professional services of the property factors, the association chose to gradually incorporate housing management functions 'in-house', with the intent of controlling the quality of GHA's service to its tenants. GHA differed in this aspect of policy to other CBHAs, most of which chose to 'take over from the Factors' at an early stage.

Section Two has concentrated both thematically and historically on two main sets of externally-oriented goals at GHA. The account of different aspects of policy development has been somewhat lengthy and detailed. However, GHA is one of the oldest and largest CBHAs in Glasgow, and its potential area of operation is perhaps the most extensive amongst CBHAs in Glasgow and includes a varied mix of housing and social status. Also, GHA has come up against a variety of technical constraints on its improvement programme. Finally, we have seen that its early formation has meant that,

particularly between 1974 and 1977, other CBHAs used GHA's experience as a reference point in formulating their own policies and approach to their organisational goals.

In Section Two I have stressed that participants' goals relating to improvement and housing management are primarily externally-oriented. These emphasise the provision of services to local groups and the qualitative and quantitative aspects of these services. However, we shall see in the following section that the evolution of external goals has had implications for internally (or systems) oriented goals. The case study will illustrate the implications of participants' external goals for goals relating to GHA's organisational growth, structure and internal relations.

In Chapter Nine, following Perrow and others I stressed that organisational goals are complex and multiple, and that at times goals are contradictory and associated with organisational conflict. While Section Two has pointed to internal and external influences on the evolution of goals at GHA, and has illustrated certain contradictory aspects of GHA's goals, it has not highlighted the significance of internal differences and divisions for GHA's development. I shall therefore focus on themes of organisational change, control and conflict in the following section.

Section Three : Organisational Change, Control and Conflict

Section Three focuses on three main phases of organisational growth and change at GHA. First, I shall describe some of the early changes in organisational structure and work relations, between 1974 and 1977. Secondly, I shall concentrate on issues of internal control and related conflicts, between 1977 and 1979 and finally, I shall discuss how these issues were reflected in organisational developments between 1979 and 1983.

3.a. Organisation structure and work relations, 1974 to 1977

In general, initiatives to change the structure of organisational roles, authority and decision-making have come from staff at GHA - a pattern which I have suggested earlier is inevitable given the practical distribution of responsibilities in CBHAs. However we shall see that a significant outcome of organisational growth was that GHA's Management Committee took steps to change GHA's structure of internal control.

In the first section of this case study I discussed certain assumptions which were held by GHA's early participants about their organisation. I suggested that the ideas prevailing at GHA between 1974 and 1976 implied a lack of preparedness for the future scale and complexity of GHA, and for the Management Committee's developing responsibilities as an employer and as a manager. To illustrate GHA's evolving organisational complexity I shall now focus on some of the early management issues which affected GHA's organisational

development. Between 1974 and 1977 a central question for debate was whether particular functions should be provided directly by GHA staff or 'bought in' from outside agencies.

3.a.1. The issue of architectural services

GHA, for reasons peculiar to its formation, had a symbiotic relationship with Assist and, between 1974 and 1976, Assist architects carried out architectural services, administrative functions and co-ordination of the improvement programme. However during 1975 the Committee resolved to appoint staff to service and co-ordinate GHA's expanding improvement programme. From this point onwards, there were important changes in the GHA-Assist relationship.

Gradually Assist's wide-ranging involvement in servicing the Management Committee contracted towards the conventional model of relations between professional architects and their clients. This change was mainly stimulated by the awareness of individuals in both GHA and Assist that role boundaries between both organisations, in terms of task responsibilities and decision-making, had become increasingly confused. During 1975 discussion papers and written proposals were produced by the architect from Assist and by GHA's first Development Officer (DO) - the central theme being 'where do we go from here?'⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ Proposals focused on the future development of GHA and its evolving role in Govanhill; on changes in GHA's organisation structure and on the relationship between GHA and the Assist.

One paper proposed that GHA should establish a non-profit Estate Agency involved in sales, purchase and legal advice; that GHA seek alternative sources of finance to fund its housing improvement programme; that GHA should provide a wider improvement service, including drawing and documentation for individual house owners; and the establishment of building (producer) co-operatives. (110)

Proposals by GHA's trusted and much-respected Technical Adviser from Assist were both imaginative and entrepreneurial. However his main concern was that he and Assist should retain the character of their work at GHA, and with local residents, which ranged beyond the conventional role of the architect. Assist's approach was outlined in 1976 as follows:

Assist works closely with the real client (NB the consumers of the architectural product) and not necessarily the official client (GHA). ... Assist does not work within conventional professional boundaries. (111)

In general, two main issues confronted GHA's Committee during a period of task expansion and staffing growth. First, there were questions of demarcation - who does what, where and when? Secondly, there was the question of 'how best to organise so as to ensure effective internal control over GHA's longer-term development?' That these issues were raised in papers to Committee which were the subject of open and lengthy Committee discussion was characteristic of internal dialogue during GHA's early years.

By 1976, there were three types of professional-client relationship operating at GHA. First, GHA was the client in a conventional professional-client relationship with certain experts - for example, quantity surveyors and accountants. In this case the professional was employed by GHA's Committee to provide an advisory and technical service. Secondly, there was the less bounded relationship between GHA and Assist, which during 1975 and 1976 had become the subject of debate. In another paper it was commented that: 'Clearly Assist's role in relation to GHA must change, just as GHA has changed since the early golden days ...'.⁽¹¹²⁾ Thirdly, GHA's employees showed signs of developing into a different type of "professional", in parallel with those employed in other CBHAs. "Professional" skills were gained from experience of planning improvements, liaising with residents, handling procedures in the approval process and in liaising with external professionals, property interests and government agencies. The reference point in relation to administrative problems increasingly became other staff in CBHAs. A further factor was that Committee members referred to the DOs - whose role involved local planning, administration, clerking to the Committee and public relations - as 'the professionals'.

In late 1976 the Committee resolved that Assist should move into a more conventional architectural role. GHA's staff and Committee were in agreement that Assist architects should operate within a more specific brief in order to prevent role ambiguities and confusion between GHA's staff and architects. Co-ordination

and Committee servicing were formalised as functions of GHA's staff. For GHA's technical adviser from Assist, the compartmentalisation of Assist's role was a less challenging and rewarding prospect. In January 1978 he left Assist and GHA to embark on a similar role, in developing a newly-formed CBHA, to that characterising his early involvement with GHA. (113)

From GHA's standpoint, the formalisation of relations between GHA as client and its professional consultants, was a first stage in GHA's incremental attempts to control its local provision of services. The expansion of GHA's staff and the professionalisation of staff functions were therefore indirect outcomes of managerial choices which reflected an implicit strategy of control.

3.a.2. Growth and changes in the organisational culture

Chapter Nine has demonstrated how organisational growth has affected organisation structure, work practices and work relations in CBHAs generally. In this section I shall focus on the effects of organisational growth on GHA's organisational style and culture.

Until 1977 GHA had a small staffing structure which was divided into two sections (Development and Finance) and secretarial support staff. Committee-staff relations were highly co-operative and GHA's early participants have commented that 'staff and Committee worked together as a team' and that 'we operated like a work co-operative'. (114) We shall see that these nostalgic perceptions emphasised the qualitative decline which participants

had experienced in work relations between 1977 and 1981 - a decline which was followed, however, by a period of consolidation and some improvement.

The main phases of staffing growth at GHA were between 1975 and 1977, and 1979 and 1980, ⁽¹¹⁵⁾ and, as I have emphasised earlier, the pattern of growth reflected both internal choices and external influences. For example, in mid-1976 Committee and staff agreed that Development staff (DOs) should each be responsible for co-ordinating improvements in different parts of the locality. In common with other CBHAs, the expansion of GHA's Development section was influenced by the phasing of planning approval for new Action Areas, and by the projected flow of income from the accumulation of government allowances paid for acquisition and improvement work.

Secondly, I have described how, after 1977, Committee and staff at GHA became increasingly committed to developing an 'in-house' Housing Management service. This policy had implications for the establishment and growth of a Housing Management section at GHA. Also it resulted in GHA's Development staff gradually handing over certain aspects of their work to Housing Officers - for example, the organisation of decanting and tenant liaison. ⁽¹¹⁶⁾

Thirdly, several factors influenced the establishment and growth of GHA's Finance Section. These included the complexity of the funding and approvals process; staff expansion; increasing expenditure; the growing complexities of accounting and problems

with auditors. By 1977 there was a general commitment to employing specialists who would establish systems for ensuring effective financial control.

To a significant extent therefore, changes in GHA's organisation structure have resulted from participants' concerns about the effectiveness of control over both internal and external operations at GHA. In parallel with organisational growth were the trends of increasing specialisation of functions and formalisation of responsibilities within the staff structure. By 1980, GHA's organisation structure therefore had incorporated certain minimal aspects of bureaucracy within its staff organisation. Accountable to the Committee was an official organisation reflecting elements of specialisation and formalisation of procedures. However, by 1978 there were signs of increasing discordance between, on the one hand, participants' early expectations and, on the other, the effects of growth, increasing complexity, turnover of staff and Committee (particularly between 1978 and 1980), and industrial relations' issues. Participants referred in interview to the increasing social distance between staff and Committee - a pattern which was reinforced by extensive turnover of both Committee and staff during this period.

By 1980, GHA's Maintenance Manager and a secretary were the only staff remaining from those employed in 1976. Between 1978 and 1979 nearly all staff with a minimum of three to four years employment at GHA, had resigned for reasons which included changes in

family circumstances, the attraction of less demanding work and career advancement. During this period there was also marked turnover on the Committee, and by 1980 there was only one Committee member who had been involved since 1975.⁽¹¹⁷⁾

Committee turnover appears to have stemmed from varied influences. A minority left after gaining an improved house or because of their disappointment in GHA's ability to meet their own housing needs. However, on the basis of my interviews and observations I have concluded that most resignations were due to people leaving Govanhill; to personal circumstances, such as family illness; and to competing demands and interests. I have found no evidence that resignations resulted specifically from tensions associated with the Committee's roles as employer and as local landlord, or stemming from participants' experience of persistent local criticism alongside the chequered progress of the improvement programme. However, some Committee members have suggested that tensions stemming from the improvement programme are 'easier to cope with' than those relating to landlordism and the employment relationship.⁽¹¹⁸⁾

Many CBHAs have experienced phases of significant turnover of personnel.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ I would suggest, however, that such phases are influenced as much by coincidences in the career and personal circumstances of participants as they are by membership dissatisfaction, or by the self-interest dimension which was stressed in MacLennan et al's study.⁽¹²⁰⁾ In GHA's case extensive turnover was followed by a period of stability and we should therefore consider how the

association coped with such a significant changeover of personnel. In fact, there were a number of influences which ensured continuity and consistency at GHA. First, experienced staff had, prior to leaving, stressed the value of 'training', and had established systems for training both staff and Committee. Between 1978 and 1981, GHA's participants were significantly involved in 'organisational learning'. Secondly, continuity was sustained through the extensive records of policy development in the association's minutes and files, and through contacts with consultants and approval agencies. Thirdly, processes of staff selection and socialisation were geared towards ensuring both consistency of approach and a high level of organisational commitment. GHA's senior staff and the Staffing sub-committee planned interviews some time in advance, and prior to leaving in 1980 one senior official was largely responsible for co-ordinating training of all varieties.

Fourthly, there was the key role of external actors in sustaining continuity at GHA. The lawyer who had participated in GHA's Steering Group and who had previously worked with Crossroads, the community work agency, remained actively supportive to GHA's Committee, as its much-trusted and respected Legal Adviser, in 1978-79. In this capacity he was a regular attender at GHA's meetings and sometimes at interviews for key posts. There is no question that his role was significant in sustaining the Committee's confidence during a period of extensive organisational turnover and

conflict, and during which the legitimacy of the authority of the Committee and its advisers was challenged by staff.⁽¹²¹⁾ Finally, it should be noted that officials of the Glasgow office of the HC were sympathetic to GHA's Committee and to the problems Committee members faced during a period of major organisational uncertainty and change. Staff entering key positions were also "socialised" at meetings with HC officials as part of their training. At one such meeting with GHA's new DOs (August 1979), an HC official suggested that there were four main influences on the quality and efficiency of associations' improvement programmes: 'the calibre of staff and Committee members and their experience; the Housing Corporation; good consultants; and Margaret Thatcher'.⁽¹²²⁾

Therefore, during the period of GHA's extensive turnover the association faced the problem of the ground conditions issue, its improvement programme was notably expanding, and there was growing uncertainty about funding. Organisational stability and continued productivity resulted from internal and external influences. In particular, elements of internal bureaucracy provided a source of reference to past developments and to routine and legitimised practices. Moreover, GHA's dominant managerial ideology emphasised consultation and participation, and the value of training for staff and Committee in generating and sustaining involvement amongst participants. At the same time, there was the accumulated experience and expertise of GHA's former staff and professional advisers - a key resource to new staff.

Finally, I would suggest that the external constraints on GHA's building programme caused frustrations, but also allowed GHA's new entrants the opportunity to gear up and to consolidate on the building work which had been programmed by their predecessors.

Having focused on these influences on continuity and stability at GHA during a period of development characterised by extensive turnover of personnel and significant external constraints and uncertainties affecting the improvement programme, I shall now concentrate on some of the key areas of inter-group conflict and tensions which have affected GHA's organisational development.

3.b. Control and conflict

Organisational tensions and conflicts have affected relations within the official or staff organisation, relations internal to the Committee, and relations between staff and Committee at GHA.

3.b.1. The issue of control and staff perceptions, 1977 to 1978

As GHA grew, participants held competing expectations and preferences regarding the structure and style of internal control. In general the dominant staff approach at GHA, which has persisted despite turnover, has emphasised the values of participation and consultation in staff decision-making, and of attempting to maximise job satisfaction by providing staff with the opportunity to become involved beyond the remit of their jobs. Staff meetings and the

opportunity for all staff to attend Committee meetings were long-standing organisational practices at GHA. There was also an emphasis on keeping hierarchy to a minimum, and staff pay differentials were lower at GHA than in some other CBHAs prior to 1977. (123)

As GHA expanded, established values and practices of co-ordination, control and decision-making at GHA, were increasingly questioned by new entrants. Also, staffing growth highlighted certain role ambiguities within the staffing structure which have influenced patterns of conflict at GHA.

A significant focus of staff tensions was the role of Development Officers at GHA who jointly shared administrative and co-ordination functions. This pattern had evolved from the initial conception of the Development function held by GHA's early Committee members and their advisers. The generic role of the DO - which encompassed co-ordination, local planning, liaison with government agencies and local residents and responsibility for advising and reporting to Committee - was complemented by the early DOs' wide-ranging interests and extensive commitment to GHA's objectives. Against this background it is not surprising that the assimilation of staff with specialist technical skills, with considerable work experience in the traditionalist, authoritarian and casual labour context of the building trade, resulted in underlying tensions relating to role divisions and responsibilities, to differences in style and to expectations about control. (124)

Therefore the DOs' role in co-ordination was an organisational convention which was implicitly supported by a consensus of staff and Committee at GHA, and this pattern was common to the majority of CBHAs. However in 1977, in view of projections of staff expansion, the DOs were concerned that their role might become increasingly ambiguous. In October 1977 the Committee was requested to clarify the formal structure of authority within the staff organisation. The Committee resolved that the DOs should retain overall responsibility for internal co-ordination during the coming period of expansion at GHA. (125)

Despite the DOs' commitment to supporting established structures of democratic decision-making within the staffing structure, there was a growing questioning amongst GHA's staff of the influence of the Development section. For example, GHA's technical staff were sometimes critical of the key role of Development Officers in influencing policy. One member of GHA's technical staff commented:

They are generally young and enthusiastic, but they lack the skills and practical experience which are necessary in dealing with builders and government officials. Also we are more concerned about the standards of improvement work. (126)

Development Officers generally have entered CBHAs as recent graduates in planning-related fields and 'the DOs', as they are commonly referred to, have tended to join CBHAs holding high expectations of involvement in organisational planning and decision-making, and of a challenging job comprising both people-related and

administrative elements. One new DO described development work as like a game of chess: 'You feel you have just mastered something when the board starts to look different'.⁽¹²⁷⁾ And another new DO mentioned his disappointment that at times the administrative component seemed to dominate: 'I have told reception that I am not available to meet with residents today. I have an SHC/4 form to complete for submitting to the Housing Corporation.'⁽¹²⁸⁾ The work orientations of Development staff at GHA therefore stressed the advantages of working in a locality-based organisation which was seen to provide opportunities for greater challenge, involvement and contact with local residents and clients than would be possible in a local authority housing department. I have suggested that such expectations were reinforced by GHA's selection procedures. Job descriptions, adverts and intensive interview following a lengthy information session, all served to stress such values.

Staff with similar work orientations were also attracted into other sections. For example, two successive Housing Officers at GHA between 1979 and 1981 had previously worked with housing co-operatives in England, and others had left local authority housing management departments hoping for more scope and personal contact with tenants. Also technical staff whom I interviewed at GHA described how they preferred the variety and responsibility of housing association work, as compared with their prior work experience in building firms. However senior technical staff were generally older than staff in other sections at GHA. But it was

not only technical staff entering GHA who criticised existing patterns of control and decision-making characterising the staff organisation, and to an extent such staff criticism served as a catalyst for change. GHA's first Housing Officer, who remained at GHA for one year, assumed the role of internal critic.

The Housing Officer, who had previously worked in a neighbourhood co-operative in Liverpool, entered GHA in May 1978. He was sceptical of the organisation's internal image as 'democratic', and shortly after joining GHA he argued that the DOs (and particularly those longest in post) contributed most to the development of policy. He also questioned the value of frequent staff meetings and suggested that some staff might not choose to be involved in discussing the broad range of policy issues covered at these meetings. Thirdly he suggested that the effectiveness of GHA's work and internal control and procedures might be increased if a hierarchy of authority was formalised in GHA's staff structure. Finally, he was critical of the fact that GHA by 1978 had not fully resolved to bring Housing Management functions 'in-house'.⁽¹²⁹⁾

On the question of staff structure, I have described how co-ordination was implemented through regular staff meetings. These included a weekly lunchtime meeting open to all staff; monthly meetings of different staff sections which were attended by DOs; and monthly Development meetings which were focused on development and co-ordination matters. Minutes were taken at all meetings and were circulated to all staff. Administrative decision-making was

therefore structured to allow for maximum participation and involvement of staff, although one section (the DOs) officially occupied a central role in staff co-ordination and in advising the Committee.

During 1978, other groups began to criticise this structure of administrative decision-making. Further, some Committee members also questioned the value of frequent staff meetings, a pattern which markedly differed from the organisations in which they themselves participated as workers. Therefore during a period of staffing growth and an expanding work programme there was growing questioning of the extent to which internal democracy was conducive to efficiency.

Despite such questioning, in July 1978 the Committee agreed to a staff proposal that the 'Co-ordination' meeting be expanded to include representation from Housing Management, Technical and Finance sections. Also on the subject of meetings, a staff paper commented:

The system is quite time-consuming but it was felt that benefits in terms of job satisfaction and quality of performance outweighed the possible benefits of conventional hierarchy or independent action by staff. (130)

GHA's first Housing Officer resigned in March 1979, by which time GHA's Management Committee had resolved, first, to develop factoring as a service provided by GHA; and secondly, to formalise a hierarchy of control with the appointment of a Director. (131)

Between 1978 and 1981 there was increasing conflict between staff and Committee at GHA. The major issues influencing tensions and conflicts related to pay and conditions, and to questions of hierarchy and control. Before outlining these developments I shall now identify certain important characteristics of GHA's Management Committee.

3.b.2. Changes on GHAs Committee, 1978 to 1980

By 1977 GHA's Committee reflected a pattern characterising the politics of housing and community action - namely that women rather than men have often tended to become more involved in such issues. GHA's Committee, like that of most CBHAs, is predominantly female in composition - although we shall see that a different pattern has prevailed in certain other associations. A further significant membership pattern on GHA's Committee was that in the early stages most members were employed in white collar and skilled manual work and were owner-occupiers rather than tenants. I shall suggest here that several factors influenced this pattern. First, we have seen in Chapter Ten that Govanhill was more socially differentiated than many other CBHA neighbourhoods and that several neighbourhood action groups existed prior to GHA's formation. GHA's original Committee consisted mainly of individuals who had been involved in actively questioning the planners, who were concerned about the implications of planning proposals for their personal and financial investment in their homes or who believed that local interests required representation. Further GHA, being

one of the first formed CBHAs, its participants had set about incorporating the confidence and experience of known local activists and the advice and expertise of individuals connected with housing and planning through work, but who were not necessarily residents of GHA's prospective Action Areas. It is not therefore surprising that the composition of GHA's early Committee diverged somewhat from the pattern described in MacLennan et al's study:

Reflecting the Glasgow penchant for resident based management, a high proportion of members in Glasgow were not in employment. In Glasgow this proportion was 57% and it reflects not only participation by retired households and married women, but it also mirrors high local unemployment rates. (132)

However by 1977, the three professional advisers on GHA's Committee - a Community Worker, a rent officer and a property factor - had resigned from the Committee. Only the lawyer remained. I have mentioned earlier that between 1976 and 1980 there was extensive turnover on GHA's Committee and GHA's third Chairperson resigned in June 1979 after six years on GHA's Committee. (133) The main reason for her resignation was that being in full-time employment she felt unable to sustain the continuous contact with staff, which had characterised the involvement of her predecessor, who was retired, and which she believed was necessary to oversee developments at GHA. However, she also had a grievance as an owner-occupier whose house had been improved by GHA. Her close had been improved early in GHA's programme, at a time when associations generally applied a low standard of specification of roof repair. As a

result after the improvement work was completed her ceiling required extensive further repairs. Personal tensions resulted from the sharing of responsibility as a local landlord; from simultaneously pursuing a private interest by pressing the association to take remedial action; and from the demands of competing commitments. Further, these tensions were exacerbated by the growing intensity of conflicts over industrial relations issues and over proposals for change in GHA's staff structure.⁽¹³⁴⁾

Certain other resignations resulted from similar tensions between self-interest and commitment to GHA's objectives. For example, one Committee member resigned in 1979 due to his dissatisfaction with the Committee's response to his request for a larger house on the grounds of the special requirements of his disabled wife. The Committee offered the only larger house available but this did not meet his request.⁽¹³⁵⁾ Later he was rehoused outwith the area by GDC.

Therefore, five years following registration, GHA's Committee was, on the one hand, more locally based and, on the other, less experienced. By November 1979, GHA's Committee involved only four members of three years duration. During the months prior to AGMs held in 1978, 1979 and 1980, attendance at Committee meetings was markedly lower than the Committee's official complement of 15 members. Attendance at main Committee meetings at such times was frequently reduced to eight attenders. A regular annual pattern was a Committee decision to conduct a membership drive through

newsletters and public meetings, and to invite interested individuals to attend sub-committees or to be co-opted on to the Management Committee. (136)

Since 1978 proportionately more tenants have become involved on the Committee and although men have been a Committee minority since 1979 two out of four executive positions have been held by men. One further important change was in the conditions of access to Committee membership which prior to 1979 was open to Govanhill residents living outwith GHA's Action Areas. In 1979, however, the Committee resolved to restrict the association's and therefore its future Committees' membership, to the planning zone of Govanhill within which GHA operated - a decision which obviously would prevent any return to the social diversity of GHA's early Committee.

One reason for this change in policy was primarily the Committee's response to external criticism by an aggressive SNP Councillor whose constituency was one of three in which GHA operated. The Councillor's criticism of a house allocation decision served to raise wider policy implications. GHA's Housing Officer had allocated a house to a temporary tenant of the Region. Local residents complained and their criticisms were voiced by the SNP Councillor at all available opportunities - at public meetings, Committee meetings and in GDC Committees. However in interview the Councillor showed clearly that he was just as aggressively critical of GDC as he was of GHA. (137) At any rate, his role

merged with GHA's history when he lost his seat in the March 1980 local election!

As well as stimulating discussions between GHA and GDC's Housing Department on the Nomination Rights issue, the Councillor's actions stimulated discussions within GHA, and between GHA and the GDC, on the role of local councillors and on other aspects of Committee membership. GDC clarified that while all councillors whose constituencies were affected by GHA's operations had the right to attend GHA's meetings as nominated representatives of the local authority, they did not have the voting rights of elected Committee members. (138) Subsequently, the Committee revised its membership policy. It defined the residential zone of access to membership as bounded by GHA's Action Areas in Govanhill, although the Committee was able to co-opt three additional members beyond its complement of fifteen. GHA has since co-opted a long serving Committee member who had retired previously on moving outwith the area.

Therefore after 1977 the Committee increasingly involved a significant proportion of relatively inexperienced members with less than a year in office, although since 1979 there has been growing experience and consolidation of membership. We shall see that a period of intense conflict (1979 to 1981) was followed by improvements in staff and Committee relations and by GHA's increased involvement in various joint endeavours with other associations (1982 onwards) - reflecting a pattern established by the original Committee, but which was submerged somewhat by turnover, internal

tensions and change. GHA's Chairman, 1979 to 1984, has been consistently available to staff and Committee and he has kept in daily contact with the office - in spite of being in full-time employment. He described, semi-jokingly in interview how his involvement has affected his perceptions of women: 'I am pro "women's lib" now - they are much harder workers'. (139)

Having outlined these characteristics of GHA's Committee, I shall now focus on changes affecting GHA's staffing structure and on the conflicts relating to the issue of hierarchy at GHA.

3.b.3. The 1978 issue of hierarchy

I have described how between 1978 and 1979 GHA was characterised by growth in the scale of its programme, by expansion and multiplication of its goals relating to housing provision and housing management; by turnover of staff and Committee and by growth in the scale and complexity of GHA's staffing structure. Further we have seen that both new and experienced participants had begun to question the effectiveness of the established style and structure of authority in GHA's staffing structure. This pattern of internal criticism increased with staff growth and with the expansion of specialist sections at GHA.

In general staff favoured continuing the regular cycle of staff meetings and new staff members usually supported this pattern. This comment by a member of GHA's Finance section typified the views of new staff entrants at GHA.

When I first came to GHA I wondered about the point of so many meetings. I now realise how useful they are for learning and for keeping in touch with different sections and with developments affecting us all at GHA. (140)

Increasingly, however, Committee members questioned staff as to the relevance of staff meetings for the effective servicing of policy-making by the Committee. As might be expected, such generalised questioning was partly stimulated by specific events and issues. For instance, during 1978 GHA faced the problem of extensive delays in two contracts. All participants were aware that contract delays may stem from varying influences, and the Committee was committed to monitoring delays and their causes and effects. In one of these problematic contracts there was a growing concern that the delays had resulted from poor contract management by the consultant architects on the scheme. However it also became known to Committee that a member of staff responsible for monitoring schemes on site had been largely ineffectual and Committee members criticised staff for not presenting this as an issue to be confronted by the Committee. In September 1978 the Committee resolved that officials should refer any prolonged complaints about other staff to Committee.

On the other hand, staff argued that the inefficiency had not been evident during the contract period.⁽¹⁴¹⁾ This staff response however, did not serve to re-establish the confidence of Committee members, several of whom argued that GHA's growth implied the need

for a clear structure involving a hierarchy of control, and formalisation of responsibility for reporting to and servicing of the Management Committee.

There were other influences on these changing attitudes about control and on employer-employee relations at GHA. A major influence was the conflict and tensions relating to the issues of staff pay and conditions.

Since 1976, the vast majority of staff at GHA had been members of the Transport and General Workers Union, Strathclyde Housing Association Staff Branch. In fact, certain staff members had taken the initiative in forming the union branch and at one point the T&GWU Branch was convened by a staff member of GHA. Union initiatives affected both Committee perceptions of staff and Committee decisions at GHA. Following the formation of the branch, Govanhill members were active in the formation of the Glasgow Area Federation of Employers in CBHAs during 1976 and 1977. (142)

Between 1976 and 1979, the Union branch was recognised by participants at GHA as the pacesetter in negotiating over pay and conditions. The 1978 claim for staff pay increases was a significant one and, simultaneously the Union was pressing for a Conditions of Service agreement. Prior to resolution of Union-Federation bargaining, GHA staff negotiated with their employers over a claim for maternity benefit.

Committee members expressed the view that pay demands and levels resolved during 1978 were high. Some commented that they were surprised to find that staff, who they had believed were 'dedicated', proved to be hard bargainers in pressing for large pay increases based on comparability with public sector professional workers. Committee members also believed that work conditions resolved through negotiations at GHA, for example over maternity benefit and overtime, were superior to agreements operating in most comparable workplaces in Glasgow.

In making such comparisons, Committee members referred to joint negotiations and work conditions in industrial firms, in the public sector and drew on their own work experience. Further, some Committee members interpreted the branch's demands as inspired by radicalism and as reflecting 'unreasonable' expectations of CBHA Committees as employers. Union members, on the other hand, regarded their employers as somewhat inconsistent and unprogressive. (143)

Despite the extensive involvement of GHA's participants in their respective organisations on the industrial relations front, these tensions were largely common to CBHAs in Glasgow between 1978 and 1980. At GHA, however, there was a local factor which affected industrial relations. The Glasgow Federation had appointed as their Secretary the same lawyer who provided initial and continuing legal advice to GHA's Committee, and this created an additional source of tension during that period. In general, by 1979, staff and Committee relationships reflected a decline in the mutual trust which had

previously been a significant aspect of relations at GHA.

This decline in trust paralleled the growing awareness of tensions and uncertainties related to the decision-making roles of staff and Committee at GHA. For example, I described earlier how new entrants to GHA's Committee had raised questions about GHA's improvement standards. While GHA's technical staff were also interested in maximizing improvement standards, they expressed resentment at certain actions of Committee members who were responding to tenants' complaints. For instance in mid-1979 Committee members decided to visit improved houses where standards were in question, together with technical staff (Clerk of Works) who were involved in the contract. On one such visit Committee members had agreed with a tenant's complaint about the unevenness of a floor in an improved house.

The Clerk of Works concerned argued that the original contract specification approved by the Housing Corporation had made no reference to floor levelling, and that SDD cost limits, as well as the state of houses prior to improvements, meant that GHA and its tenants could not realistically expect perfection of 'finish' in improved houses. Further, GHA's technical staff felt that Committee members were, in an unstructured way, becoming involved in details of policy implementation and in aspects of work requiring staff discretion. Staff argued that improvement standards should be increased through official channels of sub-committee discussion, and resolutions to the main Committee, and not simply on the basis

of a superficial observation of improved houses. (144)

Having described these tensions in relations at GHA, I shall return to the internal debate on GHA's staff structure. Late in 1978, staff had made a number of proposals to Committee. These included recommendations for employing additional staff; for upgrading certain staff whose responsibilities had expanded beyond those specified in job descriptions; and most significantly, a recommendation for changing the official structure of authority. The staff proposal concentrated administrative authority and responsibility in a committee of senior staff. It suggested that the Co-ordination Meeting (a forum) should be redefined as a Co-ordination Committee (an executive body), which would involve senior staff representatives from GHA's different specialist sections, and which would be collectively accountable to GHA's Committee. (145)

This staff proposal followed lengthy debate at staff meetings during which the Housing Officer had proposed an alternative solution - the appointment of a Director at GHA. The Housing Officer argued that a considered Committee decision to appoint a Director, followed by a careful selection process, would serve both to increase organisational effectiveness and to improve the servicing of the Committee's policy-making role. It is interesting that the Housing Officer argued this case strongly despite his past experience of a problematic appointment of a Director in an English housing association, following which the new Director's strategy

of expansion had resulted in financial problems. However, he had concluded from this experience that the key factors in effective appointments were considered selection and Committee monitoring of a Director's management style and actions. (146)

Subsequent to staff meetings in January and February 1979, some staff articulated their reservations about the initial staff proposal, stating that they had never been certain that a staff hierarchy co-ordinated by a committee was the most appropriate long-term management strategy. However, there was no staff support for the alternative proposal of a Director. In late February 1979 the Committee met without staff to consider staff recommendations on organisation structure and invited their legal adviser to this special meeting. (147)

The February 1979 Committee meeting represented a significant point in GHA's organisational development. I shall describe the dialogue at some length as it typifies, on the one hand, certain Committee concerns about control and about relations with staff and, on the other, the tensions between organic (democratic and flexible) and bureaucratic (hierarchical) control and between professional and lay roles in CBHA policy-making, which I have discussed earlier in Chapter Nine.

3.b.4. The Committee's decision to appoint a Director, February 1979

During the February meeting it was soon apparent that Committee members were not convinced that staff proposals on restructuring offered any real solutions to members' concerns about internal control. One view expressed at the meeting was that staff felt threatened by the alternative of a senior position vested with responsibility for monitoring, supervision and reportage. 'No-one at Govanhill wants to take, or have anyone else take, full executive responsibility'. Also some members were sceptical of staff's commitment to what they termed a 'flat structure'. They questioned whether staff proposals to the Management Committee always represented a consensus of staff opinions, or whether competing staff views were at times homogenised into a single proposal at Co-ordination meetings, thus resulting in the Committee's non-awareness of dissension amongst staff.

The dominant view expressed at the meeting was that GHA required a centralised executive supervisory role. Amongst Committee members of generally less than two years duration, comments such as 'We need a captain of the ship', and 'every workplace has someone in charge', were commonplace. Members with longer experience expressed the view that when GHA involved a small staff, a 'co-operative' form of management had worked effectively. Growth in scale of GHA's operations had increased the complexity of committee business and the pressure on Committee to respond to regular staff proposals for changes in organisation structure.

Other comments by Committee members which described their perceptions of staff were:

Where else would you find staff having such ability to influence pay and conditions as well as the organisation structure?

Staff seem to take all the initiatives in planning.

It's difficult to evaluate and respond to staff proposals where they've spent so long in discussing and formulating them, and they are so much more articulate.

The Management Committee at its February 1979 Special Meeting resolved to appoint a Director with functions of servicing Committee decision-making and overseeing staff. There was unanimity that such an appointment would serve to increase the effectiveness of Committee control over different aspects of the Association's development. However participants recognised that the outstanding problem was to find the right person for the job.

Having made their decision, the Committee resolved to leave in abeyance consideration of other staff proposals for change, such as the questions of regrading and new appointments requested by staff. There was considerable concern that the staff reaction to their decision might be unfavourable but the meeting resolved that, rather than engage in prior consultation, staff should be informed by delegates from the Committee regarding the impending appointment. As one member commented, 'this is our decision'.

3.b.5. Staff reactions (148)

Staff were informed the following day that the Committee had made a decision on staffing proposals and a full announcement was read out by a Committee member to a staff meeting some days later. Staff reaction was a mixture of disappointment and anger, which was directed at the lack of Committee consultation with staff about the appointment of a Director, at a time when this question was under consideration by the Union branch.

Therefore 'the decision' and the Committee's style of communication and of consultation were all issues of staff contention. However staff were also taken aback at the Committee's decision to leave the other staff recommendations in abeyance. From the staff point of view the proposals for more staff to man the existing improvement programme were of more pressing concern than the appointment of a Director.

Several staff suggested that the Committee's decision and approach represented a 'lack of confidence and trust in existing staff' and reflected a 'breakdown in communications between staff and Committee'. Other staff responses focused on the implications of the Committee's decision. Some expressed concern that the Committee would see the appointment of a Director as the solution to management problems which affected relations between staff and Committee and within GHA's organisation of officials. These points were expressed in interviews.

Basically the Committee want to hand over responsibility for decision-making to a Director.

The Committee is only likely to create further problems if the appointment of a Director is seen as a means of resolving internal problems.

A minority of staff responded differently to the Committee's actions. These individuals working in different staff sections at GHA were also critical of the Committee's handling of events, which they perceived as lacking in foresight and sensitivity. They were, however, sympathetic to the Committee's experience of management problems and, further, they did not reject the Committee's decision to appoint a Director. For these staff the central problem was to re-establish communications between the staff and Committee and to break down the climate of 'them and us', of apathy and distrust, which was so markedly in evidence two weeks after the Committee's decision. Therefore a minority of staff concentrated on improving relations at GHA and on ensuring a considered, participative approach to the appointment of Director.

One experienced member of staff, who was about to leave GHA for a post with a new association in the city, took the initiative in attempting to press staff to understand and accept the Committee's actions and to influence Committee members' awareness of staff concerns. Her role was a mixture of mediation and leadership. The outcome of such efforts was that the Committee resolved to hold a Saturday seminar on staffing issues, six weeks after the decision. (149)

The day seminar proved a constructive session, during which staff and Committee discussed the reasons for the Committee's decision to appoint a Director; staff concerns and reservations were openly re-stated; Committee members emphasised their intentions of 'retaining control' and of not becoming 'a rubber stamp' and all participants debated the job description for the post of Director at GHA. Also, Committee members met with staff in different staff sections to discuss their work and their problems as a preliminary step to resolving the other proposals which staff had placed before the February Committee meeting.

The Director's job description was largely based on one proposed by the Employers' Federation, apart from certain modifications which emphasised that the Director should operate in a consultative manner, and should not exclude other staff from attending Committee meetings. It was resolved that the Director would have no specific departmental responsibility and that he or she would be responsible for training throughout GHA.

At the Co-ordination meeting, a senior member of staff commented:

Most of us are generally in agreement with the Management Committee's decision - our main concern is who is appointed. We are also happy with the Job Description - only one member of the Technical staff is still strongly opposed to the appointment. In fact the quicker the appointment's made; the better for GHA - then we can resolve outstanding staffing questions ... Union members are worried though that we might be instructed by the Branch, not to co-operate.
(150)

In fact most staff and Committee felt that the April meeting had significantly operated to improve relations and understanding of problems experienced by each group. Further, it is evident that the attitudes of staff and Committee towards the appointment of Director had evolved out of on-going dialogue since the meeting of February 1979.

Having described the changes in organisation structure and in staff and Committee relationships which were affected by GHA's growth and which led to the Committee's decision to appoint a Director, I shall now focus on the outcomes of this appointment at GHA. In Chapter Nine I referred to certain studies which have analysed the outcomes of new managerial appointments for work relations and for organisational effectiveness. We shall see that GHA's experience reinforces the conclusions of these studies which emphasise the interplay of the following influences. First, there is the established system of relationships which defines the role which is entered by the new manager. Secondly, there are the dominant expectations regarding the manager's conduct and approach which are held by the main organisational groups relating to and affected by the manager's role, notably his/her super-ordinates and subordinates. Thirdly, there is the role of 'significant others' - groups and individuals who operate outwith 'the plant', but whose positional power and/or trust allows them to affect internal expectations of the role and conduct of the new manager. This influence may be official or unofficial. Fourthly, there is the prior experience

management style and personality of the new manager. Finally, the new manager's tasks and relations are affected by the wider and changing inter-organisational, political and economic context in which organisational objectives are pursued.⁽¹⁵¹⁾

In the case of CBHAs a 'conventional wisdom' at the time of writing⁽¹⁵²⁾ is that the management style and effectiveness of senior officials in CBHAs are significant influences on the quality of their internal and external organisational relations. However, we shall see that apart from the appointment of a Director, several factors, including chance, have influenced the role of Director, between 1979 and 1983, at GHA.

3.c. Organisational developments, 1979 to 1983

GHA's first attempt at advertising for a Director produced no suitable applicant and there was a hiatus of nine months between 'the decision' and the arrival of GHA's first Director in December 1980. Prior to his entry into GHA, several developments served to exacerbate underlying tensions in industrial relations at GHA.

In particular, two issues relating to work conditions became a focus of conflict between employers and workers at GHA during this period. First, a DO had claimed maternity benefit, prior to agreement being reached on this issue between the Union branch and the Federation. The claim resulted in protracted internal negotiations and hard feelings on both sides.⁽¹⁵³⁾

Secondly, there was the issue of how the office should be manned over the Xmas/New Year period, 1980. Committee requested that staff should not take holidays over this period. The staff response was that prior to the significant turnover on the Committee (1977 - 1979) the 'previous' Committee had agreed that holidays could be taken. At a subsequent meeting GHA's Committee resolved to honour the decision of the previous Committee, and requested that staff volunteer their services in order to keep the office open during that period. (154)

Apart from these conflicts, organisational turnover and expansion to meet the requirements of the improvement programme and of the association's policy of extending housing management services, were a continuing pattern at GHA during 1979 and 1980. Prior to the arrival of the Director the Committee confronted the outstanding decisions on new appointments and on staff regrading. By June 1979, nine Clerical, Housing, Finance and Development posts were advertised to replace staff leaving GHA and further appointments were approved in November 1979 to meet the requirements of GHA's expanding house improvement programme. The Committee had resolved to make these appointments prior to the Director's arrival and in spite of a letter from the HC, London, which requested associations to exercise financial restraint. (155)

3.c.1. The new role of GHA's Director and its outcomes

GHA advertised twice before positive agreement was reached on selection. At the Committee's request a Housing Corporation official sat in on the interviews as observer.

GHA's first Director had previously worked in Housing Management in a large English housing association which employed more than 200 staff and which owned over 7000 houses. He was quickly aware of the prior reservations of staff and of the high expectations of Committee members which related to the role of Director at GHA. He believed that GHA's participants lacked experience as a result of high turnover, but he was impressed by what he termed 'the grasp and commitment' of staff and Committee. He commented:

CBHAs could gain from some of the professionalism of English associations, and English associations could learn much from CBHAs if they are to become more responsive.

The Director defined his main initial tasks as relating to the development of Housing Management; and to clarification of the roles of Management Committee, sub-committees and staff in the decision-making process at GHA. (156)

After two to three months, participants generally felt that the appointment had been a positive step for GHA. By March 1980 the Director had initiated Committee discussions on internal procedures and on specific aspects of the Development programme. (157)

In general, Committee members felt the Director had improved the

quality of reporting and advice, and of Committee discussion.

Housing Management staff described the Director's approach as 'direct, challenging and constructive' and a DO stated that:

At times we had 'shouting matches', but we generally felt that the Director was in tune with issues affecting different sections, and was therefore able to represent GHA effectively to external bodies.

Staff generally agreed that the Director's main contribution was in the Housing Management section - an area in which least development had occurred and in which his former experience was directly relevant. (158)

In the Spring of 1980, it was evident that inter-group relations had continued to improve since the period of open discussion at GHA in April 1979. Also, it appeared that the initial management problem facing any new entrant into a complex and contentious management role, had been confronted and overcome by GHA's new Director. Most significantly the Director had operated with a management style which did not offend the values and expectations (official and unofficial) of participants at GHA. Within a short time-scale the Director had gained both legitimacy and support for his authority amongst both staff and Committee, thus increasing the credibility of his initiatives. (159)

The cumulative confidence, to which I have referred here, was short-lived and the Director's impact on structures and processes at GHA was limited by events. Due mainly to personal circumstances, which led to pressures to return nearer home, the Director resigned from his post and left Glasgow in April 1980, after only four months in post. After the initial stunned reaction the Committee decided to delay readvertising until the Director had confirmed his resignation. The post was readvertised in June 1980.

Prior to GHA's second Director taking up post (January 1981), a survey of staff attitudes showed that most staff favoured the appointment of a Director at this stage of GHA's development.⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ In general therefore the effective appointment of a Director, though short-lived, had served to modify earlier reservations about the post at GHA. However, some new entrants - namely the DOs who had not lived through GHA's organisational trauma of 1978 to 1979 - had revived some of the old ideas about alternative management strategies, such as rotating Co-ordination.

Such considerations were partly stimulated by external circumstances. For example in Chapter Seven we saw that in late 1980 Scottish associations became concerned about their future resource allocation. Staff at GHA, like those in other CBHAs which had established a complement of DOs to service an expanding improvement programme,⁽¹⁶¹⁾ were concerned about the possibility of impending redundancies. Against this background the reappointment

of a Director was a focus of some contention.

Following the first Director's resignation the Committee approved a staff proposal that the Co-ordination Meeting, in the interim, should assume responsibility for the functions of Director. It was also agreed that the Co-ordination Meeting should in rotation be chaired by representatives of different sections. In practice, however, as in the past, responsibility for overseeing the servicing of Committee meetings and for liaising with government bodies on major policy matters was assumed by GHA's more experienced DOs. When staff found this system appeared to work effectively they proposed to Committee that the Director's appointment be held in abeyance until there was more certainty about the future resources to be allocated to GHA. (162)

The Committee rejected the staff proposal which recommended a rotating position of Co-ordinator in the meantime. The dominant view of Committee was that the sooner GHA trained in a new Director, the sooner organisational practices would be stabilised at GHA. The Committee resolved to advertise and there was an unexpected internal staff applicant for the post. In the event the Committee appointed an outsider whose age, professional and administrative experience they hoped would benefit GHA in the short and longer-term future.

GHA's new Director arrived in January 1981, by which time expectations of staff and Committee regarding the role of Director had been influenced by their experience of the management style of

GHA's first Director, and by developments during the period of hiatus in appointments. Further influences on the role of GHA's second Director were his prior work experience and his expectations about GHA which influenced his management style. Finally, it should be noted that important external referents, such as HC officials and GHA's legal adviser, perceived the new appointment as a potential source of stability following the extensive organisational turnover at GHA.

Unfortunately for GHA's participants the year 1981 to 1982 was a period of increasing friction rather than one of organisational consolidation or of increasing stability and improvements in work relations. In general, GHA's second Director faced problems of legitimacy of his authority in relation to staff; and of his personal adjustment to the role of Director in GHA. These problems partly stemmed from his past experience in large-scale bureaucratic organisations and his idealistic expectations about the likelihood of co-operative work relations and community involvement at GHA. (163)

A further factor was that neither the Committee, nor the Director recognised the extent to which a new Director, from a non-housing association background, would require a systematic and comprehensive training programme, focused on general housing association issues and procedures, on local circumstances in Govanhill, and on GHA's particular organisational culture and established practices.

Also, the new Director's early adjustment to his role at GHA was not helped by the frames of reference of both Committee and staff, by the relations between the two groups and by other situational factors. The Director entered GHA during a period when some Committee members were lacking in confidence following a period of organisational instability and conflicts at GHA, 1979 - 1981. Against this background a dominant concern of Committee members was to ensure that the 'Committee is seen to be in control' by staff and outside agencies, and the Director's role was seen as significant in this respect.

If we consider the frame of reference of GHA's staff (their dominant values, expectations and intentions), it is obvious that any new Director at GHA would have had difficult problems to overcome in establishing his/her legitimacy. We have seen that staff had so respected GHA's first Director and his management style, that earlier opposition to the role of a Director had been largely overcome. However his sudden exit coincided with fears in certain quarters that growing resource restraint might affect GHA's staffing complement. Further the hiatus between appointments had allowed some of GHA's newer staff to become involved in collective management, a control option which was legitimised by the values of staff rather than by those emphasised by Committee members.

In sum, GHA's staff wanted the new Director to operate with a consultative, participative management style, following a period of organisational learning. In the event the Director's personality and management style contravened these expectations and communications between Director and different staff sections were generally poor. Staff were concerned that the cumulative tensions relating to the Director served to inhibit effective problem-solving at GHA, to prevent Committee awareness of staff problems and to increase problems with outside agencies. Moreover, Committee members had become increasingly sceptical of staff motivations, following the latter's earlier opposition to the appointment of Director and their participation in industrial action.

Staff and Committee relations at GHA deteriorated during the Summer of 1981, by which time staff meetings focused extensively on problems relating to the role of Director at GHA. Staff resentments, that their problems were not understood or given credibility by Committee, eventually erupted at a meeting in September 1981, when staff and Committee relationships reflected an underlying intensity of conflict, and which was followed by an almost universal sense of despondency.

In the Winter of 1981 - 1982 GHA's Committee increasingly gave credibility to staff concerns by institutionalising joint consultation on organisational issues, and by implementing some of the proposals which evolved out of joint discussions with staff.

The Committee established and monitored new systems of reporting, of training and of delegation during 1982. In general the quality of communications and relations between staff and Committee had begun to improve at GHA, although the 1982 city-wide pay dispute escalated sharply at GHA and hardened attitudes on both sides.

Therefore incrementally GHA's participants attempted to re-establish the effective communications which both staff and Committee members agreed were essential to the co-ordination of improvements and of housing management and to effective decision-making processes at GHA. However this shared emphasis on improving work processes and work relations coexisted with a persistent consciousness of divisions of interest, and therefore of underlying conflict, between staff and Committee on the industrial relations front.

GHA's second Director resigned in November 1982 to take up another post in England. This time there was no suggestion at GHA as to any alternative to the reappointment of a Director. The Committee had remained largely intact, consolidating on experience and gathering confidence throughout an unquestionably difficult period in GHA's history. By late 1982, however, although staff turnover was declining there were no clear signs of longer-term stability in the senior posts at GHA.

GHA's third Director was an internal candidate - a Development Officer of three years experience at GHA who was highly committed

to the organisation and to both ideological and practical aspects of CBHA objectives. His approach to servicing the Committee's policy-making role, to exercising his authority over staff (including staff participation) and to generating initiatives in the pursuit of GHA's objectives, was inevitably affected by reflection on earlier developments at GHA and by the internal discussions on the role and conduct of GHA's Director in which he participated. While he has only been in post 18 months at the time of writing, I would suggest that his management style and approach is compatible with GHA's history and objectives, and with the expectations of the main groups internal and external to GHA. Further, there are signs of increasing stability of GHA's personnel and of growing internal reflection on policies, of the extension of training provision, and of improvements in staff and Committee relationships.⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ Since 1980, GHA's Committee composition has been largely stable and today is therefore considerably more experienced.⁽¹⁶⁵⁾

In conclusion, the outcomes of appointments of Directors at GHA have each been influenced by internal and external factors. The experience of each appointment was affected by prior events and circumstances which had influenced the relations between staff and Committee, and their dominant expectations of the role and management style of the Director. Developments in the urban system of industrial relations, concerns over future funding and the views of GHA's advisers, all served to influence these expectations. Further, there was the prior work experience of GHA's Directors,

which affected the ease with which they related to the role of Director, to its associated responsibilities and powers, to their superiors and their subordinates, to GHA's complex and changing tasks and environment and to its relations with government agencies.

We have seen in Section Three of the case study that the period in GHA's history which was most associated with internal conflicts was also a period characterised by major organisational changes. These included the expansion and diversification of GHA's objectives; significant turnover of personnel; growth and increasing complexity of the staffing structure; and the ongoing complex issues facing GHA's local housing programme, such as ground conditions and inadequate funding. In this context it would seem that the most constant characteristic of CBHAs is the prevalence of the uncertainties, changes and complexities affecting their development. Finally, I shall conclude here that in the light of the internal and external problems faced by GHA's Committee between 1979 and 1982 the staying power and commitment of Committee members have been remarkable.

I shall now turn in Chapter Twelve to consider the development of Reidvale Housing Association which was formed in 1976, three years after GHA's establishment.

Notes and References to Chapter Eleven

- (1) Interview with GHA founder member, January 1979.
- (2) I was able to interview three of GHA's former and founder members in 1979. I also interviewed GHA's first official from Assist, Mike Thornley, who in May 1979 produced a diary of early developments, against which I was able to check out participants' accounts and GHA's detailed minutes. Also Minutes of GHA Steering Group meetings from 11.2.74 to 11.12.74 document these uncertainties.
- (3) Minute of GHA Steering Group meeting, 3.2.74.
- (4) The Minute of the meeting of 11.12.74 which was attended by R Young, who had recently left the Assist for the HC, described the HC's uncertainty about procedures and about the relative responsibilities of the HC and the SDD, in relation to approvals under forthcoming legislation.
- (5) Govanhill Housing Association, Application to the Housing Corporation for Loan Finance, Enclosure No 1, page 3, September 1974. Sep. 1974. See also Minute of GHA Steering Committee meeting, 10.6.74, 26.6.74 and 12.2.75 which highlight the Committee's concerns about cash flow problems.
- (6) See Part Three, Chapter Nine of the thesis.
- (7) Interview with Community Worker who had worked at Crossroads, June 1979.
- (8) The appointment of Glasgow Corporation's nominated representative was clarified in a letter to GHA from the newly-elected administration, 30.5.74.
- (9) In 1979 I interviewed five officials employed at GHA between 1974 and 1976 and five of GHA's early Committee members.
- (10) Interview with President of Govanhill and District Residents' Association, who joined GHA as an adviser to the Committee during 1974, June 1979.
- (11) GHA's first Chairperson retired January 1975 subsequent to his appointment as the first DO in another CBHA.
- (12) See article by M. Thornley, Tenement Rehabilitation in Glasgow, in R. Darke and R. Walker (eds.), Local Government and the Public, London, Leonard Hill, 1977.

- (13) Minute of GHA Steering Group meeting, 3.2.74.
- (14) Application for Loan Finance, September 1974, op. cit., Enclosure No 8, page 2. See also Enclosure No 1, page 2. This paper stressed how the association sought advice from a variety of individuals and organisations concerned with all aspects of housing.
- (15) The continuing debate was recorded in staff papers to Committee. For example, 'Future Organisation and Role of the Govanhill Housing Association', December 1975; 'Comments on the Green Paper on Future Organisation of the Govanhill Housing Association and Comments on the GHA/Assist Special Relationship', January 1976; and 'Where Do We Go From Here?', February 1976.
- (16) Minutes of GHA's Management Committee, 14.1.76 and 3.3.76.
- (17) Minute of Steering Group meeting 3.2.74.
- (18) See P. Selznick's case study, TVA and the Grass Roots, Berkely, University of California Press, 1949. Selznick's emphasis on incorporation of potential dissent and of expertise is reflected in GHA's discussions on widening its area of operation and local membership (Minutes 24.6.74), and on incorporating a variety of expertise on to the Committee (Minutes of Committee meetings, 1.3.74; 2.4.74 and 18.4.74).
- (19) Minute of Steering Committee meeting, 1.3.74.
- (20) Minute of Steering Committee meeting, 10.6.74.
- (21) Interviews with Assist architect, February 1979, and with other early participants between 1979 and 1980.
- (22) Minute of GHA Committee meeting, 26.8.74 records participants' doubts about the appropriateness of such a liaison Committee.
- (23) Discussion Papers on GHA's organisation and role and GHA's Application for Loan Finance, 1974, op. cit.
- (24) C. Perrow, Organisational Analysis: A Sociological View, Tavistock Publications, 1974, p. 173.
- (25) Ibid, pp. 134-137.
- (26) Interviews with GHA's Finance Officers, May 1979 and March 1980 and discussions with Committee members, 1979 to 1980.

- (27) Interviews with architect and Development Officer from Assist, January and February 1979. See also Chapters Five and Eight on the role of Assist.
- (28) GHA's Minutes of Committee meetings document incremental improvements in standards of rehabilitation. For example, the standards of work to the back courts was increased in May 1975 and in December 1975, when the grant level was increased. Also measures were approved to counteract post-improvement dampness in ground and top floor houses after experience of problems with a 10 close contract. Policy decisions about standards influenced further changes in GHA's specification of works between March and July 1977. The specification was increased to include ground floor insulation; close doors; increased standards of roof repair; and a commitment to increasing the proportion of house amalgamations on top floors.
- (29) A study commissioned by GHA concluded after interviewing 28 out of 32 owner-occupiers who left the area that the majority felt they had been in a weak bargaining position in relation to the District Valuer. See Govanhill Research Project II, October 1976, by Steve Mason.
- (30) Interviews with GHA's three original Development Officers, 1978 to 1979, all of whom left GHA in 1979.
- (31) See Chapter Twelve, Case Study of Reidvale Housing Association.
- (32) Management Committee Minute of October 1977 meeting records that the 'Committee is dissatisfied with the competence of SDD' and views the delays in approval as 'disgraceful'.
- (33) Interviews with GHA Committee members, Clerks of Works and DOs, between 1978 and 1980. As a reaction to delays the Committee meeting of 11.7.77 suggested that future contracts should involve only two closes, 'all that contractors can handle' - a position later modified.
- (34) Letter from Reidvale HA, 22.4.77, stated concern over cuts in specification demanded by the HC which had implications for future maintenance.
- (35) Minute of meeting of GHA Management Committee, April 1977.

- (36) Surveys carried out by community workers at The View showed that the majority of residents in these blocks wanted to remain in Govanhill (e.g. 115/156 households who were interviewed in August 1977 from the Carfin Street/Govanhill Street block wanted to remain. A further survey, January 1979, showed a similar pattern for the Inglefield Street Block residents. These groups organised public meetings to which GHA was invited.
- (37) See Chapter Six for a discussion of Glasgow District Council's role in planning the Action Area programme in the city.
- (38) The Carfin Street block included 184 houses whose residents formed the Carfin Street Block Residents' Association.
- (39) Interviews with officials in the Private Sector section of GDC's Housing Department, May 1980, and with officials of the Department of Architecture and Related Services, March 1981.
- (40) SDD commented in a letter to GDC's Director of Planning, 27.6.77 that 'the very high costs of consolidation may make it difficult to justify new building in a potential housing surplus situation'.
- (41) Carfin Street residents had lobbied actively to ensure the improvement of their block since mid-1976.
- (42) Govanhill Community Plan Working Party submission to Hugh Brown, Member of Parliament, 1977.
- (43) As illustrated in The View surveys, 1977 and 1979.
- (44) Article in The View, October 1978 by the revitalised Govanhill Street/Carfin Street Action Group stressed the need to lobby GHA, MPs and local councillors in order to secure their commitment to improving the block after almost three years of uncertainty.
- (45) Reports by structural engineers and Coal Board to GHA, June and July 1978.
- (46) I interviewed different interests represented in the negotiations during 1979 including staff and Committee at GHA; representatives of residents' groups and GDC and SDD officials.

- (47) Letter from GHA to the HC (11.7.78) recognised that grouting at £20,000 per close was recommended as the safest solution by structural engineers where ground conditions are particularly suspect. However the engineers recommended that GHA gives serious consideration to proceeding with rehabilitation without 'carrying out grouting work', steel ties were costed at £6,000 per close.
- (48) The Coal Board accepted its responsibilities regarding the two tenements in question, while it was more cautious with respect to others in Govanhill. Letter to GHA, July 1978.
- (49) February 1979 meeting held at the GDC.
- (50) Incident reported to me by the DO concerned, July 1979.
- (51) Inglefield Street, Carfin Street and Park Square Blocks.
- (52) Minutes of Govanhill Local Plan Working Party, March to June 1979.
- (53) See, for example, letter from Carfin Street Block Residents, 31.1.79; also articles in The View, December 1979 which criticised GHA for using houses as offices; The View, January to February 1979 when criticism focused on delays and on GHA's priorities regarding the programming of Blocks for approval by the HC.
- (54) Local councillor interviewed at City Chambers, May 1979.
- (55) The engineers stressed that in this area the ratio of rockhead cover to void was less than 6:1.
- (56) GDC had carried out grouting in Maryhill as did Queens Cross HA, May 1980.
- (57) The structural engineers report was considered by GHA's Development sub-committee on 5.6.80 and was approved at the June 1980 Management Committee meeting.
- (58) See Chapter Eight of the thesis.
- (59) As a Development Officer in 1977 in an association embarking on its first contracts involving owner-occupiers and shops, I was recommended by other DOs and HC officials to ask GHA and Assist for advice. Also, in my interviews with SDD and GDC officials during 1979, officials referred to GHA's achievements in retaining a higher proportion of owner-occupiers than had other associations.

- (60) Interviews with DOs in other CBHAs, 1979 to 1980.
- (61) Discussions with GHA's DOs employed since 1979 between 1980 and 1981. See also GHA Annual Report 1982-83.
- (62) GHA Sales Policy, October 1983.
- (63) Interview with GHA's Director, January 1984.
- (64) Ibid.
- (65) See Chapters Five and Seven of the thesis.
- (66) C. Perrow, Organisational Analysis: A Sociological View, 1974, op. cit.
- (67) Reported on Nationwide, 13.9.79. The scheme was jointly promoted by the GDC and the Building Society.
- (68) As reported by GHA's DOs who have monitored local house prices for acquisition purposes.
- (69) GHA, Report on Consumer Survey, 7.8.79.
- (70) See Articles in The View op. cit., 1978 to 1980. Also, during the research I found that chance contacts with shopkeepers and local residents in local shops stimulated outspoken, uninvited critical comment on relations with GHA, which at times was evidently based on partial or incorrect information.
- (71) A frequent comment at meetings or during interviews.
- (72) Carfin Street/Govanhill Street, 1976 to 1979 and Park Square Blocks, 1980 to 1981.
- (73) Interviews with Committee member after the 1979 ACM, and later in November 1979 following the explosion which displaced residents of tenement.
- (74) Interview January 1980.
- (75) Interviews with Community Workers from Crossroads, op. cit.
- (76) Interview with representative of Park Square Action Groups, July 1980.
- (77) Discussion with Crossroads Community Workers, May 1980 and interviews with past GHA Committee members, February 1979 and May 1980.

- (78) Minute of GHA Public Meeting, 4.2.81, and Fact Sheet for residents.
- (79) GHA Annual Report, 1980 to 1981, Chairman's Report.
- (80) For example, Elderpark HA, Queens Cross HA and Partick HA.
- (81) M. Brailey, 'Associations' Allocations', in Roof, November/December 1981, Shelter Housing Magazine, p. 21.
- (82) A rehousing principle approved at GHA Management Committee meeting, 30.4.75.
- (83) Paper to Committee by Community Worker discussed at special meeting on rehousing, 19.6.75. This paper discussed the probability of demolition to the East of Cathcart Road, one of the main traffic routes into the city centre.
- (84) Interview with GHA official, February 1979.
- (85) Prior to final approval of the Allocations policy GHA had allocated properties in September 1977 to residents from the demolition area. See Minutes of Property Management sub-committee, 14.9.77 and 21.9.77.
- (86) Interviews with Housing Officers in six associations, 1979 to 1980.
- (87) Minute of GHA Management Committee meeting, May 1979.
- (88) Interviews with GHA Committee members, November 1979.
- (89) See Part One, Chapter Three and Part Three, Chapter Seven of the thesis.
- (90) Reported by two officials and a Committee member who were involved at GHA between 1973 and 1977, Interviews February and May 1979.
- (91) This strategy was described during an interview with a senior official in the Reletting Section of Housing Department of the GDC, January 1981.
- (92) Minute of GDC Housing Committee, Housing, 1235, 1978 to 1979, Print No 12.
- (93) Interview with GDC official, January 1981, op. cit.
- (94) Interview with Development Officers at GHA, January 1979.

- (95) Minute of Special Meeting of GHA's Management Committee, 14.12.77.
- (96) SFHA Paper on the urgency of rationalising Factoring which included a report on a meeting between SFHA and the Property Owners and Factors of Scotland, SFHA, December 1976.
- (97) Minute of GHA Special Meeting, December 1977, op. cit.
- (98) Staff paper to Committee, 'The case against taking housing management in-house, or for at least postponing the decision', November 1977.
- (99) For example, Reidvale, Elderpark, Queens Cross, Shettleston, Partick Housing Associations. These CBHAs employed Housing Officers within two years of their formation.
- (100) Staff paper, 'Proposals for Property Management', presenting the majority staff position to Committee, March 1978.
- (101) Discussed at meeting on Finance Issues, 18 April 1979.
- (102) 'Programme for In-House Factoring', Paper by GHA Housing Manager, 8.2.80.
- (103) See Appendix to Chapter Eleven.
- (104) As described in interview by Housing Officer, May 1980.
- (105) I carried out interviews with both Development Officers who in sequence serviced the Boyd Street Area (November 1978 and November 1980), and with three Committee members from that area (February and April 1980).
- (106) Boyd Street was a regular topic at GHA Committee meetings which I attended as an observer during 1979 and 1980.
- (107) Interviews with Committee members, November and December 1979.
- (108) This became GHA policy following the 1983 AGM.
- (109) The title of a staff paper presented for discussion at GHA, March 1976.
- (110) Staff Paper, 'Future Organisation and Role of the GHA', December 1975.
- (111) Staff paper to Committee, 'Comments on the Green Paper on the Future Organisation of the GHA and Comments on the GHA/Assist special relationship', January 1976.

- (112) Ibid.
- (113) Interview with architect from Assist, May 1979.
- (114) Interviews with GHA's original staff and Committee members, 1979, op. cit.
- (115) See GHA's Annual Reports.
- (116) As described in staff paper to Committee, 'Staffing Issues - Property Management', May 1979.
- (117) These 'reasons' were identified through my interviews and during my period of observation, when I was a regular presence in GHA's office and at meetings, between 1979 and 1981.
- (118) My assessment of reasons for Committee turnover is based on my interviews with past and present Committee members and on my observations.
- (119) For example, Partick HA, 1977 to 1979 and Tollcross HA, 1978 to 1979.
- (120) D. Maclellan, M. Brailey and N. Lawrie, The Rehabilitation Activities and Effectiveness of Housing Associations in Scotland, A Report prepared for the Scottish Development Department, April 1983, pp. 120 - 121.
- (121) An observation regularly stated in interviews and discussions with participants, 1980 to 1981.
- (122) Reported by DO in interview, August 1979.
- (123) Director's paper commenting on 'Staffing Levels and Structure', 18.1.80, and interviews with staff who had come from other associations between 1978 and 1980, all emphasised these points of difference at GHA.
- (124) These tensions were openly referred to in discussions with staff and Committee during my period as observer.
- (125) Proposal by Finance Sub-Committee Meeting, 13.10.77 which was approved at the October meeting of the Management Committee.
- (126) Clerk of Works in interview, December 1979.
- (127) Development Officer in interview, June 1980.
- (128) Interview with DO, August 1980.

- (129) Interview with Housing Officer, February 1979.
- (130) Staff paper to Management Committee, February 1979.
- (131) Special Meeting of GHA Management Committee to which no staff were invited, 22 February 1979.
- (132) D. MacLennan et al, 1983, op. cit., p. 41.
- (133) GHA's first Chairman resigned in 1975 on taking up a post of DO in a different CBHA. His successor, GHA's first Chairwoman, resigned due to illness in 1977.
- (134) Interview, November 1979.
- (135) At Management Committee meeting, 30.5.79.
- (136) Minute of GHA Management Committee meeting of 28.11.79.
- (137) This was clearly evident when I interviewed the local councillor concerned in November 1979.
- (138) Minute of Management Committee meeting, September 1979, op. cit.
- (139) Commented in interview, August 1979.
- (140) Interview with GHA Finance Officer, July 1979.
- (141) Interview with DO, February 1979.
- (142) See Chapter Eight for an account of general developments in Industrial Relations.
- (143) Interviews and discussions involving staff and Committee at GHA in 1979 and 1980.
- (144) These concerns were highlighted in interviews with Clerks of Works and with Committee members, 1979.
- (145) Staff proposals to the Management Committee, January 1979.
- (146) Interview and discussions with Housing Officer, December 1978 and January 1979.
- (147) I attended the Special Meeting of GHA's Committee, 22.2.79 as an observer.
- (148) I was working two days a week in the office, on GHAs files and Minutes during the period prior to and following 'the decision'.

- (149) I attended the Saturday Seminar on Staffing Issues as an observer, 7 April 1979.
- (150) I attended as observer the GHA Staff Co-ordination Meeting, April 1979.
- (151) See discussion of studies of appointments of new managers in Chapter Nine, and in particular the work of A. Gouldner, Wildcat Strike, New York, Free Press, 1965, and R. Guest, Organisational Change, Homewood Illinois, Dorsey Press, 1962.
- (152) I updated the study early in 1984.
- (153) The Special Meeting of the Management Committee was attended by two Union representatives. The DO left GHA in 1979.
- (154) Minutes of Staffing Sub-Committee, 17.9.79 and of Management Committee meeting, 28.11.79. The Staffing Sub-Committee was formed during the period of staff expansion, July 1979.
- (155) At Management Committee meeting, November 1979.
- (156) Interview with GHA's Director, 19 December 1979.
- (157) Director's papers for Committee discussion on procedures at GHA, April 1980.
- (158) Interviews with GHA's staff, May 1980.
- (159) In my view the appointment of GHA's first Director had more similarities to the circumstances of Guest's study than to those documented by Gouldner.
- (160) Survey by researcher from Glasgow University, Summer 1980, immediately after Director's resignation.
- (161) GHA's Action Areas had almost doubled to include 1663 properties, between 1978 and 1982.
- (162) Staff papers to Committee, 'Appointment of Director/Development Programme', 7 July 1980 and 'Staff Co-ordination', 15 July 1980.
- (163) Observations following discussions with staff and Committee members and GHA's second Director, March to May 1981.
- (164) Discussions with GHA participants, January and March 1984.

- (165) By mid-1983 five Committee members and one co-opted member each had more than three years experience; five had over two years experience and three had joined the Committee in 1982. At the 1984 AGM (June) the male membership of GHA's Committee had increased to five and GHA's Chairman resigned after five years in post, choosing to remain as an ordinary Committee member due to his other commitments.

APPENDIXGOVANHILL HOUSING ASSOCIATION LIMITED

	<u>1975</u>	<u>Jan.</u> <u>1976</u>	<u>Jan.</u> <u>1977</u>	<u>Jan.</u> <u>1978</u>	<u>Jan.</u> <u>1979</u>	<u>Jan.</u> <u>1980</u>	<u>Jan.</u> <u>1981</u>	<u>Jan.</u> <u>1982</u>	<u>Dec.</u> <u>1983</u>
Units in Housing Action Areas	310	310	345	835	1216	1438	1663	1663	1663
Units in Project Areas	472 (Jly. '75)	472	475	835	1216	1438	1663	1663	1663
Units in ownership	24	172	345 ^f	512	637	911	1111 ^{ff}	1155	1295
Units improved	-	10	66	142	249	386	561	767	984 ⁺
Units improved (owner-occupiers)	-	5	6	17	46	75	109	134	169
No. of GHA members	-	9	81	123	211	263	346	367	424
Capital Expenditure (£ million) (Apr. to Mar.)				1.24	1.76	1.99	2.73	3.69	2.81

Estimated Expenditure 1983/84 - £3.1m

^f (a) all missives concluded
(b) does not include decant houses

^{ff} 35 demolished

⁺ 1123 houses prior to amalgamations

CHAPTER TWELVE

A CASE STUDY OF REIDVALE HOUSING ASSOCIATION, 1976-1984

In this chapter I shall explore the various and complex influences on the development of Reidvale Housing Association Limited (RHA). The case study is divided into two main sections. In the first section I shall concentrate on RHA's early development (1976-1977). In particular, I shall consider how the expectations and intentions of RHA's early participants influenced RHA's operative goals and organisational culture in its formative period. I shall also examine how RHA's early development was influenced by the extensive uncertainties (political, economic and technological), which we have seen to generally affect the early development of Glasgow's CBHAs.

In the second section I shall focus on the evolution of RHA's operative goals. I have emphasised in Chapter Nine that organisations generally have multiple goals and that conflict and tensions are inevitable aspects of organisational life. As in the case study of GHA, I shall focus on goals and activities which are externally oriented - on RHA's role as a housing developer and on its role as a local landlord. I shall then concentrate on internal relations and on the dynamics of internal control which have characterised RHA. In this second section we shall see the outcomes of RHA's organisational growth and increasing complexity. We shall see the effects, on the one hand, of the uncertainties and constraints facing RHA's participants and, on the other, of organisational tensions and changes. Moreover, we shall see how, just like GHA, RHA emerged as an organisation characterised by a strong local identity, sustained

resident participation, and certain notable achievements.

Section One : Formation, early development and uncertainties,
1976 to 1977

In Chapter Ten I described the local developments which generated the founding of RHA (1973-1975). Like GHA, RHA's formation had resulted from community action which was supported by key professionals and which aimed to influence the housing strategies of state agencies. However, unlike GHA's early experience, influential actors in RHA's formation were able to draw on the model of the community-based housing association which had been established elsewhere in the city.⁽¹⁾ RHA's Steering Group was given the authority to proceed, as the last of the 'first phase' of CBHAs promoted by the Housing Corporation (HC) - District Council (GDC) partnership, in the Spring of 1975, some two years after GHA's formation.⁽²⁾

RHA's early participants had faced a similar range of uncertainties to those which affected the formation of all of Glasgow's CBHAs. There were planning and political uncertainties. For example, how would the planning of improvement work be phased? How much autonomy would the association have in its housing provision? Would local politicians and the local authority really continue to provide support? There were economic uncertainties about the flow of funds and about the details of the funding process. Finally, there were the organisational uncertainties which related to the Committee's role in employing staff to service the building programme and to the association's future role as a local landlord.⁽³⁾

There were further similarities between RHA and other young CBHAs. For example, both GHA and RHA occupied ground floor tenement flats; their offices were characterised by a relaxed, informal style and by an apparently bustling, non-routine and stimulating work atmosphere. The image of that time in no way suggested that five years later these organisations would control the expenditure of millions of pounds of public monies. (4)

I have already stressed that there were also certain notable differences between young CBHAs. A marked characteristic of RHA's office was that daily business - the filing of official communications, applications for loan finance, meetings with professional consultants, interviews with residents - was conducted in parallel with unplanned visits from residents wanting advice on their housing problems, or simply to satisfy curiosity, as well as visits by Committee members who called in just to see how things were going. This "open house" was partly enabled by the work and family situations of RHA's early Committee members. However, it also resulted from the fact that RHA shared its office during 1976 with the Reidvale Residents' Association, and one afternoon a week office business took place in the midst of a Pensioners Club!

1.a. RHA's Committee: early concerns and intentions

Reidvale's original Committee involved mainly tenants of private landlords in the area. However, one influential member, whose advice was particularly valued, was the community worker whose actions had stimulated the formation of Reidvale Residents' Association, and who

lived in the area. Committee meetings were held fortnightly and these were regularly attended by officials from the regional office of the HC, who provided information and advice which was both welcome and influential in the early stages. The local Labour councillor of that period, who was invited to attend meetings in his capacity as a nominated representative of the District Council, in fact never became a regular attender at Committee meetings. RHA's Committee members between 1975 and 1977 were therefore subjected to a new learning experience regarding their evolving roles as local and collective housing developers, managers and employers. This "learning" also focused on the housing association planning context, its characteristic uncertainties and bureaucratic constraints. This at times frustrating experience for Committee members was alleviated at RHA by the support of professionals and sympathetic HC officials whose knowledge, experience and contacts constituted important resources to the Committee.⁽⁵⁾

In October 1975, on the strength of promotional finance promised by the local authority,⁽⁶⁾ the Committee of nine - at that stage the only shareholders in RHA - resolved to appoint their first member of staff. Following HC advice and the pattern adopted by other CBHAs, this appointment was to be a Development Officer (DO). Prior to this appointment Committee members were involved in abstract discussions about RHA's goals (policies) and in administrative tasks.⁽⁷⁾

In their discussions about RHA's goals the Committee placed emphasis on the notion of local control over the rehabilitation programme in Reidvale, and this local or "community" control was perceived as being dependent on Committee control over RHA's business.⁽⁸⁾ This approach was a natural outcome of the community worker's philosophy of community development.⁽⁹⁾ As well as this interest in local control, RHA's Committee discussed their goals of improving local housing and its environment, of expanding local housing opportunities, of involving local people in RHA's management, and of improving standards of housing maintenance in the area. A dominant concern was to halt the outward movement of young families by improving local housing conditions and more generally to halt the physical and social decline which had affected the neighbourhood. These early and abstract intentions became RHA's official goals or policies, as expressed in Annual Reports and Committee Minutes. As well as this early debate over policies, the Committee was involved in administrative details between 1975 and 1976. For example, it was agreed with the HC officials that Committee members would refer to the HC office any information about local residents who wanted to sell their house to RHA.⁽¹⁰⁾ HC officials explained the details of the acquisition process to the Committee. Also, they encouraged the Committee to assess RHA's initial requirements for decant houses (empty flats which would house residents while their own houses were being improved), and in fact this meant that the Committee was required to guess the pace of the initial building programme.⁽¹¹⁾

By January 1976 when the Committee employed RHA's first member of staff, auditors had already been appointed, a bank account had been opened and signatories appointed. As in other associations, the Committee gradually recognised that until RHA could generate its own income it would be dependent on bank overdraft facilities and on HC loan finance. Many of these early patterns were common to other CBHAs such as Govanhill, Elderspark, Partick and Queens Cross.

To illustrate the distinctive characteristics of RHA in the early stages it is necessary to take account of significant personalities and the backgrounds and intentions of early members, which influenced their frame of reference and approach. For example, an important influence on RHA's Committee has been the strong personality and notably active commitment of the Chairman. In fact, prior to his involvement with RHA, he and his family had considered moving to a New Town to ease overcrowding at home. However, the pulls of work and of his extended family encouraged his involvement in promoting the local association, and his decision to remain in the area.

A different characteristic of RHA's early Committee (1975 to 1977) was that some participants held a markedly sceptical attitude towards government bodies. This scepticism stemmed from participants' past experience of planners and politicians. Although no Committee members had had prior experience of local politics, several individuals had gained experience in speaking at public meetings in the presence of officials and politicians and participants had developed confidence

during the period in which they lobbied government agencies to expedite the formation of their local association. Scepticism and wariness were demonstrated by instances where the Committee delayed agreement with the "authorities", until they were fully aware of the implications of action. For example, in October 1975 the Committee delayed signing a Deed of Agreement between RHA and the HC (The Standard Deed of Variation of Conditions) until further discussion of its content, and this considered approach was encouraged by the community worker. In general, the approach of RHA's representatives in the early stages was perceived as more outspoken and more aggressive than that of other young CBHAs. (12)

RHA's first staff member therefore entered an association run by a Committee which involved a mix of strong personalities, which was led by a strong committed Chairman and whose participants stressed the idea of 'local control' mediated through the Management Committee. By February 1976 the Committee's emphasis on resident control of the housing association was communicated through the local newspaper, as follows:

The success of the whole project depends directly on the residents of Reidvale. The housing association has been set up in such a way as to allow you to participate in the management and policy-making. It is up to you to become involved and to help the project to be successful. (13)

A long-standing Committee member commented in interview:

We were told at the start, by the Housing Corporation, that this is 'our' association and that we are in control. Perhaps we were naive in the way we understood the situation. Quite honestly it was impossible to grasp exactly what we were getting into. (14)

Also, RHA's Chairman commented in an interview for Voluntary Housing:

'When we started all this talk of millions of pounds frightened everyone'. (15) Such comments are suggestive of the unreal character of events which have faced all young CBHA Committees. For example, RHA's Committee was asked by the HC to 'name a figure' which would meet the cost of rehabilitating the area. Someone hit on the sum of £20 million. One of RHA's original Committee members commented in interview: 'The sum seemed ridiculous then ... Looking back we were really thrown in at the deep end'. (16)

1.b. The official as catalyst

Reidvale's first Development Officer (DO) was selected because of his prior housing association experience in Liverpool and because of his apparent commitment to working within a locally-based and locally-controlled housing association. His earlier involvement in a large, traditional, charitable association, which owned 6,000 houses and employed around 200 staff by 1975, had led him to view it as:

... too large, bureaucratic and unaccountable to tenants. Basically at that time I was disillusioned with its scale, with the lack of community involvement in its management and I questioned its accountability. However I now believe that CBHAs could learn considerably from the professionalism of conventional associations. (17)

After a year or so of working in a CBHA which was run by a lay Committee, RHA's first DO was ambivalent in his assessment of the organisational outcomes of CBHAs. On the one hand, he believed that if their participants had been informed at the start by HC officials about the extensive problems and complexities which faced them, then their enthusiasm might have been considerably less. On the other hand, he recognised that neither Housing Corporation officials, nor CBHA staff in Glasgow, recognised the complexities of housing association work and development in the early stages.⁽¹⁸⁾

In the early stages just as in other associations, RHA's Committee had problems in making decisions about staff appointments. Against the background of uncertainties about the pace of the improvement programme and the flow of income to RHA, it was inevitable that the Committee looked for advice from their professional staff and from HC officials. In the event this advice was at times contradictory and at times Committee members also held conflicting views about staffing priorities.

From the start a dominant objective supported by all RHA's participants was the realisation of an effective and fast rehabilitation programme. Out of the existing 1,500 houses in Reidvale, over 1,000 properties were assessed as suitable for improvement. Following discussions with HC officials, RHA's Committee assumed that the association could aim to improve 150 houses per year. There was therefore a general expectation that the rehabilitation programme could be completed in around seven years, by 1983. These assumptions

were also held by many other associations in the early stages. However, neither RHA's participants nor their advisers held a clear conception of realistic staffing levels required to meet these expectations.

Early in 1976 RHA's first DO argued a case for a team of six staff to establish the programme.⁽¹⁹⁾ The DO's approach emphasised that RHA required to "gear up" quickly to man the future programme in view of the poor structural condition of the housing stock. However, the staffing levels he proposed were higher than those deemed necessary by HC officials. In general RHA employed more staff than other CBHAs during its first three years - a pattern which we shall see influenced tensions in organisational relations. By January 1977 RHA employed seven officials - three DOs, two clerical/administrative staff, a Housing Manager and a Clerk of Works.

During its first year the Committee also discussed goals relating to the association's role as a local landlord. RHA's fast rate of acquisition from private landlords and owner-occupiers meant that the association soon became a major landlord in the area. The Committee was also committed to 'getting rid of the private factors' and soon after the first DO's arrival policy discussions were initiated on RHA's future role in providing housing management services.⁽²⁰⁾ In 1976, a Housing Management Sub-Committee was formed to investigate and make recommendations on policy to the Management Committee. In June and July 1976, the Association employed a second DO and a Housing Manager to service the sub-

committee and to develop RHA's housing management services. The Housing Manager knew the neighbourhood well being a resident of North Dennistoun and had previous practical experience of working in a factor's office in the city. In the Autumn of 1976 the association approved a Tenancy Agreement which specified the formal duties and obligations of RHA and its tenants and discussed the implications of bringing housing management "in house" - a pattern which clearly differed from GHA's early approach.⁽²¹⁾

1.c. Public accountability and internal tensions

Early in 1976 RHA's Committee had become concerned about cash flow problems to the extent of doubting whether the association could pay staff wages.⁽²²⁾ Just as in Elderpark HA in 1975, RHA's first DO offered to work without pay until the association was in a position to backdate his salary. In the Reidvale case, this experience led some Committee members to adopt a highly conservative approach to expenditure. Against this background the staffing policy favoured by RHA's first DO during 1976 and 1977 resulted in tensions and conflict both internal to RHA and between the Committee and the HC.

In Autumn 1976 at a stage when the Committee was deliberating on the phasing of the improvement programme on the basis of a staff survey of properties and of residents' preferences, the HC agreed to guarantee an extended overdraft to help the association cover its expenses. In September 1976 the DO proposed that RHA should employ more staff and presented a budget including these proposals to the

Committee. Over the two months during which the proposals were discussed, HC officials regularly attended Committee meetings. In their view RHA's Committee was being advised to expand its staffing complement at a pace which might result in severe cash flow problems for the association. The Committee, however, resolved to support the staffing policy document and agreed to advertise for 11 staff by March 1977.⁽²³⁾ Further, in October 1976, the Committee agreed to advertise for three more staff. On the request of a Committee member who disagreed with the decision, a senior official of the HC Glasgow office called a meeting with RHA's Committee and at this meeting the HC's criticisms of RHA's policy of staff expansion were categorically stated. As one Committee member who was present at the meeting remembers, the HC official argued that 'Reidvale Housing Association is not an employment agency'.⁽²⁴⁾

The DO responded directly to the HC's intervention. He stated pointedly in a letter to the HC:⁽²⁵⁾

The major difficulty is the fact that the Management Committee are becoming confused because they are receiving conflicting advice from their staff and from the Housing Corporation. The conclusion that I have come to is that I as Development Officer must be unintentionally misleading my Committee. You will appreciate that I cannot continue to give such misleading advice to my Committee. This will only strain the relationship between us all further. I therefore, request that you arrange a Retraining Programme for myself in which you can point out to me the errors that have been made.

The DO duly presented himself at the HC's office on 18 October 1976 in order to receive 'advice and direction'. He found, however, that HC officials had more important business to attend to than meeting his demand for 'retraining' that particular morning! (26)

Between March and April 1977, RHA was also criticised by HC officials over its policy on decant houses. Like most young CBHAs, RHA had insufficient empty properties in its ownership which were of adequate standard of repair and decoration to use for housing residents while their own houses were being improved. (27) Staff proposals in March recommended the improvement and repair of more than 30 houses, although the HC in January had set a limit on 30 decant houses. The HC Glasgow office was concerned that the DO's proposal did not appear to fund the building work to prepare decant houses from the allowances provided by SDD for this purpose. Once again the HC Glasgow office intervened and criticised RHA's approach. By this stage relations between the HC and certain RHA officials had become noticeably strained. (28)

By mid 1977 however, this pattern had changed. In May 1977 RHA's senior DO worked together with an accountant from the HC and produced a jointly agreed cash flow and budget statement. (29) As a result of these efforts the Committee was able to develop its staffing policies knowing that certain key aspects of its policies were understood and agreed by the HC. A further outcome was an improvement in relations between RHA and the HC. We shall see, however, that the Committee's major internal critic remained

particularly unconvinced about the proposed pattern of organisational growth at RHA; and that while certain tensions, which stemmed from RHA's accountability to central government, had been alleviated, there remained considerable tensions on the local accountability front.

1.d. RHA's early improvement programme, 1976 to 1977

RHA, in common with other CBHAs, experienced slow progress in getting the improvement programme off the ground. From the start RHA's Committee and staff had favoured a high standard of repair and improvement work - higher than had been emphasised by most other CBHAs. As a result RHA's scheme submissions to the HC involved costings which invariably exceeded cost limits, and therefore RHA's schemes were routinely subject to double scrutiny by the HC and by SDD.

RHA's first improvement contract went on site on 24 January 1977, a year after RHA employed its first official. This was a "single close" contract which included six houses and two shops. The contractors completed the work on site, efficiently and speedily, in approximately eight weeks. An official opening ceremony was held on the 4 April 1977, which was attended by local residents, representatives from other housing associations in the city, officials from the SDD, the HC and GDC, as well as by local politicians. (30)

The association was anxious to impress. It had been rumoured for some time that Scottish Office officials were doubtful as to the advantages of investing public monies in tenement rehabilitation. One such official had previously voiced the question as to whether people would still want to live in these buildings in the year 2000! Perhaps more significant was the comment by an HC official at Reidvale's "opening" which referred to the improved close as 'the most expensive scheme of tenement improvement in the city'.⁽³¹⁾

1.d.1. The issue of standards

RHA's emphasis on high standards of repair and renewal represented a further area of divergent expectations between RHA and the HC. The association's approach to building standards was, however, supported by RHA's architects. The architects employed by RHA on initial schemes were members of Assist. At Reidvale, Assist's role differed from the central role the practice had played in GHA's formative stage. RHA's DO advised his Committee that until the association had resolved a long-term policy on architectural servicing, it was appropriate to view Assist as the first of perhaps several architectural firms which might be employed by RHA in the future. Other options considered were whether to employ in-house architects (an option chosen by Elderspark Housing Association) or whether to set up a separate company employing architects to service the association's improvement programme.⁽³²⁾ Therefore, while Assist might have preferred greater involvement in the association's development, in 1976 they were provided the facility of working from the "show house"⁽³³⁾ in

the area, they were invited to attend Development Sub-Committee meetings to report on the progress of contracts, but otherwise operated in the Assist-style of emphasising resident consultation in design. They later became one of several architectural firms employed by RHA. A further important aspect of Assist's role in Reidvale was its involvement in coordinating the improvement of tenement back courts, frequently in partnership with the Residents' Association and Block Committees rather than with RHA. (34)

An important point about Assist's involvement in Reidvale's first contracts is that the Director of Assist (a Senior Lecturer at Strathclyde University) held similar aims about standards of repair, improvement and "finish" to those favoured by RHA's participants. The emphasis was on maximising items of renewal in contract specifications in order both to minimise future maintenance problems and to meet residents' design preferences. (35)

In April 1977 the HC called a meeting with the intention of persuading the association to reach agreement on cuts in future specifications. Items proposed for exclusion or modification ranged from alternative, cheaper materials for piping; reduction in the extent of window replacement; the exclusion of lowered pine ceilings; the reduction of insulation to close walls; exclusion of tiled splashbacks in bathrooms and the exclusion of the "spy holes" in entrance doors, which residents view as essential in Glasgow tenements. At the meeting the general point was made that, given the cost limit system, the choice lay between the alternatives of

improving very few houses to a high standard or improving more houses to a lower standard.

Reidvale's Committee stated their opposition to these cuts after a discussion in which representatives' fears were expressed regarding the likelihood of a gradual erosion in improvement standards.⁽³⁶⁾ However, after HC officials had visited the site of the next programmed improvement scheme, it was resolved that, apart from two items - timber line ceilings and fluorescent lights in the bathrooms - the other cuts in specification would not be enforced. In May 1977, Reidvale's committee resolved to write to the Chairman of other associations in the city, as well as to the Improvement Section of the local authority and to their local MP, in order to mobilise a solid front of local opposition to any future attempts to reduce standards.

It should be noted at this stage that, while I have shown RHA to be in harmony with their professional architectural consultants on the issue of improvement standards, on other points they diverged in approach. In particular, Assist architects would have preferred more flexibility in the approach of the association's staff and Committee towards individual residents' preferences. For example, in the early stages the Committee resolved to provide woodchip as wallcovering with a choice of colours offered to residents. Other associations (e.g. GHA) agreed to provide a choice of wallpaper. RHA's reasons here were primarily on grounds of future maintenance

(drying out problems after plastering). Later, however, the Committee resolved to increase tenants' choices whenever possible.⁽³⁷⁾

1.d.2. RHA's approach to owner-occupiers

Assist architects were also committed to providing an intensive advisory and professional service to owner-occupiers wishing to improve with the aid of loan and grant. RHA's members also intended that the association would coordinate improvement schemes for private owners, however in practice, different factors served to inhibit owner-occupier improvements in Reidvale. Key internal influences here were RHA's conflicting priorities about building standards and about the retention of owner-occupation, while an important external constraint was the level of grants to owner-occupiers.

For instance, RHA's building specification included a high cost repair element, which was closer to that favoured by associations like Elderpark HA than to the early standards pursued in Govanhill and Central Govan, where Assist architects had also been employed. Those working in the Reidvale area argued that such discrepancies partly reflected the poorer structural condition of many tenements in Reidvale, while we have seen that it also reflected concerns about RHA's future maintenance responsibilities. RHA's early approach also stressed that local owner-occupiers should be circulated with realistic information about the likely costs of rehabilitation of their houses. Information sheets for owner-occupiers presented costings which were based on the experience of other associations

and outlined loan and grant facilities. As a result there was growing concern amongst owner-occupiers about their ability to meet the costs of rehabilitation. This pattern was similar to that described by J Gower Davies' study of a voluntary improvement scheme initiated by Newcastle City Council. (38)

Recognising these concerns and faced by growing criticism amongst owner-occupiers, the association supported the establishment of an owner-occupiers' sub-committee early in 1976. Its remit was to examine the position of owner-occupiers in the context of rehabilitation costs and loan and grant facilities. This sub-committee was of short duration and folded in 1977. In general, there were some notable differences between RHA's and GHA's approaches to mixed ownership improvements in the early stages. While GHA's early Committee, which included mainly owner-occupiers, did not distinguish between multiply-owned tenements and those in the association's ownership in the phasing of improvement programme, RHA's participants concentrated first on improving tenements which had been acquired by the association. In the context of the higher standards of repair favoured by the association (and therefore higher costs), RHA's staff were more tentative in their approach to negotiating agreement with owner-occupiers. When information about probable costs was presented to owner-occupiers the vast majority of people resolved to sell to the association. (39)

It is interesting that owner-occupiers who were most committed to retaining ownership occupied the more spacious, attractive, and higher priced houses on Duke Street and Whitevale Street, the more imposing streets in the locality. As many houses in these streets had internal bathrooms, they were phased for improvement later in the association's rehabilitation programme. Given cost levels, therefore, many owner-occupiers felt pressured to sell by the association, although after improvement work there is no question that most former owner-occupiers who remained in the area were pleased with their "new" houses. (40)

The residents who valued owner-occupation were frequently young families and, for this group, selling to the association provided an incentive to move, ahead of plan, outwith the area. A different group, however, was that of a minority of elderly owner-occupiers who valued ownership of their unimproved property, even in some instances where their home was in chronically bad condition without an inside toilet, and positioned on the second or third landing of the tenement. One such owner-occupier pencilled a note to RHA in 1977 which stated: 'You are taking away from me the only thing of value that I possess'. On the other hand, many such elderly owner-occupiers believed that it was in their interest to sell to the association and to realise the value of their property, thus providing a means of a comfortably furnished improved house of which they had security of tenure during their remaining years. (41)

Against this background of owner-occupier perceptions of pressure to sell to RHA, it is not surprising that the association was a focus of residents' criticism. Frustration and criticism were, on the one hand, the outcome of individual values and preferences relating to the retention of property ownership and, on the other, the result of awareness of financial and technical constraints on doing so. These patterns were common to other CBHAs. We should remember, however, that CBHAs coordinate owner-occupier improvements on behalf of the local authority. In Glasgow the local authority has used its discretionary powers to maximise opportunities of access to central government grants. Clearly where associations pursue high standards of rehabilitation and where extensive structural work is necessary, cost levels are prohibitive to many working class owner-occupiers. In this context aggression and criticism are turned on the local CBHA and not on the central government agencies which determine grant levels. (42)

By July 1977, RHA owned 338 properties out of the 822 in its Project Areas and it had improved 24 flats. By this stage it was evident that the approach of significant individuals had served to influence relations between RHA and the HC. There was a marked awareness amongst RHA's participants of the limitations which government agencies could impose on RHA's activities. Also there was a general preparedness to fight on issues which were defined by participants as affecting the interests of RHA and of people and housing in the area. Whereas in Govanhill this type of commitment

to neighbourhood-based collective action had a longstanding historical tradition, in Reidvale this pattern had originated only in the early 1970s.

I shall now discuss a different aspect of RHA's early development, namely the evolving relationships between the local Committee and their paid officials.

l.e. Staff-Committee relations, 1976 to 1977

We have seen that RHA's first DO held a strong conception of the organisational growth necessary to meet RHA's aims of housing improvement and of property management. His proposals to Committee did not, however, meet with unconditional support amongst Committee members and there were two notable critics on RHA's Committee. First, the community worker disagreed with the DO's approach, believing that the Committee was under pressure to plan ahead in the abstract, after very limited experience in their policy-making role. The community worker also believed that his own critical role frequently served to confuse other Committee members. Owing to other work commitments he gradually reduced his involvement and eventually resigned from the Committee in 1976.

A second source of criticism was one very committed local resident who from the start had emphasised the idea of community control over CBHAs. He was also, however, concerned about the proper use of public monies and about the Committee's obligations to the public purse. Moreover, he was wary of professionals and their

persuasive power in relation to laymen. As a result, he consistently challenged both small and large items of association expenditure as well as different staff proposals. In general "Mr N." was concerned that RHA's Committee could easily become dependent on their professional staff, and he believed that, if the Committee was to retain control, members had to be wary of potential staff pressure for expansionism and for high salaries. (43)

Similar reservations were held by other members of RHA's Committee and we saw in Chapter Eight that this pattern was reflected in other CBHAs. We should remember that, in 1976, CBHA Committees had received no guidance regarding their future role as employers and that their main point of reference on employment matters was their own work experience. The outcome of these circumstances in Reidvale was consistent opposition to staff proposals for regrading and salary increases (Spring 1977) and for new appointments (1976-1977).

By April 1977 staff generally felt that the Committee lacked awareness and understanding of the CBHA work process and funding context, and of RHA's organisational specialisation, complexities and problems. The outcomes were staff frustrations and a distancing in relations between staff and Committee - a pattern we have seen elsewhere. Staff therefore resolved to initiate a programme of meetings aimed at explaining the work process and the details of individual jobs at RHA. In 1976 RHA's Committee had joined the Glasgow Federation of Housing Associations, the organisation representing Management Committees as employers. The Committee had nominated a

representative to this body and in Spring 1977 the Union branch, which only two out of Reidvale's seven staff members had joined at that time, was attempting to establish negotiations on pay and conditions with the Federation. While these negotiations proceeded slowly, the majority of staff at Reidvale preferred to negotiate directly with their employers. Predictably perhaps, localised negotiations were at times fraught and left individual staff members feeling disappointed regarding their rewards and recognition at work.⁽⁴⁴⁾ It is fair to say, however, that while one employee on the technical side left the association, primarily for this reason, the majority of employees during 1977 thrived on the challenges which were intrinsic to working in a fast developing and changing work situation and on the periods of chaos following the declaration of Action Areas or at the decanting stage of improvement schemes. At such times demarcation between work roles became insignificant and the work atmosphere was generally that of a team all pulling in the same direction - for example when the office had a continual stream of visits by local residents, architects and professionals, or when the finely tuned decanting arrangements which were dependent on the bureaucracies of Gas and Electricity Boards, as well as on removal firms, in practice did not go according to plan. While such events were common to CBHAs, especially in the early stages, at Reidvale it was not unusual for Committee members and staff to carry out certain tasks themselves, as for example in helping elderly residents with the dismantling of their homes.

Having discussed some of the early developments in staff-Committee relations, I shall now focus on the dynamics of RHA's local accountability; on the evolving relations between the association and local residents' interest groups, and on local perceptions of RHA.

1.f. RHA and the dynamics of local accountability, 1976 to 1977

1.f.1. Local perceptions of RHA

RHA's participants pursued their housing objectives in the context of previously established relations with other neighbourhood groups. We have seen in Chapter Ten that Reidvale Residents' Association had pressured government agencies to promote a locally-based housing association. Several of RHA's Committee members were active participants in the Residents' Association and had previously worked closely with Whitevale and Bluevale Tenants' Association, which represented council tenants living in two high-rise blocks over the railway line. All these associations were represented in the local Community Council.

From the start RHA's representatives were called to task at public meetings held by the Residents' Association. Questions were raised about the slow pace of the improvement programme and about disturbance to residents while contracts were on site. Also, we have seen that the pace of staff expansion was queried regularly by RHA's major internal critic who was also Chairman of Reidvale Residents' Association. At some of these meetings outsiders might

easily have assumed that RHA had come to be perceived as a mini-housing authority operating within the locality, indeed as an agency considerably distanced from the concerns of local residents.

However, in spite of RHA Committee members' change in status to that of local collective employers and housing developers, there is no doubt that RHA's key participants (both Committee and staff) were committed to wider neighbourhood concerns. As a result, RHA became increasingly intermeshed with other aspects of neighbourhood life. In general local people's perceptions of RHA's role were sometimes divergent or contradictory, and this has been reflected in inconsistencies and tensions between RHA's goals, residents' (clients') interests and preferences, and funding and bureaucratic constraints.

For example, in the phasing of improvements RHA controlled the distribution of opportunities of access to improved houses, so that some local people gained access to improved houses which met their needs and preferences before others. Also, we have seen that RHA's tenants gained access to improved housing before owner-occupiers and that some owner-occupiers felt pressured to sell by the circumstances of the improvement programme. Further, there is no question that the association's role and the constraints on the Committee were not fully understood by neighbourhood residents. This was so in spite of newsletters distributed to Action Area residents; in spite of a house to house survey and the personalised approach of the association's staff in the early stages; and in spite of attempts to explain

complexities of the administrative and funding context at Residents' Association meetings. As in other CBHA localities, RHA was regularly confused with the local authority and it was not infrequently regarded with suspicion as an agency which could not or would not meet local needs. (45)

I shall now give two examples of how circumstances and external controls interacted with the approach of RHA's participants and resulted in conflicting local attitudes to RHA in the early stages.

1.f.2. Two controversial decisions

During 1977, the local authority declared two blocks at the edge of the locality as an Action Area for Demolition, following a survey of the properties. There was no local opposition at the time, largely because of the extreme state of disrepair and structural decay of the blocks. RHA at that stage resolved that as the association required all the empty houses in its ownership for decanting purposes, RHA could not offer the possibility of rehousing within the area to the residents affected by demolition. Thus residents were faced with the options of council housing or of acquiring a house outwith the area. The Committee also took the view that they could not open a Waiting List as this might encourage unrealistic expectations for rehousing by RHA in the short-term. We have seen that Govanhill Housing Association took a different view when faced by similar circumstances. (46)

In effect, RHA's participants had no real control over events, and took a realistic stance on the issue. Against the background of concerns about the chronic state of disrepair of the block, and in the knowledge that new building might be one positive outcome for the neighbourhood, they made no attempt to fight for the retention of the block - an approach which might have gained more local support for the association. Also in 1978, when Annbank Street residents formed an Action Committee and requested RHA's support in a last ditch stand to save the block, RHA's representatives stated that they could not reasonably argue a case for saving the block. However the association suggested that if the local authority would agree to provide long-term decants for Annbank Street families then, at a later stage, RHA might be able to help. The local authority could not agree to this proposal and RHA therefore stated that it could offer no definite help to Annbank Street residents.

As a result, it was not uncommon to hear comments such as: 'Why can't they say, when houses are available, we'll do what we can? If you mention Annbank Street the shutter goes up'. Or 'The association didn't seem to want to try and fight the Annbank Street case'. Both officials and staff were tarred with the same brush. (47)

There were, however, similar incidents with different outcomes. For example, in 1977, one tenement in the midst of RHA's Project Area was declared a Dangerous Building by the Building Control Department of the Local Authority. Residents in that close were rehoused early in 1978 but the owner-occupiers, under existing legislation, had no

access to full compensation for their property. (48)

In this instance RHA's participants were committed to retaining the building for improvement on the grounds that its demolition would affect neighbouring tenements and would result in a large gap site in the midst of the area. The Local Authority conceded and the dangerous building was shored up and closed to await rehabilitation. Later, residents of the property in question were able to register on RHA's Waiting List, which RHA had opened following continuous requests by people for access to a housing queue.

These two examples illustrate the different ways in which local residents as Committee members have taken decisions, or been seen as party to decisions, which have adversely affected the interests of local people. In the course of such decision-making they have taken account of environmental circumstances outwith their control and evaluated the likely practical outcomes of different courses of action, knowing that in certain instances Committee decisions will be locally unpopular.

In the Annbank Street case, just as in the Govanhill case of demolition East of Cathcart Road, I would emphasise that the structural condition of the properties by the mid 1970s meant that rehabilitation was never a realistic option. Similarly young CBHAs have had too few empty properties to make sweeping offers of future rehousing for the residents displaced by demolition. While the local popularity of CBHAs might have been enhanced by statements committing

support to the residents affected by demolition it is perhaps remarkable that so much realism prevailed in practice.

As we saw in the Govanhill case study those who stay the pace as Committee members are well aware of the inevitability of local criticism and I have suggested that it is remarkable that so many Committee members remain committed for so long. In the Reidvale case, we shall see in a later section that the leadership qualities of RHA's Chairman, the time commitment and personal energies he has put into his involvement, and the sustained commitment of key officials, have over the longer-term been crucial in influencing the solidarity of RHA's Committee.

1.f.3. RHA's relations with other neighbourhood groups

A further emphasis in the approach of RHA's first DO was that the association's local role should in the longer term extend beyond its official housing objectives. In this respect his approach converged with that of all active Committee members in RHA.

In 1977 when the community worker left the area, Reidvale's Committee and staff worked with other groups, such as the Bluevale/Whitevale Tenants' Association, to ensure his replacement. Neighbourhood groups used RHA's officials as a resource to jointly submit an Urban Aid application, which had a successful outcome.

Regular informal discussions had in turn led to the recognition of common interests among the different local associations - the

Bluevale/Whitevale Tenants' Association, RHA, Assist, Reidvale Residents' Association (and later the Community Council). These groups resolved to find a suitable building which would provide a meeting place and social focus in the neighbourhood. During 1976 a disused factory was surveyed but it became evident that acquisition and conversion problems were likely to ensue. In 1977 it was discovered that a large Annexe to the Glasgow College of Building was shortly to be vacated. Pressure was put on the Strathclyde Regional Council to agree to lease the building for joint use by RHA and other community groups. A group of local doctors also approached RHA in 1977 regarding the possibility of leasing premises and were included in the list of prospective leaseholders. In 1978, the HC agreed to loan the funds necessary for office conversion. All that remained was to find the necessary funds for converting large rooms into halls for community use. These local groups formed a Neighbourhood Centre Committee which submitted applications for £40,000 of Urban Aid funds, to cover the costs of internal works to the building, and for Scottish Development Agency funding, for environmental works. These submissions were successful and the Community Council also received a grant from the Region (£5,000) to convert a large room in the building for its purposes. Prior to this work taking place, the large room was dismantled by volunteers and school children from the local Secondary School, under the supervision of a local contractor. (49)

Later in 1977, RHA gained approval for a Job Creation Project which was sponsored jointly by RHA and the Community Council. The Project employed a Survey/Liaison Officer, a secretary and two odd-job men. Out of this project evolved a play group, neighbourhood advice and support and a Community Industry scheme which concentrated on the neighbourhood centre, decorating pensioners' flats and helping elderly tenants during decanting. (50)

Thus RHA from an early stage worked in partnership with other community groups to generate improved social and environmental facilities in the locality. Participants were also interested in increasing local employment wherever possible. By 1980 the central position of the new offices and Neighbourhood Centre, together with signs of environmental improvement - a playground built on a gap site, the transformation of the backcourts and stonecleaning - all served to generate more sympathetic and favourable perceptions of the association, which coexisted with the more critical perceptions mentioned earlier. The establishment of RHA and the goal priorities of Committee and staff had therefore served to attract resources from a number of government agencies which were channeled towards different neighbourhood interests.

To illustrate how these developments affected local residents' perceptions I shall return to Mr N. - RHA's most outspoken critic in the locality who was committed to increasing local awareness of his concerns about RHA's organisational growth, 1976 - 1977. At

RHA's AGM in 1977 Mr N. had voiced his concerns to RHA's shareholders in the presence of invited pressmen from a Glasgow evening paper. (51) He subsequently resigned from the Committee and continued his role as local critic in his capacity as Chairman of Reidvale Residents' Association. At the same time he was a regular visitor at RHA and worked with the association on common issues.

RHA's Annual Report, 1979 - 1980, included an interview with Mr N. in which he stated his views on RHA. (52) I quote this interview at some length as it illustrates certain significant attitudes to RHA which were held by Mr N. and other community leaders in the area, such as the subsequent Chairman of the Residents' Association.

About 1975 the Community Worker Ashok Ohri, got the Residents' Association going. A sub-committee was formed to push to get Reidvale made a Housing Action Area. We thought that once it was an Action Area the District Council would do something about the houses. A number of things followed - the RRAG; Pensioners Club and so on. Then we started up the Housing Association.

I thought at that time that the local people could run the Association - maybe employing one or two professionals, but basically volunteers doing the day-to-day work. I realise now that that isn't practical, but I thought we would just apply for the money, then get the local tradesmen to carry out the work. I didn't think the work would be so extensive.

I got disillusioned with the Housing Association when I saw how the staff was going to grow. The locals would have very little control because of the size of the staff. I believe now that the whole system of finance and the concept of Housing Associations means that inevitably the Housing Association becomes part of the establishment.

I will say this I have always found all the staff at the Housing Association very helpful. Recently for example there was a fire around here, and the Housing Association did everything to provide alternative accommodation and get furniture for the people involved. The factors or the District Council wouldn't have done that. If the Housing Association could build on that sort of thing it would be an asset to the Association and the area.

These comments were followed by an expression of disappointment about the lack of active participation by local residents in public meetings regarding house and environmental improvement, including those held by the Residents' Association and the Community Council. Active participation in all these aspects of local developments has to this day been limited to a small proportion of local people in Reidvale.

Therefore, four years after RHA's formation even RHA's major local critics argued that the association's impact, in partnership with other community groups, had served to improve housing conditions and opportunities for participation in the locality; and that, despite the slower pace of house improvement than had been hoped for in the early stages, RHA offered the potential for a housing service more responsive to the interests and needs of local residents than other housing agencies. However right until his death in 1981 Mr N. maintained, together with the Chairman of the Residents' Association and certain other activists in local community politics, a strong belief that local monitoring of the association was essential to ensure that it remained responsive to local interests. In his words:

The community based groups (the Residents' Association and the Community Council) should work together in monitoring the Housing Association. At the same time we do want to maintain good communication and a friendly relationship with the Housing Association. (53)

This first section of the case study has illustrated similarities in the formative stage of the two associations. In both associations participants experienced a gap between their early expectations and the practical outcomes of the formation of their local association. In both associations organisational goals evolved through dialogue between participants and between the associations and other neighbourhood groups. In both associations the evolution of policies was influenced by external contingencies and events operating outwith their localities and by the actions of government agencies.

On the other hand, we have seen that there were also notable differences in the circumstances affecting the development of the associations. These included local housing conditions; the scale of the CBHA housing programmes; strategic choices, for example about housing standards and the approach to external agencies; and the housing interests and personalities of key participants. Major differences between the associations were reflected in their origins, in the scale of the area in which they operate and in the social diversity within their neighbourhoods. For example, while GHA was formed in a neighbourhood characterised by a long-standing tradition of locally-based collective action, this was not the case in Reidvale. Further, GHA's initially defined "planning zone" covered a widespread

area in geographical and housing terms. The housing on which GHA focused was intermingled with tenements with standard amenities; the locality was attractive to Glasgow people who favoured owner-occupation and it reflected diversity in the social status, and backgrounds of its residents. On the other hand, RHA's originally conceived planning zone was the smaller and more compact area of South Dennistoun, which was also much more homogeneous in social terms. I shall consider some of the outcomes of early developments and strategic choices in the following section in which I shall discuss the interplay of internal and external factors in influencing the evolution of RHA's goals.

Section Two : The evolution of RHA's goals, 1977 to 1983

RHA's official goals reflect those four categories of goals which I have characterised as common to CBHAs⁽⁵⁴⁾ and on which I concentrated in the GHA case study. RHA's Annual Report, 1977 stressed objectives relating to improving local housing conditions through the association's rehabilitation programme and new building; to efficient housing management; to resident participation and control; and finally to the efficiency of internal systems.⁽⁵⁵⁾

With respect of housing production, RHA was optimistically committed to a fast programme of area rehabilitation.

It is the aim of the housing association to complete these (800 plus) improvements at the rate of 200-300 houses a year; it may take a year for the association to build up to a programme of this size (which would mean at least two closes being started every month), but once this has been achieved it will only be a matter of a few years before the whole area is improved. (56)

The 1977 Report was also explicit about RHA's housing management objectives:

The housing association is not simply improving the houses in the area. It is devising a new system of managing them, and it is this function that will keep the association going long after the last tenement has been improved ... The housing association intends to bring back the idea of the local office, with better methods of rent collection and carrying out repairs. (57)

In relation to the association's role as landlord, RHA's early participants placed more emphasis on developing an efficient, responsive housing management service than on establishing an Allocations Policy, and this pattern clearly contrasts with GHA's early development. On the question of extending residents' participation in the association's affairs, the Annual Report stated:

The best way to speed up the work and ensure that it is done to your satisfaction is for you also to purchase a £1.00 share and come and help us run the association. This association is here for the people and will be run by the people. If we can make it a success then we will have ourselves to congratulate and we will have decent houses to live in for the next 30 years. If it is a failure then we will only have ourselves to blame. (58)

This quote from the Chairman's Report 1977 highlights participants' assumptions regarding local control over the association's development and achievements.

It is also important to remember that RHA placed emphasis on its social role within the locality. The 1977 Report referred to the 'Social Side of the Housing Association':

A lot has been said in this booklet about houses. The speedy improvement of houses is obviously a high priority for the association... . The management committee are aware that all work and no play would make Reidvale Housing Association a dull boy. The social aspect has unfortunately been neglected because of the pressure of work on Committee, but it is hoped that the Open Days held in early July will be the first of many social events, both formal and informal. (59)

Further, the 1978 Annual Report devoted six pages (one-fifth of the Report) to the association's involvement in several community projects.

We have seen that in practice Reidvale had devoted time and energies to such projects since early in 1977. It, therefore, would appear that the early interests of RHA's Chairman and most senior staff were reflected in RHA's operative goals of providing support and taking initiative on neighbourhood projects. By 1978, such operative goals had evolved into officially legitimised goals of the organisation.

In the remainder of Section Two I shall further explore the evolution of goals at RHA. I shall consider the development of goals

and outcomes in relation to the improvement of housing conditions in the locality; to the association's role as "landlord"; and to issues of organisational structure, internal relations and control.

2.a. The improvement of housing and the environment - RHA as a local housing developer

It is evident that the coordination of house and environmental improvement schemes was a significant priority emphasised by staff and Committee. We have also seen that RHA's participants and professional consultants pursued production goals which led to a dual emphasis on a speedy improvement programme and on a higher standard of improvement than was favoured by government funding and approvals agencies. As a result RHA experienced more regular delays in approval than other CBHAs with schemes not generally exceeding cost limits.

2.a.1. The approach to resident consultation and planning

Between 1977 and 1978, RHA's Committee resolved to expand its complement of Development staff to increase the pace of the house improvement programme, while ensuring the continuation of a personalised service to residents. Following the declaration of new Action Areas, the DOs conducted a house to house survey of residents. Whereas the majority of associations conducted this survey through the distribution of a questionnaire, RHA's approach involved personalised contact with residents. Through a time-consuming process (many visits had to be repeated) staff determined information regarding

house size, tenure, occupancy, age-structure of households and preferences regarding local authority or housing association rehousing. On these visits information sheets identifying alternatives open to owner-occupiers, the role of the association and scope for resident involvement were frequently discussed at some length with individual households. (60)

This initial survey was clearly intensive in terms of the use of staff time. Whilst it provided a general picture of housing and social characteristics within the Action Areas, at the stage of selecting specific closes for an improvement contract, further, more detailed information was required. The results of this second stage survey usually showed that many variables had changed.

Residents' preferences regarding rehousing; the composition of households and the pattern of ownership were often different from those shown in the original social survey. In fact, all CBHAs experience similar aspects of uncertainty in the coordination of improvements, with changes occurring right up to the stage at which residents are about to enter the improved houses.

RHA's social survey, however, did provide the initial basis for local planning. While the personalised "house to house" approach was time-consuming and did not provide definitive information, it did provide an important learning experience for DOs. Further, it helped in establishing contact between RHA's staff and local people, and it gave staff the opportunity to encourage residents to become involved. It was not uncommon that local residents visited RHA for

the first time to submit their £1 share, the day after the DO had arrived on their doorstep. By March 1977 RHA had 147 shareholders, by March 1978, there were 276 shareholders and by March 1983, there were 421 shareholders or members of the association.

The social survey influenced RHA's goals relating to housing mix. In 1977 the association took stock of the mix of house sizes and occupancy patterns in its Action Areas. The survey showed that, just as in other CBHA localities, overcrowding was prevalent in spite of the high proportion of elderly residents. In general there was a shortage of houses for families with children. In five tenement blocks which included a total of 796 houses, 8.4% of households consisted of more than five people, while only 7.8% of the houses had over four apartments (two to three bedrooms). Further, this imbalance was particularly marked in one tenement block.⁽⁶¹⁾

As a result, RHA's participants have attempted to include amalgamations wherever this has been feasible in rehabilitation contracts. We have seen that CBHAs faced rehabilitation cost limits which were weighted in favour of producing smaller houses in tenements (two to three apartments).⁽⁶²⁾ In general where associations have included a high proportion of amalgamations in rehabilitation schemes this has served to increase their building costs per housing unit; to result in scheme submissions to the Housing Corporation which exceed cost limits and therefore to effect delays in scheme approval. This was certainly the pattern which resulted from RHA's emphasis on enabling young and larger families to remain

in the area. The preference was to house larger, younger families at ground floor level where amalgamations were at times structurally impracticable. Also, as elderly residents have frequently preferred to be housed "one-up" to evade the fear of vandalism and breakins at the vulnerable ground floor level, RHA was prepared to press for amalgamations at second and third floor level.

Until 1980 RHA's amalgamations had combined housing units on the same landing. Since 1980, however, RHA has employed a different design solution to the problem of creating larger housing units in tenements, that of vertical rather than horizontal amalgamation - "maisonettes". The vertical integration solution has enabled a more flexible adaptation of the tenement structure and one which gets round the problem of small ground floor houses. Further, RHA's officials have argued that the maisonette approach is cost effective. By March 1984 six maisonettes had been completed and 14 maisonettes were on site, having been included as part of three different rehabilitation schemes.

In parallel with this new design emphasis since 1980 RHA has wherever possible favoured larger kitchens. In the early stages of the rehabilitation programme when many residents wanted to return to their existing homes after rehabilitation, CBHAs have faced structural and social constraints on extending house sizes. At the same time, the building of bathrooms has served to limit living space. In the medium-term, or latter stages of area rehabilitation, the movement of some residents establishes vacancies and thus enables

flexible design solutions. As in other areas RHA faced some criticism by tenants of improved houses in which kitchens were considered too small. Since 1979, therefore, wherever practicable, the policy has been to maximise the ratio of kitchen and living space to bed space in improved houses - an approach which has reinforced the pattern of RHA's scheme costs exceeding cost limits (indicative costs).⁽⁶³⁾ In general, RHA's experience has been common to CBHAs in Glasgow which have generally aimed at improving housing standards and catering for a variety of housing needs through rehabilitation and new building in tenement areas.

2.a.2. RHA's approach in coordinating rehabilitation for private owners

(a) Owner-occupier improvements

In the first section I emphasised certain differences between RHA and GHA in terms of their approaches to owner-occupiers. While both associations distributed information about loan and grant facilities accessible to owner-occupiers, the initial estimates of likely costs were higher at Reidvale than at Govanhill, largely due to a more extensive common repairs element. One outcome of these differences was that owner-occupiers in Reidvale sold their houses to their local association at a faster rate than in Govanhill.⁽⁶⁴⁾ Earlier I suggested that factors, such as local housing market patterns and the relationship of grant levels to tender prices have influenced people's commitment to retaining ownership. In CBHA

neighbourhoods the general pattern, despite rising grant levels, has been that only a small proportion of private owners have been prepared or able to bear loan costs, in the context of continuing inflation and employment insecurity during the 1970s and of increasing standards of common repair to tenements.⁽⁶⁵⁾

At any rate in Reidvale, prior to RHA's formation, out of the 1,114 tenement houses within RHA's future Action Areas (as declared by February 1978) 594 properties were owner-occupied while 520 were privately let (53% and 47% respectively). By January 1978, two years after RHA had begun its programme of acquisition, only 33% of properties remained in owner-occupation, and 46% of properties in Action Areas remained in the hands of private landlords. By January 1979, 22% of properties in RHA's Action Areas were in owner-occupation and 29% were privately landlord. Within three years RHA had become the major property owner in the area. Further, RHA owned 67% (747) of the 1,114 properties in the Action Areas by March 1979 and by March 1984 RHA owned 93.7% (1,044) properties.

To date, RHA has coordinated 14 improvements for other owners. In 1983 the association became involved in discussions with six owner-occupiers in one close who were all committed to retaining ownership. These owner-occupiers preferred to implement a repair scheme, rather than full-scale comprehensive improvements. Assist architects were commissioned to coordinate a backcourt improvement scheme and in 1984 Assist have been asked to act as the residents' agent and to

carry out a survey to assess the rot and structural condition of the close. In this instance the role of Assist is closer to their preferred approach of extensive resident participation. However, the outcomes of the survey may influence the capacity of the six residents to retain ownership.

I suggested earlier that many owner-occupiers were happy to sell to RHA, thus relieving themselves of financial responsibility for a home which was frequently in poor condition and providing scope for an improved house at no personal cost, or the opportunity to acquire outwith the area. However some owner-occupiers were aggrieved, and felt that the costs of improvement quoted after an architectural survey were unreasonably high. For these residents, the conditions of "choice" which they faced had little credibility, and were perceived as leaving them only with the option to sell.

(b) Commercial owners

Reidvale, in parallel with other associations, experienced difficulties in coordinating improvements in situations of mixed ownership. Contracts involving landlords, owner-occupiers and commercial properties have generally produced more uncertainties, management problems and delays, than contracts involving closes in association ownership. All associations coordinating owner-occupier improvements have found that owner-occupiers, even where they are committed to retaining ownership, require intensive consultation at regular intervals regarding the extent of internal works they are able to afford. The works specification is liable to change

throughout the pre-site work period and, not infrequently, owners will decide to sell to the association at the last minute when confronted with final costs. (66)

Negotiations with private landlords have proved similarly uncertain and in several instances the legal process of acquisition from absentee owners, or landlords, has proved fraught with difficulties in tracing either owners or the title deeds of properties. Further problems are experienced in negotiations with commercial properties where owners frequently resent having to share in the costs of common repairs and improvements to the close. Whereas RHA has tended to concentrate on properties where housing is in association ownership, other associations have approached their negotiations with private owners prepared to compromise with other interests. As a result by the early 1980s, RHA had improved a smaller proportion of properties in mixed ownership.

To some extent this pattern was influenced by RHA's initial emphasis on high standards of common repair and improvement which resulted in high cost levels. In the case of commercial properties, at RHA the general emphasis was on attempting to influence government agencies to provide loan and grant facilities for the small shop-keeper providing a local service. Therefore, in 1977 an approach was made to the Scottish Development Agency and RHA and SDA officials discussed the feasibility of SDA's involvement. Also, through involvement in the Glasgow Forum and representation on the Council of the Scottish Federation, RHA attempted to press for recognition

of the problem. By 1978, however, RHA had acquired several shops (14 out of the 103 shops in Action Areas) as a result of portfolio (multiple) acquisitions from landlords.

To illustrate RHA's experience in coordinating rehabilitation for private owners, I shall now discuss the progress of two schemes which were initiated in 1977, by RHA and how that experience influenced modification in RHA's approach. In 1977, the association began discussions with five shopowners, two dentists and six owner-occupiers who were affected by a scheme for the improvement of two closes on the main shopping street, Duke Street. By 1980 no agreement had been reached on the apportionment of common repair costs between RHA, the shops and the two dental practices, for whom decanting was also a problematic issue. It was resolved that the scheme should proceed by improving the houses as a first stage, leaving common works until negotiations were resolved. Full scale common works are now programmed for 1985/1986, as agreement appears likely on costs, and on the future location and disturbance payments to the dentists concerned.

In a contract programmed in one of the side streets, RHA resolved to reach agreement with commercial properties through independent arbitration. It was hoped that resolution in this case would set a precedent and provide a more systematic basis for approaching improvements on the main shopping street.

This cumulative experience led RHA to argue that:

In the absence of further legislation to change the position of commercial premises within Action Areas, extensive negotiation and arbitration will be necessary in most properties affected by commercial premises. (67)

In fact, RHA has not taken up the arbitration option, although the association took 12 shopkeepers to court prior to the new conditions of grant and loan funding which were established in 1982. RHA's representatives were active in the lobbying which preceded this change in policy. Like other CBHAs, RHA argued that the tenement deed of conditions was an unrealistic basis for apportioning common repair costs to commercial owners and that other criteria such as floor area and usage of tenement amenities provided a more realistic basis for allocating common costs.⁽⁶⁸⁾ Access to grants for commercial owners has helped RHA in negotiating agreements with commercial interests, as has the fact of RHA's majority ownership of most tenements in Reidvale.

By March 1984, RHA had improved 32 commercial properties (nine of which were owned by RHA) and there was marked evidence of work on site on the main shopping street. In general RHA's strategies in coordinating the improvement of commercial properties had evolved out of the association's early difficulties in administering such schemes. This experience had led to the awareness amongst key participants that schemes affecting commercial properties require a strategic, professional and flexible approach to private owners whose economic interests may be variably affected and whose responses to

association proposals cannot be gauged with any certainty. Secondly, in common with other CBHAs, RHA's approach was affected by the absence of any central government commitment to establish a more enabling legislative framework for area-based comprehensive rehabilitation.

Having discussed RHA's approach to the multiple ownership of tenements and to the varied private interests affected by the association's goals of comprehensive tenement rehabilitation, I shall now concentrate on other factors which produced delays and uncertainties and which affected RHA's goal achievement.

2.a.3. Uncertainties and delays

In Part Three of the thesis I have argued that the process of tenemental rehabilitation by CBHAs is inherently uncertain, due to the changing technology of building; to wider economic and political factors which have influenced both contractors' pricing and levels of grant which affect private interests. Further in Chapters Ten and Eleven we have seen how neighbourhood interest groups have attempted to exert influence on the process of rehabilitation and how there are variations between localities, and between streets and tenements within them, in terms of the structural problems which CBHA rehabilitation must tackle. Finally, in Chapters Six and Seven we saw that the production goals of housing associations and their outcomes have been significantly constrained by the policies of state agencies and their methods of ensuring the public accountability of associations. In the following parts of this section I shall explore

these various influences as they have affected RHA's rehabilitation programme.

We saw in the first section that RHA's early participants were committed to an efficient and speedy programme of tenement rehabilitation in Reidvale. However, like other CBHAs, RHA's programme was influenced by uncertainties and external constraints which stemmed from technical difficulties and structural problems encountered in its building schemes, and from differences in the approach, capacity and performance of the architectural firms and building contractors which the association employed. The progress of RHA's improvement programme was also adversely affected by delays experienced in the processing of scheme approvals by the HC and by the SDD.

During 1978 delays affecting scheme approval had become a common focus of concern of CBHAs in Glasgow. However, as early as 1977 RHA's participants were frustrated over such delays in approval and at times delays had been exacerbated by the association's insistence on retaining standards which were disputed by government agencies. It had become common practice for Committee members to accompany their officials on visits to the HC Glasgow office for the purpose of negotiating on contract specifications. When this was not possible, staff were able to state with certainty to HC officials that 'my Committee will not accept these cuts in specification'. This experience stimulated RHA's participants to engage in lobbying and to press for collective action by Glasgow associations. (69)

The major concern was that RHA's improvement programme was proceeding far more slowly than the Committee and local residents had believed possible. By late 1977/early 1978 tender prices throughout the city were in excess of cost limits. As a result, scheme submissions, in some volume, were referred by the HC to the SDD for approval. There was a general concern that the length of time involved in approval could only be the result of an unpreparedness within the relevant section of SDD for its role in the approvals process. In Autumn 1977, Reidvale's Chairman had approached associations throughout Glasgow to encourage support for collective action on the issue of delays. This meeting resulted in recognition of common problems and in the establishment of the West of Scotland Forum of housing associations.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Committee members, with their Senior Development Officer, initiated meetings to inform the local MP and Councillors at District and Regional level of their concerns and these politicians agreed to raise the question of delays in approval at a political level. A meeting was also held with Scottish Office officials who accepted that delays were inconveniencing the association, but believed it was unlikely that the "backlog" could be cleared immediately.⁽⁷¹⁾

During this phase of external lobbying, the Reidvale Residents' Association held a meeting at which RHA's officials and Chairman were asked to account for the slow pace of improvements in the area. RHA distributed a newsletter explaining the complexities of the process of coordinating improvements and the stages in the approvals process

at which delays were being experienced. This was evidence of the fact that strong leadership of the Residents' Association served continually to remind RHA of its local accountability.

In the newsletter⁽⁷²⁾ the association explained that delays were not only being experienced in the process of scheme approval, but also that there had been some delay in receiving the project approval which would allow RHA to coordinate improvement work in other street blocks. Residents were also informed that two blocks of properties at the edge of the Reidvale area had been refused project approval by SDD and were therefore likely to be zoned for demolition. In this situation RHA saw its major contribution as ensuring that residents received maximum compensation at the point of rehousing.

Local debate over the causes of delays and the slow pace of the area rehabilitation programme led to further campaigning. One resident wrote personally to the Permanent Under Secretary of State: 'I am sure if you were to see for yourself how stagnant this situation is you would realise that we have just cause for our grievances.' This was followed by a request for help, 'for myself and the rest of the community of Reidvale'.⁽⁷³⁾ Representation was made to the SDD by the Chairman of Reidvale Residents' Association and a petition, which was supported jointly by the North Camlachie Community Council, Reidvale Residents' Association, RHA and District and Regional Councillors, was sent to the Under Secretary of State for Scotland at the Scottish Office. The letter accompanying the petition from

the Chairman of the Community Council raised questions regarding the delays in project approval for two blocks in the area, and pointed to 'long delays occurring at tender stage due to Housing Corporation and Scottish Development Department procedures'. Further, it was stated that:

The Housing Association has evolved standards which are considered suitable by the local community. Any move to further reduce these standards would bring into question the validity of carrying out further rehabilitation as the standards would no longer be acceptable to local people. (74)

In response to these approaches the Residents' Association was assured that the then Labour Government had 'no intention of cutting back or cancelling the programme of tenemental rehabilitation in Glasgow',⁽⁷⁵⁾ and that any delays were the outcome of the responsibilities of SDD and the HC for ensuring on behalf of the taxpayer that work is done economically and public money spent to good effect: 'I can assure you that any such necessary delay will be reduced to the minimum consistent with a proper assessment of the need for the project, its cost and its viability.'

In the Scottish Office's response to the Community Council's letter there was the implied criticism that a major factor in any delays was the high costs of some schemes submitted by Reidvale Housing Association.

The cost estimates by the Reidvale Housing Association for Blocks D and E are very much in excess of those for which an owner-occupier could expect to receive house improvement grant, and also in excess of costs which were recently approved in respect of other Reidvale proposals. ... The savings obtained in the case of (two recent contracts), seem to establish that there is scope for a modified approach Prudent and economical rehabilitation projects will not suffer serious delay. (76)

By Spring 1978, several other associations in the city were experiencing similar delays in obtaining scheme approval. Even those associations which had consistently made efforts to maintain costings as near to the level of cost limits as possible were discovering that contractors' estimates were rising continually, thus making it increasingly likely that their schemes would be subject to delays caused by dual scrutiny at HC and SDD. In Chapters Six and Seven we have seen the development of city-wide campaigning by CBHAs and their increasing participation in the national representative body of housing associations, the SFHA. It is perhaps not surprising, against the background of early developments, that key participants in RHA have been active in Glasgow and in the SFHA on all lobbying and campaigning fronts, and in 1983 RHA's Chairman, a Committee member and RHA's Senior Officer were all members of the SFHA Council.

To return to the question of RHA's approach to standards, it should be pointed out that RHA's participants were well aware that the association's approach to standards had been more uncompromising than was characteristic of other associations in the city. As one Committee member commented after a meeting where certain concessions

on standards were under debate:

You heard me shouting at the last meeting. I feel we mustn't give at all on standards. Once we do that we might as well give up. It would be like entering a bottomless pit. (77)

Despite this emphasis, three factors led staff and Committee to be more prepared to discuss certain minimum modifications where costs were well in excess of cost limits. First, the pace of improvement in the early stages had progressed at a somewhat slower rate than in other areas. Reidvale celebrated the improvement of its "100th house" in May 1979 and by December 1980, the association had improved 347 houses (297 after amalgamations). Secondly, these delays inevitably affected the association's accumulated income from development sources (SDD acquisition and improvement allowances and GDC owner-occupier coordination fees). In 1979 and 1980 there was a shortfall on RHA's budgeted income from development and staff explained its causes to Committee in terms of structural problems; the poor performance of one building firm; negotiations with owner-occupiers and the HC; delays in approval; and very high tender prices. Also all such delays had a cumulative effect on reducing the pace of the programme by tying up decant houses. Thirdly, HC officials in 1979 had warned all associations in the city to monitor the work of their consultants (architects and quantity surveyors) to ensure that cost submissions to the HC did not include overbilling as a result of either incompetence or intent. RHA's DOs were concerned about the performance of a firm of consultants in

this respect and therefore recognised that alongside the association's concern with maintaining its standards, it was also important to increase supervision of contracts on site and of the work of professional consultants. Clearly any such professional incompetence would serve to reduce the credibility of RHA's arguments about standards. (78)

Therefore during a period of rising tender prices the association learnt more about bargaining and compromise on standards. For example, in August 1979 the Development Sub Committee was informed that the HC had requested DOs to agree to £12,000 worth of cuts in two contracts which were 62% above cost limits. The DOs argued that by agreeing to reductions such as "all electric" houses, baths rather than showers, costs could be reduced to 32% over cost limits - in a scheme which involved extensive common repairs and a high proportion of amalgamations. They argued that no compromises would mean that the period of Tender Expiry would be exceeded and that there would be a requirement to retender. It would also mean perhaps extensive further delays in a contract which affected residents inhabiting the only two closes in Reidvale which had shared toilets, who had been initially approached about the improvement of their closes in Autumn 1977.

Whilst eventually accepting that this situation might require compromise, the Sub Committee discussed the possible implications of the newly appointed Conservative Government for the standards and pace of the improvement programme. After lengthy discussion the Sub

Committee reaffirmed its earlier position that RHA's policy was to retain a minimum standard of improvement and repair, placing emphasis on the implications for future maintenance. It was resolved that, if "cuts" in close insulation and repair were required by the HC, then the full Committee should discuss the issue and a public meeting be called in the area. The general feeling was that RHA's Committee as local landlord should not be prepared to take the same rents from tenants while providing different levels of standards. 'We can't ask the same rents for second rate houses.'⁽⁷⁹⁾ In the event, however, the association was able to provide both baths and showers; gas and electric fires and to carry out amalgamations.

By 1980, RHA's experience reflected that of other CBHAs. Savings were generally required on Housing Corporation initiative prior to contracts going on site.⁽⁸⁰⁾ However, in general the savings required were unpredictable in terms of the extent to which schemes related to cost limits at early stages of submission. At times RHA's officials felt that the conduct of scheme approval varied considerably at Housing Corporation level depending on the approach of new entrants to the Housing Corporation's technical section! The new approvals procedures instituted by the Housing Corporation in Autumn 1980 recognised that the significant stage in the scheme costing process was after tender prices had been established with the builder selected to do the contract. Previously the HC had pressured for cuts in the specification at the stage of design submission, as well as at the post-tender stage. Despite reservations

about the change in the approvals process, we have seen that most CBHAs found that the new system was better fitted to the actual process of developing a contract than the six stage system which operated previously. If the issue of resources heightened by the moratorium (November 1980) had not established new uncertainties (economic and political) associations might have entered a more stable phase in the improvement programme - in the context of a more systematic, understandable and therefore less fraught process of bureaucratic approval.

As well as these financial and bureaucratic constraints on rehabilitation, the progress of schemes was affected by technical uncertainties and problems. For example in 1978, after a six close contract had started on site, it became apparent that the stonework of the back wall of two closes was in such poor condition that the wall was unstable. Association staff and consultants, therefore, had to request HC and SDD approval for a revised specification which included the rebuilding of the back wall.⁽⁸¹⁾ There were other such instances, for example when contractors on site discovered more extensive dry rot at ground floor level than had been identified at the stage of architectural survey. We have seen that this experience was a regular aspect of the CBHA rehabilitation process. However, RHA has never faced the major technological uncertainties associated with past undermining, which influenced GHA's progress, and the progress of other CBHAs like Tollcross, Parkhead and Queens Cross. In general any such technological uncertainties established

a key role for the association's officials in negotiating a speedy resolution with external consultants and government officials in relation to circumstances which at times had no precedent.

The outcome of cumulative experience on several fronts was significant in these aspects. First, from 1978 onwards there was a growing realism at RHA. This evolved from continual reassessments, on the one hand, of the administrative requirements of coordinating and monitoring improvements and, on the other, of the effectiveness of RHA's building specifications in relation to both residents' satisfaction and implications for future maintenance. Three years after establishment there was considerable recognition within RHA that delays experienced in the process of approvals operated in parallel with other factors, such as technical uncertainties and problems on site, the inadequate performance of consultants and builders, in affecting the projected time scale of rehabilitation.

Since 1980, RHA's rehabilitation progress has been significantly affected by funding constraints. In the year 1981 to 1982, the year of the moratorium, RHA improved less than one third (57 properties) of the number of properties improved the previous year (182). However, in spite of concerns about funding, RHA's annual cash allocation was sufficient to enable the association to steadily increase the pace of rehabilitation between 1982 and 1984. In the year preceding March 1983, RHA improved 140 units and in the year until 31 March 1984, RHA improved 206 units. In both these years RHA exceeded the cash planning target approved by the Housing Corporation (£2.4 million in

1982 to 1983 and £2.85 million in 1983 to 1984). RHA's capital expenditure was £3.26 million in the year 1982 to 1983 and £3.44 million in the year 1983 to 1984. In these years RHA's performance has demonstrated the cumulative outcomes of planning and consolidation of expertise. Further, the association was able to spend so much partly because other CBHAs in the West for different reasons, such as technical problems and acquisition delays, had been unable to meet their cash planning targets.⁽⁸²⁾

RHA's recent progress has also been reflected in its cash flow and budget circumstances. For example, as a consequence of delays in general, prior to 1982, RHA experienced a regular shortfall in its projected income from development sources. However between 1982 and 1984 RHA had begun to realise a regular surplus from its development activities.

In summary, then, in the early stages RHA's pace of improvement was slower than had been intended by RHA's participants and in comparison with some other associations (such as Elderpark, Govanhill, Queens Cross and Govan). However the programme has speeded up remarkably since 1980. Further, it is generally recognised that improvement standards throughout the area have been consistently high. Post improvement surveys⁽⁸³⁾ have shown that, as in Govanhill, residents of improved closes are generally satisfied, both with the approach by officials and with their "new" house.

In this section I have emphasised several facets of RHA's approach to its local role in coordinating rehabilitation. We have seen that RHA's operative goals have been characterised by a marked emphasis on standards and by the extensive involvement of RHA's Committee in influencing standards and in their monitoring. It is interesting that on RHA's Development Sub Committee several long-standing members have had some work experience in the building trade and this Sub Committee has therefore been a male preserve. However, in 1979 following the experience of being decanted, it was a group of women who formed a Decants Sub Committee to monitor the standard of decant houses offered to residents. This Committee served as a pressure group and having exerted considerable influence, it folded in 1980.

A further characteristic has been RHA's commitment to providing larger housing units within tenements and in this respect, just as on standards and on the commitment to new building and area renewal, there has been a growing "leveling" of practices amongst Glasgow's CBHAs. A further pattern is that several CBHAs have attempted innovative design solutions in tenements. For example we have seen that both RHA and GHA have promoted schemes including Maisonettes, or two storey houses, within a tenement. As well as these innovations, like some other "younger" CBHAs, RHA had included central heating and door entry systems in some of its rehabilitation schemes by 1984. Also by March 1984 RHA had provided 77 amenity flats for the elderly, comprising almost one eighth of the improved housing stock. (84)

RHA's progress on the improvement front clearly mirrors the tensions resulting from the association's dual accountability - to local residents and to government agencies. In the following section we shall see that RHA's local accountability has operated alongside other influences, such as the policies of state agencies and the association's goals, in affecting the shape of RHA's rehabilitation programme.

2.a.4. Local accountability and the shape of the improvement programme

I have argued earlier that CBHA improvement programmes have been influenced by the intentions of government agencies; by the views of HC officials about the viability of different sizes of associations and by government funding of rehabilitation.⁽⁸⁵⁾ However they have also been influenced by Management Committee policies and strategic decisions which at times have been constrained by the interests and stated preferences of neighbourhood groups.⁽⁸⁶⁾ We have seen how the dynamics of local accountability influenced the development of GHA's rehabilitation programme and in this section I shall illustrate how local pressure served to influence the shape of RHA's programme following 1978.

From the start the Committee had expected that in the longer term RHA's area of operation would cover over 1,000 properties to the South of Duke Street (South Dennistoun). However, early in 1977 Dennistoun residents had become aware of local authority planning

proposals for improvement of sub-tolerable tenement properties at the far North end of Dennistoun. Residents from those blocks approached RHA early in 1977 asking whether the association would be co-ordinating rehabilitation work in the Milnbank area.

Within RHA the Committee took the view that wherever possible it should provide support, advice and information to residents in the North who were confused by the circulation of draft Action Area proposals by the local authority, and who were totally unsure as to the role of government agencies. One view amongst Senior Staff at that time was that RHA should initiate the formation of a housing association to service the improvement programme for Dennistoun as a whole. RHA's senior DO argued that such a development would result in a more viable and efficient locally-based housing association. However he emphasised that devolved area representation would be essential. Some residents who visited the association from the Milnbank area also suggested that RHA was the most appropriate agency to coordinate improvements.

Housing Corporation officials, on the other hand, did not suggest to RHA's Committee that they might become involved in the Milnbank area. The HC and the local authority favoured the formation of a separate CBHA in North Dennistoun. In the absence of any local community group pressing for the improvement of housing in the North the HC, in partnership with GDC, called a public meeting of residents in the proposed Action Area and the Steering Group for Milnbank Housing Association was formed at this meeting. As a result there

are at present two discrete locally-based associations in Dennistoun.

It is interesting that in certain instances, between 1976 and 1978 the HC Glasgow office encouraged residents' groups from two neighbouring localities to merge in forming a single housing association. For example, Bridgeton and Dalmarnock in the East End operate as a single housing association with two offices and sub-committees. The same is true for Whiteinch and Scotstoun and for Springburn and Possilpark.⁽⁸⁷⁾ In the latter cases, while the Housing Corporation influenced structures on new grounds of viability and efficiency the residents themselves in certain instances would have preferred separate organisations.⁽⁸⁸⁾ Similarly in the case of the Dennistoun housing associations, while RHA's members and GDC and HC officials held views on the appropriate organisational strategy for tackling housing obsolescence in the Milnbank area, the relevant issues and options were not presented for open debate. As I argued in Part Three of the thesis in the last resort it was the government agencies which had the power to determine the scope of CBHA operations.

In the Autumn of 1978, by which time the HC had become less concerned about "expansionism" at RHA, the interests of RHA's Committee and of local residents had converged into a mutual emphasis on completing the local programme of house improvement in Reidvale. There was a further block of housing in the North East of Dennistoun, which had been initially surveyed along with properties in Reidvale by the local authority as a potential Action Area.⁽⁸⁹⁾ The HC in August 1978 asked RHA's Committee to consider

whether it would assume responsibility for coordinating improvements at Cardross Street.

The rumour network ensured that Reidvale Residents' Association soon became aware of the impending policy decision. Active participants in the Residents' Association held the view that RHA's first responsibility was to ensure the improvement of housing within Reidvale. The Residents' Association's Chairman requested that the Committee receive a deputation, prior to making a decision. In the event, Residents' Association delegates expressed 'grave concern' that Cardross Street might be improved before parts of Reidvale. Staff presented the case that with a new staff structure and the additional finance available, RHA would be able to coordinate improvements in the new area, while continuing with the programme in Reidvale. The Management Committee, however, resolved not to take on the responsibility for Cardross Street in the light of the strength of local feelings against doing so.⁽⁹⁰⁾ Following this decision the Milnbank Housing Association agreed to act as the agents responsible for coordinating improvements in that area. In this instance, therefore, local accountability relations served as the major influence on Committee policy-making on the question of extending RHA's area of operation. However in the preceding case of the Milnbank Street programme, key influences were first, Housing Corporation policy and, secondly, the absence of any agreement amongst RHA's participants about expanding the programme at a stage in RHA's development when the building programme was only then getting off

the ground. These factors together ensured that RHA's potential involvement in Milnbank never became an issue for open debate in Reidvale.

Prior to the formation of Milnbank HA it therefore appeared likely that local residents would have been open to the idea of RHA's involvement in their area. A significant factor in both cases was therefore the strength of residents' perception of Reidvale (South Dennistoun) as the neighbourhood to which RHA is accountable. This pattern might have suggested the parochialism of the association, except that several of RHA's participants have become so active on wider fronts.

To conclude this section on RHA's improvement programme I shall briefly describe its progress between 1977 and 1983. By March 1977, 15 months after registration, RHA owned 350 of the 463 houses in its Action Areas and RHA had not completed any improvement schemes. By March 1979, of the 1,114 units in its Action Areas, RHA owned 747 properties and had completed rehabilitation work to 103 units. By March 1981, of these 1,114 units RHA had completed 342 improvements and owned 929 properties. Also by March 1981 RHA had completed improvement schemes for seven private owners.

It has been since 1981 that RHA's programme has really taken off. By March 1984 RHA had rehabilitated 745 properties of which 14 had been improved for other house owners. Also, between 1976 and 1983 RHA's capital expenditure has increased from £0.01 in 1976, to

its first peak of £1.92 millions in 1979/1980 and to £3.44 millions in 1983/84.⁽⁹¹⁾ At the present time (January 1984) it is assumed that RHA's rehabilitation programme will be completed in 1987, leaving RHA on the development side to realise its plans for new building and environmental improvements.⁽⁹²⁾

I have stated earlier that since 1980 RHA's improvement programme has been significantly curtailed by inadequate cash resources. Yet on the other hand we have just seen that it has only been since 1980 that RHA has sustained a significant, steady rehabilitation output which particularly since 1982 has confronted tenements in multiple ownership. How can we explain this growing output which has characterised the development of several of Glasgow's older CBHAs, despite the Thatcher Government's increasing control over public expenditure? The essential reason is that CBHAs like RHA have been able to capitalise since 1980 on the basis of their accumulated expertise and local planning. There is no question that professional consultants and builders have accumulated expertise which has benefited CBHAs. Also, CBHAs have been able to draw on an expanding stock of improvement schemes which development staff had initiated in previous years, but which had been held in abeyance due to tenure problems or residents' housing preferences, since resolved, or which were at initial stages of the approvals process. The problem for older associations like RHA and GHA is that, given the expanding number of associations, the current level of allocation means that they cannot realise the rate of production that they had both planned for and geared up to in the early stages. As a result

at times they have faced criticism by local residents of the pace of the improvement programme, about the inconveniences to households and about unimproved properties which have been left vacant awaiting rehabilitation - these properties being a target for vandalism, and a regular focus of concern by tenants of neighbouring flats. (93)

In general the development of RHA's improvement programme has been influenced by similar types of uncertainties and constraints to those which affected GHA's improvement programme. The influences included technological factors, such as unforeseen structural problems; aspects of the local housing market and of private housing investment; the approach of commercial interests affected by the rehabilitation programme; the demands and pressures of neighbourhood groups; and wider political and economic developments. However we have seen that the goals and interests pursued by association participants and their response to contingencies and constraints, have also significantly affected the evolution and outcomes of the rehabilitation programme.

There remains one final aspect of RHA's role as a local housing developer which I shall consider here. We have seen that since 1977 RHA's participants have not simply pursued goals of rehabilitating the sub-tolerable property in the area. The association has expressed interest more generally in operating as a locally-based area renewal agency in partnership with other agencies (community groups, other housing associations and government agencies). The neighbourhood centre involvement can be seen as one outcome of this commitment. A further outcome has been RHA's attempts to develop gap site new

build schemes. (94)

2.a.5. New building, planning and progress

A minority of CBHAs like GHA and Elderpark had completed new build developments by 1983. RHA became interested in developing new housing on vacant sites zoned for demolition in 1978. Since that time RHA's officials have submitted plans for a new build development to include sheltered housing for the elderly and general family housing in 'a good quality housing environment which complements the tenement rehabilitation and meets the existing and projected housing need'. RHA submitted Outline Planning applications to develop the site in two phases in 1978 and 1982.

Prior to 1981, RHA's negotiations with local authority officials (Planning, Town Clerks and Roads Departments), were affected by the fact that the Planning Department was preparing the Local Plan for the area. However, once the Local Plan had been formally adopted, RHA was recognised as the likely developer of the site for predominantly housing purposes. Having reached a broad agreement with the Planning Department over the style of development, RHA in May 1982 explored the possibility of partnership funding with commercial developers of a mixed retail and housing development. By this stage the limited funds available to the Housing Corporation, and the priority placed on the rehabilitation of sub-tolerable housing, meant that RHA could not act speedily as sole developer. However uncertainties about time scale led to no certainty of interest by the private developers.

Until RHA owned the site it was unable to gain access to loan finance for consultants' fees and therefore the association could not commission consultants to prepare a detailed design submission. Ownership of the Phase One site was finally realised in October 1983 and a site start is anticipated in 1983/84 for a development to include 20 units, the plans for which are now well advanced.

Regarding Phase Two, following detailed discussions with the Planning Department, Outline Planning Permission was granted in December 1982 for a large and mixed purpose phased development of 184 housing units. This development is planned to include general family houses (27 of two apartments; 37 of three apartments ; 22 of four apartments; four of five apartments; and seven of seven apartments) to cater for different generations and household sizes. The proposed scheme also includes a variety of housing for special needs - 39 amenity for the elderly; four shared housing units (for example for single people); a block of 40 sheltered houses for the elderly and four flats for disabled persons. However, prior to this, in July 1983 two private developers approached RHA having been referred to RHA by the Planning Department who were interested in promoting 'joint developments'. In September 1983 the association held a meeting with the Planning Department to clarify the reasons for its change in approach. The association's representatives learnt that the Planning Department now favoured a substantial retail development on the main road and that the developers were interested in a supermarket outlet. Only one developer pursued this interest

and following a meeting with the developer, RHA informed the Planning Department that the developer's plans were not compatible with RHA's proposals.

Therefore by late 1983 the Planning Department appeared to have radically departed from the proposals which were included in the Dennistoun Local Plan in 1981 and which had been based on several years of local consultation. The plan to redevelop the site for 'predominantly housing purposes' appears to have been modified to include a single storey supermarket with associated car parking, which RHA views as totally incompatible with existing plans for housing and for the environment. (95)

In conclusion, therefore, we can see that RHA's experience as a locally controlled developer of new housing has to date shown strong similarities to its experience in coordinating rehabilitation. First, the planning of the scheme at the promotional stage was complex and time-consuming, not insignificantly because RHA had to liaise with different sections of the local authority and with the Housing Corporation. In particular RHA had to wait for the Planning Department to develop through consultation its comprehensive plan for the area, as has been documented in several studies of housing. (96) Yet perhaps surprisingly, soon after completion the comprehensive plan would appear to be subject to modification by the planners without further consultation with the public. Secondly, there were funding difficulties, during a period when funds for housing association rehabilitation were stretched, and public funds for new

public sector building in Strathclyde Region were sparse.

Thirdly, since 1979, the local authority had become increasingly interested in partnership schemes with private developers in the inner areas, and this was reinforced by the Conservative Government's emphasis on privatisation. These were reflected in the Planning Department's approach and in RHA's increasing willingness to consider joint funding of a large housing scheme. RHA's experience here also illustrates the "pump priming" effects of CBHA rehabilitation, whereby commercial developers have shown a renewed interest in a decayed inner area which had previously been proposed for local authority clearance and redevelopment. This pattern was duplicated in other CBHA localities such as Govanhill, Rutherglen, Queens Cross.

In conclusion, the CBHA experience of developing new building, as in the case of rehabilitation, would appear to be characterised by uncertainties, contingencies and external control by government agencies.

I shall conclude this section by describing RHA's response to the Conservative Government's policy of privatisation which vested associations with the Right to Sell under the provisions of the Tenants' Rights Etc (Scotland) Act, 1980. Since September 1981 RHA has operated a sales policy which entitles sitting tenants of generally two years occupancy to buy their improved house. RHA's policy (Clause 3b)⁽⁹⁷⁾ specifies that the purchase price will be either:

the vacant possession value as assessed by the District Valuer, or the "book debt value", together with any outstanding debt to the lending authority at the time of the sale, whichever is the greater.

As it has been implemented by other CBHAs this policy allows RHA to offer a discount on the market value price, where market value price is greater than the cost of provision of the dwelling (book debt value). In February 1984 RHA revised the policy to take account of those tenants who had previously sold their house to the association (Point 3b4 states that discount will be reduced by the amount of grant made available for the association to acquire the house).

RHA has kept a register of enquiries to monitor this policy. By March 1984 there had been six enquiries. Of these, five tenants followed up their initial enquiry with a survey to determine the market value of their house. In all these instances the book debt value was higher than the valuation and the costs of acquisition served to inhibit the tenants concerned from buying their house. (98)

Having described the evolution of RHA's goals and practice with regard to the association's role as a local housing developer, I shall examine in the following section the development of RHA's role as a local landlord.

2.b. RHA's role as a local landlord, 1977 to 1984

We have seen that from the start RHA's Management Committee was committed to the idea of 'getting rid of the private factors', and was generally concerned with developing an efficient local housing

management service. During 1977 it was frequently said that RHA's Housing Management functions would long outlive its role as housing developer. It had been assumed that the improvement programme could be completed over a five to ten year period (with development functions therefore becoming redundant) and that tasks relating to the allocation of properties, to tenant problems and to property maintenance, would persist in the longer term.

2.b.1. RHA's approach to property factoring

In its 1977 Annual Report the association stated:

The long-term aim of the housing management function of the association is to provide a comprehensive and efficient service to meet the needs of tenants. This is in keeping with the overall aims of Reidvale Housing Association: to provide local means and channels for servicing local needs relating to housing and to allow for local involvement in policy-making.

Effective policy-making by the Committee and high standards of property maintenance will enable our improved houses to retain the looks and amenities associated with their extended life. (99)

During 1977 and 1978 local residents regularly requested that RHA should assume responsibilities for factoring their closes.

Early in 1977 the Committee had resolved to take on functions of Rents and Rates collection, which had previously been carried out by the factors. It was decided to "phase out" the factors gradually, concluding the responsibilities of the first set of factors in September 1977. In this context residents were informed:

The office ... will act as your local factor's office and will, in the very near future, be in full control of all answers to any management problems that may arise, i.e. Rents, Rates, Re-housing and Repairs. (100)

At this stage, systems of rent collection and repairs reporting procedures were formalised and explained to local residents. As a product of RHA's aim of providing an extensive housing management service, there was a steadily expanding requirement for new staff - two Housing Assistants, one clerical officer, a technical officer and two odd-job men were employed between 1977 and 1979 to service the expansion of this area of RHA's functions. By 1980, RHA had employed a total of six staff in the Housing Management section with responsibility for managing 760 houses in the area of which 24% were improved, 16% were on site and 60% were unimproved. Further, since 1979 this section has concentrated on developing an efficient programme of planned maintenance for its improved properties. (101)

By 1984 RHA managed 1,044 properties in its ownership and 37 properties for other owners. The Housing Management section has instituted a programme of planned maintenance on a biannual basis which aims to prevent future problems and emergencies - for example, with gas fires; extract fans; drainage; roofing and common aspects of tenement buildings. Cyclical maintenance of painter work is also carried out in improved tenements. Further, there have been extensive demands for routine maintenance of both improved and unimproved properties, with the result that until 1984 the association consistently had a deficit on the revenue side of its accounts. (102)

Like all CBHAs, RHA has experienced some maintenance problems subsequent to improvement work. For example on some contracts condensation occurred but in most cases this was solved by the association's measures to increase ventilation. On many contracts, poor joinery work resulted in requirements for corrective work and a common problem has been that noise insulation has been inadequate after improvement work - a problem which is under investigation in local authority and housing association rehabilitation schemes in 1984.

On routine maintenance, vandalism of mainly unimproved properties is a persistent problem and security costs are therefore high (£10,000 per annum). Doors and windows are frequently broken and door entry systems have at times been bypassed by local residents who have used force to enter the close, having forgotten their keys! CBHA management and maintenance problems are therefore extensive and RHA is at present aiming to generate a local employment project to help with routine maintenance, for example to counteract the effects of vandalism. In general where such problems have been raised at public meetings and when new strategies have been proposed, such as "close representatives", there has been little evidence of active interest amongst Reidvale residents. (103)

Therefore, between 1980 and 1984, housing management at RHA has become increasingly systematised and professionalised and RHA's Committee has confronted maintenance as a significant area of policy.

RHA's Maintenance Sub Committee was formed in 1980. Its functions are to oversee the appointment of sub contractors; to monitor maintenance expenditure and maintenance tenders; to discuss significant maintenance problems and to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of RHA's maintenance systems. We have seen that maintenance issues are interrelated with social aspects of housing management, as for example in patterns of vandalism. However we have also seen that RHA, like GHA, has increasingly focused on the more technical aspects of housing management. In the following section I shall concentrate on some of the more social aspects of housing management.

2.b.2. Social aspects of housing management

The main Management Committee has regularly discussed referrals from the Housing Management Sub Committee on a number of social and personal tenants' issues. For instance there were requests from local residents for consideration of their special housing problems and for rehusing by the association in advance of the programme. Certain residents requested "exchanges" either within the area or between housing association areas. Some tenants requested changes in the Tenancy Agreement due to insecurities resulting from marriage breakdowns (women frequently asked in these instances for the tenancy to be put in their names). Other residents requested that they should remain in their decant house rather than return to their former house after improvement work.

At times, the Committee or its officials were requested to arbitrate on the behaviour of RHA's tenants. Complaints on some occasions were placed in the hands of officials regarding a family's unwillingness to take their turn in washing out the close. There were complaints in unimproved closes that certain families allowed their children to run riot or that beetles were liable to spread throughout a close due to the uncleanliness of a particular household. More than once a tenant complained of victimisation by neighbours and requested rehousing on those grounds. (104)

As in GHA, the work of the Housing Management section therefore demanded intensive personal contact with residents. In fact, from the start RHA's Committee took the view that 'each case must be considered on its merits', and the Housing Manager was frequently required to report on "cases" which involved personal details about local residents. However it was also established from the start at RHA that tenants and local residents should have the right to personal privacy as far as possible. To that end there was a general policy which emphasised that although tenants' personal circumstances might require investigation, there should be no reference to the identities of local residents in the process of Committee decision-making. This approach introduced a professional, impersonal style into the discussions in the Housing Management Sub Committee, although this "professionalism", which was aimed at fairness, at times contradicted with the emphasis on treating everyone as a special case. (105) RHA's approach in this aspect of Committee decision-

making has differed in some respects from that adopted by certain other CBHAs, particularly in terms of the range of issues brought to Committee for resolution. However, there were also certain important similarities on the housing management front. The requests for special case rehousing, for one-off moves, for intervention on tenants' disputes and for positive action regarding repairs to houses were typical of housing management issues which constituted a significant aspect of the work of all CBHAs.

2.b.3. Housing management and staff functions

In terms of the allocation of functions and responsibilities between staff sections (Development and Housing Management) and between the relevant Sub Committees, there was some considerable overlap. This again shows similarities in the organisational structures and tensions generated in various associations, particularly during the early years of their development.

For instance in RHA's first two years it was the Development Officers who, at the stage of conducting the pre-improvement survey, assumed responsibility for certain aspects of allocations. At this stage, the main task at hand was to resolve the mix of house types and the requirements for amalgamation of flats on the same landing. We have seen that it was the DOs' function to assess through survey whether residents would return to their own house or wished rehousing within the same close, or neighbouring closes in the same contract, or whether they preferred GDC rehousing. It was therefore

initially the DOs and not RHA's housing management staff who mainly allocated properties within the improvement programme. However the Housing Manager generally became involved when residents requested one-off moves as opposed to decanting, followed by return to the improved close. (106)

Initially, therefore, much of the work of housing management staff was administrative: tasks included record-keeping on properties and tenants, administration of rent collection and of rents registration, and coordination of repairs. However there was also a social side to the job. Housing management staff generally served as a link between tenants and Committee on individual tenants' problems, such as those relating to rent arrears, personal and household circumstances. They frequently served as intermediary between tenants and government departments and advised tenants of their rights as claimants. A further responsibility of the Housing Manager was to advise the Committee and stimulate debate on the developments of the association's Allocations Policy.

2.b.4. A policy on allocations

I have suggested earlier that certain factors have militated against CBHAs establishing, in their early stages, the kind of abstract Allocations Policy which is generally regarded as an essential part of fair and professional housing management practice - of a type which is accountable to prospective tenants and to public sector housing agencies. In the following section I shall describe the influences on the development of RHA's Allocations Policy.

In general there were two main factors which served to inhibit the development of an official Allocations Policy at RHA. On the one hand, there was the commitment of RHA's Committee to treating people as special cases while, on the other hand, there was an external constraint operating in the early stages of the rehabilitation programme, which was the shortage of empty properties, either for decanting or general letting.

Like all CBHAs, RHA did rehouse some local residents during the early stages of the rehabilitation programme according to guidelines approved by the Committee. These guidelines focused primarily on residents whose housing was programmed for improvement. By late 1977 the stock of unimproved and improved properties in RHA's ownership had increased, and gradually RHA took ownership of a significant number of empty properties. Initially empty houses had been acquired from residents leaving the area, for the purpose of establishing sufficient decant stock. Gradually, as a result of deaths and the moves of residents into private ownership outwith the area, or into local authority housing when favourable offers were received, the stock of empty housing in RHA's ownership expanded.

As a result, housing management staff and the Housing Management Sub Committee played a more significant role in allocating properties. It was resolved in the first instance to give priority to the housing requirements of the improvement programme. However it was assumed that gradually it would become possible to offer

one-off moves to residents whose properties were unlikely to be improved for some time in the future.

By late 1977 RHA owned some larger empty properties outwith its Action Areas. This widened the range of possibilities for housing tenants within scheduled improvement contracts. RHA also owned 20 empty properties in a part of North Dennistoun. Offers of rehousing in these properties were, however, often rejected by residents who preferred to wait for their own tenement to be improved rather than a quick move to adequate housing in an area they perceived as "rougher" than their own. In relation to these few "difficult to let" properties, the Committee resolved to operate allocations more flexibly, by offering them to residents whose houses were not programmed for improvement, or on "special case" grounds. (For example where two families of different generations lived in a very overcrowded single home, an offer was made to relieve this situation by rehousing one of the families.)⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

By January 1978 RHA had assumed responsibility for rent collection for 60 flats (using a Giro rent system), 560 properties were owned by the association and 100 of these properties were empty. As stated previously, reasons for empty properties included the movement of residents outwith the area, as well as the programmed vacation of properties included in future improvement contracts planned by RHA. By 1980 the extensive stock of empty unimproved properties was recognised as a problem demanding some resolution, during a period of uncertainty about the likely pace of the improvement programme and

about future funding. The majority of locally-based housing associations in Glasgow were in a similar position and at conferences and training sessions the concern was expressed that associations could become major "slum landlords" in their areas.

Against this background RHA's Committee agreed a policy of short-term letting (whereby tenants have reduced rights of tenure) - a policy which it had viewed unfavourably in the early stages. In effect the policy was a compromise which would allow for residential occupation of empty properties, which were by no means of the standard favoured by RHA as local landlord. However, it was viewed as a priority to occupy these properties even through short-term lets, in order to avoid vandalism - the general fate of empty houses in CBHA areas. Also, the policy offered the scope to relieve housing stress for certain residents in the area, for example in the cases of single parent families and families sharing houses with parents.⁽¹⁰⁸⁾

While the Housing Management section from the start held responsibility for one-off moves, initially Development Staff had autonomously handled allocations within the improvement programme. By 1978 within the staff organisation there was a growing emphasis on the benefits of increased liaison between Housing Officers and Development Officers in the process of allocating houses within improvement contracts. Since then the staff of both sections have worked in partnership on a regularised basis, thus allowing for fuller involvement of housing management staff in relation to all aspects of allocations.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ The open plan office in the community

building in which both sections have worked since September 1979 has enabled greater ease of communication between sections, in a way that was not possible in GHA, prior to its 1983 move to similar offices. This would highlight the significance of physical layout of workspace in influencing opportunities or constraints on communications between sections.

The evolution of RHA's Lettings Policy, therefore, was different from that of GHA's Allocations Policy, and perhaps more typical of the pattern which has characterised most other CBHAs.

We have seen that RHA's Committee in the early stages placed considerable emphasis on improving housing conditions for local residents through the improvement programme. While there was recognition of the Committee's role in allocating the scarce resource of housing, the Committee was predominantly concerned with ensuring improved opportunities for residents within their planning area, or for those who had local connections. This emphasis was a marked reaction to the view that past planning strategies of the local authority had served to destroy the network of social support offered by family ties. The Committee was generally concerned that houses should not be let to "incomers", whilst residents of Reidvale lived in sub-tolerable housing. There was also the general understanding that RHA required vacant properties for decanting purposes. So at a time when the Annbank Street block was faced with demolition it was decided not to open an official waiting list as this might only

serve to raise unrealistically the hopes of the large numbers of people affected by demolition.

In the process of allocating houses there was a strong emphasis by both staff and Committee that each case should be treated on its 'individual merits' and that 'every case is a special case'. Between 1977 and 1979 the Housing Manager servicing the Housing Management Sub Committee encouraged the Sub Committee to develop a Lettings Policy which would provide an official and public guide to allocations of all types. However the general view of the Sub Committee was that this process should be delayed until a stage when RHA would have more scope in allocating houses. One new member of staff commented:

I find it difficult to understand. I sometimes wonder if it is because the Sub Committee is loathe to set precedents, that its members prefer to deal with each case as a Special Case. (110)

As we saw in the GHA case study, between 1978 and 1979 there were external pressures on CBHAs to resolve an Allocations Policy. The District Council's Housing Department, in its discussions with Glasgow associations at the Glasgow Forum, had suggested that it would consider accepting a 50% Nominations right to empty improved properties (as opposed to the 100% rights initially favoured by GDC). The local authority therefore encouraged associations to submit copies of their Lettings Policies to the Housing Department. After several months of discussion at sub committee of a draft Allocations Policy which had been produced by the Housing Manager, the policy was finally

approved, with one minor amendment, by RHA's Management Committee in November 1979.

In effect the Allocations Policy officially sanctioned and formalised the implicit criteria which had always been applied in allocating housing to residents of RHA's Action Areas. The policy mainly offers access to Reidvale houses to "outsiders" who have family connections or dependent relatives in Reidvale. The policy awards five points for every year of their previous residence in the Reidvale area (which has been defined to include demolition areas). The policy is subject to a six monthly review and any amendments take account of changes in local housing needs and the progress of the improvement programme.⁽¹¹¹⁾ In general the priority RHA has placed on improving housing conditions and opportunities for Reidvale people has been consistent with expectations expressed at Residents' Association meetings. The Allocations Policy has therefore reflected local opinion.

I would argue that while certain aspects of RHA's Allocations Policy appear to be parochial in emphasis there are other features of the Allocations Policy which are clearly oriented towards the resolution of wider housing problems. For example, like other CBHAs, RHA has agreed that Glasgow District Council is entitled to nominate tenants from the Council waiting list to 50% of RHA's surplus improved housing stock. By 1984 RHA took up several such nominations. This practice has at times proved a source of local contention and local

residents have queried why so many of RHA's houses are let to "incomers".⁽¹¹²⁾ Further, an analysis of the 91 houses let between April 1983 and February 1984, following the opening of RHA's Waiting List, has shown that 70% of those rehoused by RHA had previously been registered on the District Council Waiting List.⁽¹¹³⁾ We should also remember that many CBHAs have consistently stressed that special housing needs within their areas should be assessed through local planning and the improvement programme. As one RHA official commented, in interview:

In 1977 we assessed through survey that one in five of our residents are elderly. In that context we have attempted to include amenity housing for the elderly wherever possible in improvement contracts. Also several residents are single parents or are two family units living in one house, or ex-prisoners. Yet we are criticised for not catering for "special needs" groups. Just because our residents haven't affiliated to special needs pressure groups they aren't regarded as having special needs. I invited one of our critics to spend a week here a year ago but so far they haven't shown interest (114)

Similar views have been stated by CBHA participants at meetings of the Glasgow Forum and the SFHA Council in response to challenges about parochialism or about the increasing proportional take-up of funds allocated to associations in Scotland.

RHA's allocations in practice have also been influenced by funding and by the fact that the improvement programme has progressed more slowly than expected. We have seen two main outcomes of RHA's development programme for housing management problems and practice. At times RHA has not been able to meet requirements and preferences of

neighbourhood residents through the improvement programme and as a result, some residents have moved out of the area leaving a small stock of empty improved houses. Secondly, the slower than projected pace of the improvement programme meant that by 1982 RHA owned a stock of empty unimproved properties. In this context the interests of neighbourhood residents, and their local CBHA coincides, the main concern being to fill the empty houses. From the residents' perspective, the main aims are to prevent cumulative damp problems and to deter vandalism, and clearly their local association has similar objectives. Needless to say the topic of empty houses and their allocation was regularly discussed at meetings of the Residents' Association and the Community Council. Just as in the experience of other CBHAs in Glasgow, Allocations were a thorny issue within Reidvale. (115)

The cumulative outcome of these developments has been that RHA has reassessed its policy on the allocation of unimproved properties. RHA opened its Waiting List in February 1983, at a stage when the association had a small surplus of empty two and three apartment houses. As has been the pattern of other CBHAs like Elderspark and Whiteinch and Scotstoun, RHA received a flood of applicants. After circularising local residents RHA received 1,100 requests for application forms of which 800 were returned. Approximately one third of applicants were from District Council schemes in the East End of Glasgow. After processing initial applications, 579 applicants remained on the Waiting List and since April 1983, 81 applicants

have been rehoused by the association. Taking these developments into account it is evident that different factors have generated an increasing readiness amongst RHA's participants to allocate Reidvale houses to people from outwith the neighbourhood.

In general by 1983, therefore, housing management was no longer viewed mainly in terms of its people aspects, or in terms of developing good relations with tenants. By the 1980s, Committee members and officials had become mutually interested in developing technical and administrative strategies for confronting housing management problems. This new awareness had stemmed partly from the shared experience of CBHAs of the extensive costs involved in carrying out repairs, following bouts of extreme weather (for example, Winter 1981), and in response to vandalism.

While we have seen that the evolution of policies on factoring and on allocations was influenced by strategic choices by RHA's participants, in certain other aspects of housing management policy and practice participants operated according to a more fatalistic or deterministic view of external constraints. One such issue involved increases and inconsistencies in the rent levels of association houses. Whilst these issues were discussed by RHA's Committee members at association meetings and were raised at public meetings, there was a general acceptance that inconsistencies and increases in rents were outwith the association's control.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ We have seen that this pattern of acceptance of the system of rent registration was common to the majority of CBHAs.⁽¹¹⁷⁾

We have seen that a significant part of the experience of RHA's participants was the regular and sometimes aggressive criticism by neighbourhood residents. However, just as we saw in the Govanhill case study, RHA was increasingly perceived as providing a more responsive housing service than other agencies. (118)

In conclusion I would suggest that this account of RHA's role as a local landlord has shown both similarities to and differences from the pattern in Govanhill. Similarities have reflected the common experience of external constraints (for example, central government funding of the improvement programme and local authority policies on allocations) and the common organisational characteristics of CBHAs (in particular, their structure of lay committees with a local orientation and their paid officials with an increasingly professional orientation). Also in both associations we have seen tensions between a professional, systematic and depersonalised approach to allocations and the lay approach which emphasised the peculiarity of each case. Differences have stemmed from the role of individuals and groups in influencing strategic choices. For example we saw the pressure on GHA, 1973 to 1975, to establish an allocations policy and to let houses to residents of demolition areas.

We have also seen how certain locally operating and time specific contingencies interacted with participants' choices in affecting the development of policy and local perceptions. For example, GHA had been formed against the background of longstanding concerns about demolition in the neighbourhood, so that the impending

demolition of a block in GHA's formative stage led early participants to consider the association's potential role in housing displaced residents. Faced by demolition of a large block in the area, RHA's participants took a pragmatic stance on the question of the association's capacity to house displaced residents. Further local contingencies were housing emergencies, such as fires and structural instability which in all instances led both associations to help in whatever way they could and we have seen that frequently this was never enough to satisfy the expectations of local residents.

Finally for both associations their role in allocations has proved locally contentious. In Chapter Eleven I have argued that in their role as landlords CBHA Committees, to a significant extent, control access to a valued and scarce local resource. It is in this capacity that they influence the social composition of the neighbourhood and they have the power to affect people's experiences as neighbours. I would argue, therefore, that this aspect of the role of CBHAs will inevitably be contentious both within their localities and as a focus of state agencies.

The discussion so far has concentrated, first, on participants' aims and their experience of early developments at RHA between 1975 and 1977, and secondly, on two important areas of policy development over the years 1977 to 1983. Throughout the account I have emphasised the interaction between individual and group intentions and actions; and the influences of external relations and changing conditions on

the housing association and its participants and on the development of organisational goals.

It is evident that RHA as an organisation has experienced continual change in both internal structure and external conditions; that RHA's environment (political, economic, organisational and social) has been characterised by significant uncertainties and that RHA's aims and strategies have evolved over time in the context of experience. In both case studies there has been evidence of underlying tensions and conflict in external relations. Also, where there have been parallel changes and experiences in both associations, these have often been clearly related to similar "environmental" influences.

The discussion so far has made little reference to changes in RHA's organisational structure and relations. In the following section therefore I shall focus on the more internal aspects of organisational change which have influenced RHA's development to 1983.

2.c. Organisational growth, complexity, control and conflict, 1976 to 1983

In the Govanhill case study it was evident that certain changes in organisational structure derived from the dynamics of organisational growth. In Chapter Nine I suggested that the growth and complexity of CBHAs resulted from the goals pursued by early participants; from task-related uncertainties and changing

environmental conditions; and from aspects of their public accountability. I argued in that chapter that certain environmental factors have resulted in contradictory or conflicting aspects of organisational structure and in related organisational tensions.

In Chapter Eleven we saw how organisational changes also stemmed from underlying tensions and conflicts of interest between organisational participants. Also, the GHA case study has illustrated how participants' actions influenced organisational changes. We saw how participants sometimes aimed to advance individual or group interests, for example in negotiations over pay and work conditions or job regrading, and how at times external reference groups (the Union branch and the Federation) played an important role. In other instances, organisational tensions stemmed from contradictory strategies which different groups pursued in the 'best interests of the organisation', or in the 'best interests of the community'. In Chapter Eight we saw that this pattern was reflected in conflict over senior appointments in associations and I have suggested that tensions at times resulted from competing views about the management strategies and staff appointments which would be most conducive to organisational effectiveness. We saw also in the Govanhill case that the intervention of Development Staff on housing management issues was at times perceived by Housing Management Staff and Committee as 'interference' and, by the Development Staff, as resulting from their concern about long-term, important issues facing the association and its role within Govanhill. In Chapter Nine we saw that this pattern

was reflected in other associations.

In the remainder of this case study we shall see that RHA's development has reflected similar dynamics of growth, conflicts, and organisational change. Again we shall see that influential participants in the two associations have made different strategic choices which have been reflected in their dissimilar approaches to common issues. I shall further explore these similarities and differences in the following account of organisational changes affecting RHA.

2.c.1. Organisational growth and relations between officials, 1975 to 1977

To date RHA has experienced two main phases of organisational growth. The first phase reflected a strategy of "gearing up" to the administration of a rolling programme of rehabilitation and involved the establishment of the local office, 1976 to 1977, while the second phase reflected a management strategy of incorporating the varied expertise required to pursue complex goals in the context of recognised uncertainties and external controls. By mid 1977 RHA's staffing structure reflected the trends of specialisation and of routinisation of tasks which have been identified in previous chapters.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ However, as well as these growing aspects of bureaucracy, RHA's organisational culture or style also reflected the organisational flexibility and commitments which we have seen to characterise young CBHAs in general. For example in 1976, both secretarial staff and Committee members helped the first DO carry out the residents' survey. Also, residents' queries were answered by

any staff or Committee members who had access to the necessary information.

I have already described the varied and extensive responsibilities of the first Development Officers' role in CBHAs. By early 1977 RHA's staff structure included three specialist functions and secretarial support staff. The origins of departmentalisation stemmed from further appointments of DOs, a Housing Officer and a Clerk of Works. By mid 1977, three DOs were employed in the Development Section which was headed by a Senior DO (RHA's first staff member); two officials, a Housing Officer and a Clerical Officer, formed the Housing Management Section; and the Clerk of Works was responsible for ensuring satisfactory building standards.⁽¹²⁰⁾ RHA therefore grew at a faster pace than GHA in relation to a smaller planning programme, and it did so without Housing Corporation approval. For instance while HC officials had suggested that RHA should employ a bookkeeper to monitor the association's financial control, RHA had chosen to expand the Development Section.⁽¹²¹⁾ Specialisation in the staff structure was accompanied by growing recognition at Committee level that policy-making focused on specialised, though interrelated, issues. By 1977 this was reflected in RHA's Sub Committees (Development, Finance and General Purposes, Housing Management and later Staffing and Training).⁽¹²²⁾

By this stage certain underlying tensions within the staff structure had become evident. First, RHA's new staff entered the organisation with differing expectations about their role in RHA

in particular, and about CBHAs in general. Secondly, there were differences amongst staff in terms of their prior work experience. For example, two out of the first three DOs at RHA had joined the organisation with limited prior practical experience. Both these DOs had developed an interest in housing and planning in an academic context, although prior to joining RHA, the association's second DO had worked in the local residents' advice centre and had helped out with RHA's social survey.⁽¹²³⁾ The Clerk of Works and the Housing Officer, on the other hand, had both gained considerable practical work experience, in the building trade and in a factor's office respectively, prior to joining RHA.

Whilst all staff were committed to RHA's aims of developing a locally-based and locally-responsive housing service and of improving local housing conditions, the staff organisation reflected similar underlying tensions to those experienced at GHA. Differences in frames of reference, backgrounds, experience and approach were sometimes expressed in joking references to 'the young and inexperienced' and the 'advantages of degrees'.

From the point of view of those working in Housing Management and Technical Sections, the Committee had not yet recognised that Housing Management over time would become the most significant area of RHA's functions. The Lettings Policy, the process of allocations, the long-term maintenance of properties, liaison with tenants - all of these would continue as important activities, long after the improvement work had been completed. Despite such concerns, during

RHA's first two years staff had operated as a small team effectively managing to pull together. This early pattern of work relations was largely similar to that described by participants in GHA and other CBHAs in the city.

At times, tensions between staff were closely interrelated with those between staff and Committee. For example, a further division within the staffing structure was that RHA's Senior DO operated as the main adviser to the Committee, and as the key official who liaised between staff and Committee. While staff tended to state their opinions and disagreements openly to Committee members, and particularly the Chairman and others who visited the office daily, in practice the Senior DO was the Committee's main point of referral within the staff structure. (124)

2.c.2 RHA's Committee and industrial relations issues

We have seen that there was no unanimity within RHA's Committee on the issues of staff expansion and salary levels. However, there were certain influential personalities on RHA's Committee in the early stages. These were the Chairman, who liaised closely with RHA's staff on a day to day basis; Mr N. who, until his resignation in 1977, consistently opposed policies of staffing growth; and the community worker who had resigned in 1976.

Since 1977 RHA's Committee has, apart from one period in 1979, displayed considerable solidarity and continuity of membership.

Committee turnover has been notably low at RHA. I have found only two members who resigned due to frustration that their own housing circumstances were not being advanced by their involvement at RHA. One of these individuals resigned before an Annual General Meeting in 1977, while the other was a Sub Committee member who was a poor attender whose resignation was requested under RHA's "Rule No 38". In both these cases other Committee members and RHA's staff had for some time recognised the lack of involvement of these participants.⁽¹²⁵⁾ I would suggest that, particularly in the early stages, the main factors influencing turnover were the contradictions between RHA Committee members' expectations and their experience of participation (1976 to 1977). Since that time turnover has reflected the age and housing situations of participants. Since 1978, while the membership has remained largely stable, certain members have moved outwith the area, resigned due to illhealth, or died.⁽¹²⁶⁾

Relations between Committee and staff have at different times been strained by issues relating to staff salaries and conditions. RHA's Committee during 1977 had chosen to withdraw from membership of the Employers' Federation, preferring to negotiate directly with their staff. While they did not wish to move outside general levels of pay in the city, they were concerned that negotiating through the Employers' body might result in delays, friction with the Union branch and an ensuing hardening of staff attitudes within RHA. These reasons for remaining outwith the collective bargaining system were

contradictory to the approach of both employees and employers in other associations (like GHA), where it was believed that collective bargaining should serve to depersonalise and deintensify employment issues.

RHA's discussions on pay, grading of staff and work conditions were therefore personalised in the early stages. Staff initiatives proposing improvements in individual and collective pay and conditions were increasingly interpreted by some Committee members as signs that staff were less committed to the association than they had initially expected would be the case. Staff tended not to press hard for pay and grading improvements and prior to 1978 they chose to await the outcomes of Union-Federation negotiations. While RHA's Committee chose to withdraw from the Employers' Federation in 1977, on the staff side only a minority had opted to join the Union (two out of the eight staff employed at RHA in 1977). The consensus view in RHA was that the two bodies representing the interests of employers and workers were hopelessly divided in their approach to issues of pay, work conditions and job gradings. The employers' side in general appeared to hold a low estimation of the levels of responsibility involved in housing association work. RHA's members were therefore united in their concern that negotiations between Union and Federation might serve to increase tensions and conflict between staff and Committee.

However RHA's more internal personalised negotiations on pay increases, regradings and improved work conditions affected certain changes in attitudes of both staff and Committee. In interview long-serving Committee members described how, whereas in the early stages staff had been perceived as highly committed, even dedicated, to RHA, by 1978 following the tensions associated with wage demands and their resolution, early expectations and perceptions had changed:

At the start Committees weren't able to establish or assess reasonable wage rates for professionals. It wasn't surprising when you consider the wages of local residents on the Committee and the jobs they work at. Although the Housing Corporation was represented at our meetings, they didn't really advise us on how to employ staff or to act as employers.

It was problems we experienced as employers which changed things. At the start although we all took it seriously and felt the time we gave up to RHA was worthwhile we also enjoyed ourselves. Much was "fun and games". (127)

As was the case at GHA, Committee members therefore experienced considerable difficulties with the managerial aspects of their role. When staff proposed a redefinition and regrading of their position, the Committee were confused by the arguments involved, but did not want to accept their validity simply on the basis of trust. Yet they were aware of the structural dilemma of their role. They were members of a management body with responsibility for policy development and monitoring, while their involvement in practice was limited to attendance at meetings except for the minority of members whose work and family situations enabled daily visits to the office. As one Committee member commented:

There was no way that we could fully understand exactly what the jobs involve, or how staffing proposals were appropriate to RHA's needs or the skills of existing staff. Although these problems still remain to some extent, Committee members have learned much over time. It's still a maze for new members Really, we were thrown in at the deep end. The Housing Corporation wanted us to cope on our own in this area and Ashok (the community worker) left us too early. We could have done with being able to turn to him for advice for a longer period of time. (128)

On the staff side, the experience of negotiations during 1977 led to general recognition of problems with industrial relations issues. To an extent staff generally felt that improvements in pay and work conditions were justified and at times they perceived Committee members as intransigent. In general, the Committee was seen to lack understanding of the responsibilities and functions attached to present jobs, of situations where jobs in practice deviated from job descriptions, and of future staffing requirements. However some officials argued that the Committee could not be expected to prove enlightened employers given members' lack of experience and training in the personnel management aspects of their role. (129)

These Committee and staff attitudes reflect certain common aspects (130) of industrial relations which have been described in previous chapters.

Further, some staff and Committee members in RHA held ambivalent attitudes to their respective roles in industrial relations. Some Committee members who supported principles of trade unionism and who were union activists in their own workplaces, in the early stages had questioned the relevance of unionisation in CBHAs. They believed that staff and Committees should work as a team and that

CBHA Committees should make every effort to be "fair" employers. By 1978 the growth of unionisation led some Committee members to view the Union branch as a significant external constraint on Committee control:

The Union has really determined job definitions and the wage structure, and Committees haven't had time to work these out for themselves. Maybe as time passes we will say that the Union has worked to the advantage of the movement in Glasgow. (131)

Some staff also expressed ambivalent attitudes. For example, one official commented wryly that whilst dominant branch members would argue that the Committee should control policy development, they appeared to see no contradiction in attempting to impose their beliefs 'both political and organisational' on local Committees, for example in their opposition to the appointment of Directors. (132) Most staff, however, recognised that the Branch had effectively improved the work environment for CBHA workers since 1977.

By 1978, a year during which the Union branch and Federation agreed a major pay award, the majority of RHA's staff had joined the Union and the Branch Chairman was employed at RHA. In that year RHA's Committee resolved to implement the Branch claim prior to the finalisation of Union-Federation negotiations. However the Committee decided that if the final settlement differed significantly from the local agreement, an adjustment would be made. The Committee's major concern was to avoid the charge by other CBHAs that RHA was prepared to break city-wide pay norms and thus to attract

staff from other associations and staff generally have accepted this reasoning.⁽¹³³⁾ RHA's negotiations followed this pattern until 1983, by which time only one official had not joined the Union and RHA's Committee had remained outwith the Federation and had affiliated to the "1983 Group" which involved staff, Committee and Union representation in discussing industrial relations issues.

Having discussed how the Committee responded to its evolving role as a collective employer and how industrial relations issues affected staff and Committee relations at RHA, I shall now turn to examine how work relations at RHA were affected by issues relating to hierarchical control.

2.c.3. The issues of hierarchy and internal control

We have seen that by 1977 RHA had established a formal hierarchy within the Development Section and in practical terms a more extensive hierarchy operated within the staff organisation as a whole. The Senior DO's role had evolved into that of Senior Officer, the key role in internal control and external liaison. Unlike the emphasis on internal democracy at GHA, there was no regular pattern of formal staff meetings in RHA's staff organisation.

Prior to RHA's move into the Neighbourhood Centre, the dominant approach amongst officials was a practical emphasis on getting things done, in contrast with the emphasis on widespread reflection, consultation and joint problem solving amongst GHA's officials. When

one relatively new member of staff had attempted to initiate such meetings in 1977 one response was expressed in such terms as, 'What's the point in navel gazing and spending valuable time talking? There are houses out there waiting to be improved'.

In 1978 when RHA employed 13 staff, the Senior DO, after tendering his resignation, recommended that the Committee appoint a Director. However, after interviewing in April 1978, the Committee resolved not to appoint and as one member commented, 'We weren't certain then that to appoint a Director was the right decision for RHA'.⁽¹³⁴⁾ By June 1978, after two DOs and a Clerk of Works had left RHA, the association employed 13 staff in three established sections. The Housing Management section employed three staff, the Development section employed five DOs, and a Technical Officer with building trade experience had been appointed at the same level of seniority as the senior officials in the Development and Housing Management sections. There were also four secretarial/administrative and reception support staff.

The Technical Officer's appointment was the outcome of an agreement between staff and Committee to vest greater responsibility in a technical monitoring role in RHA's organisation. It further reflected participants' recognition of the important contribution that technical staff could make to the monitoring of building standards and in checking the work of building professionals and contractors.

2.c.4. Control and conflict, 1978 to 1979

In 1978 the Committee resolved that internal coordination and control within the staff structure should be implemented by a Management Team which subsequently was termed the "Corporate Team". This team was to include the Housing Manager, a Development Officer and the Technical Officer and in general RHA's staff favoured this approach as an alternative to the appointment of a Director. However after four to six months several staff and some Committee members had come to believe that the Corporate Team approach was unworkable. (135)

Some staff members believed that, one individual, the Technical Officer was uncommitted to participating in a cooperative management structure. As a result tensions and resentments began to build up within the staff organisation. At the same time, there were certain changes occurring within the Committee. I have emphasised earlier that RHA's Chairman, "JB", was a strong personality, a Glaswegian "character" whose energy, commitment and leadership qualities are well recognised. RHA's Chairman has been a daily visitor to RHA's office, conducting daily meetings with staff and sustaining a continuous involvement in RHA's affairs alongside his employment as a newspaper worker on nightshifts.

In 1978, however, certain Committee members had begun to question the established pattern of decision-making and the influential role of the Chairman, both within the Committee and in liaising with staff.

These individuals were critical of the fact that RHA's Chairman was party to administrative decision-making in between Committee meetings. (136)

While RHA's Chairman was generally respected by officials, a minority in 1978 were similarly critical of his management style. They referred to how JB operated as a "personnel manager" or "part-time Director", who confronted issues frequently as and when they arose. (137) They also believed that the DOs had greatest influence on Committee policy-making and that the Chairman liaised most closely with the Senior DOs. Moreover, it was evident that these newer Committee members held the work of the DOs in relatively low regard. As one Committee member commented in 1978:

The Development staff are mainly "PR" men. Any intelligent layman could perform their role ... It is technically qualified staff, with experience in the building trade, who can really determine the efficiency of the improvement programme. (138)

We have seen that these perceptions were also held by some staff at RHA and that similar tensions were reflected in GHA's development.

By Autumn 1978 RHA's more experienced officials generally recognised that the new Technical Officer held the confidence of certain Committee members, largely due to his age and experience. In effect an unofficial coalition had developed, which included the Technical Officer and a minority of Committee members, and which challenged established practices in RHA. (139) This power base served to exacerbate tensions in relations between staff and Committee and by December 1978 there was a growing consensus of opinion that the

Committee required to make decisions about changing the structure of organisational control.

In January 1979 a meeting was held to interview RHA's senior officials and to discuss alternative staff proposals for restructuring in the light of RHA's management problems.⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ There were two main areas of consensus amongst Committee members: that the Corporate Management Team was non-viable in the context of the tensions of that period, and that RHA should appoint a Chief Officer. The key functions of the Chief Officer were to include supervision of RHA's administrative organisation and coordination of staff support to the voluntary Management Committee. Committee members who favoured this appointment saw it as a means of increasing Committee control and management efficiency at RHA, in spite of what they perceived as unnecessary tensions and conflict between personalities and staff sections. These comments were made in interviews.

Organisation growth has resulted in less personal contact between Committee and staff. But also it has increased staff conflict. There are many petty jealousies.

The Committee have become worried that in practice staff are managing Reidvale. They are in control at present - but the Committee is committed to reestablish control.

We, the Committee, must be seen to be running Reidvale. (141)

By late 1978, therefore, when RHA employed 17 staff, several significant changes had affected work relationships and had culminated in these developments. First, we have seen that industrial relations developments since 1978 had established underlying tensions and awareness of contradictory expectations within the organisation. Secondly, organisational growth and specialisation had led to an obvious requirement for systematic internal coordination within the staff structure. Thirdly, the decision to incorporate technical expertise within the staff structure had resulted in RHA's growing incorporation of divergent staff commitments and approaches. Fourthly, the appointment of a senior official with building trade experience served to affect established patterns of control because of the significance of technical expertise, in the context of problems and uncertainties, and because of the greater ease certain Committee members found in relating to his skills and background. Fifthly, some Committee members were critical of RHA's Chairman's key role in the association. Finally, the Corporate (Tripartite) Management Team had lost credibility as an effective coordination body. This loss of credibility largely reflected staff concerns about the role of the Technical Officer and about the ineffectiveness of the Management Team approach - reservations which were also held by RHA's Chairman. As one member of staff commented:

Our criticisms and open attempts at presenting a picture of what we believe is really happening are viewed by some Committee members in terms of "sour grapes" and petty personality "jealousies". (142)

A poorly attended meeting in January resolved to recommend to the main January Committee meeting that the Technical Officer be appointed as RHA's Chief Officer. The announcement of this decision resulted in intense reactions, of a similar order to those described in the GHA case study. A major difference, however, was that in this instance the shock and anger which ensued were marked reactions amongst both staff and Committee members who had not attended. The vast majority of staff perceived the recommendation as reflecting a clear breakdown in trust and as being symptomatic of the growing divisions between staff and Committee at RHA. However the decision was never approved by the Management Committee and in May 1979, following an increasing openness of dialogue within RHA, the Technical Officer resigned from his post to take up a different position. Committee members who had been party to the initial proposal later commented that: 'Our initial proposal recommended an inappropriate candidate for the post of RHA's Senior Officer. It represented a serious mistake'; and that 'we have learnt more about management in our recent history than anyone might realise'.⁽¹⁴³⁾

However these same Committee members were disappointed that their Chairman had not brought his reservations into the open at an earlier stage. Some felt that the Chairman's approach in maintaining a 'peace-keeping role' on Committee and in 'personally attempting to resolve staff conflicts - including those between the Technical Officer and others' had served to prevent issues coming in to the open. The Chairman with hindsight agreed with these points.

At the time I felt it would do more harm than good to handle things openly. I was probably wrong ... Some problems are due to the Committee reacting to a fear of "loss of control" and reliance on staff. It was much easier when we were small ... The Committee must learn to look on staff as an important resource available to the community. We must accept and use sensibly their education and experience ... To some extent, the Committee now fear the monster they've created themselves (144)

We have seen how staff reacted to the initial decision with a mixture of shock, disappointment and anger. To an extent it led staff to question the credibility of Committee authority and their ability to make sensible management decisions. One staff member stated:

Committee power and the assertion of control by a small critical group was the overriding influence - not what was best for RHA and the people in the area. (145)

One active Committee member, however, who had been surprised by the intensity of staff reactions, argued differently: 'If staff are genuinely concerned about the people in Reidvale, then it won't matter to them who is in charge!', (146)

In general then, just as in the previous case study, the appointment of an individual with overall coordination responsibilities became a contentious issue at RHA - in terms of the timing of the appointment, the definition of responsibilities of the job, and the selection of an individual to fill the role. While the original proposal on the appointment was never ratified, the fact that it had happened at all effected a decline in work relationships in RHA. Against this background, new formal practices were established by

the Committee. First, a new structure of authority was resolved. The Corporate Team having been recognised as a failure, the Committee requested that the Senior Officers of each section should provide a monthly report direct to the Management Committee. One Committee member stated that: '... the hope is that by mid 1979 old wounds will be healed. Also we as a Committee must be seen to be running Reidvale HA'.⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Department heads were required to meet weekly to discuss common issues and some Committee members hoped that there would be an eventual return to a "cooperative" management team. Also, the Committee requested staff to attend meetings and to discuss staff issues openly.

Secondly, following a new awareness amongst Committee members that there had been some concern amongst staff about a former official's attendance and approach at meetings with consultants, the Committee requested that staff should propose a system of recording attendance, time-keeping and time off. Staff perceived this request for formalisation as reflecting a further 'break from trust'. While they agreed to present a system of recording such information to the Committee, they argued that the Committee would have to recognise that even the maintaining of such a record would have to presume trust!⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ Thirdly, in May 1979, faced by further recommendations for regrading and new appointments the Committee decided to establish a Staffing and Training Sub Committee to which Senior Department staff would report.

In general RHA's experience with the Technical Officer resulted in loss of interest in such a position in RHA. However RHA's participants were very concerned about the association's responsibilities in that sphere and recognised that post-improvement maintenance problems - for example, damp - were a recurrent aspect of rehabilitation. Also, as owners of a significant stock of unimproved properties, maintenance had become regarded as a key area of RHA's functions. In May 1979 a Housing Officer was asked to assume day to day responsibility for maintenance and since that time the Housing Management section has had overall responsibility for supervising maintenance standards and for reporting to a Maintenance Sub Committee. Further it has been recognised that Development and Maintenance staff must cooperate to ensure that improvement standards take account of potential maintenance problems. This pattern of operation has continued to the present day. Finally, on the theme of extending RHA's control over its affairs, since 1979 RHA has employed a Finance Officer - a pattern reflected in all CBHAs today.

Since 1980 staff and Committee relations have improved at RHA. In general, RHA's annual round of wage negotiations has not resulted in significant disputes. In that year, RHA's Committee was for the first time attended by a local councillor who took an interest in the details of RHA's affairs (RHA's first nominated councillor had seldom attended). The new participant brought to the Committee extensive experience in Trade Union work and a professional approach

to staffing issues. In general his contribution was valued by both Committee and staff during a difficult period in internal relations.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾

The issue of hierarchy, however, was not fully resolved until mid 1980. In the Autumn of 1979, several Committee members had revived the argument that RHA should appoint a Coordinator or Director. However at this point there was a dominant consensus that the association had the right person for the post within the organisation. There was recognition that the association's longest-serving DO had for some time 'operated as our Chief Officer in all but name'. Another Committee member stated, 'we need an officially recognised link man', while RHA's Chairman commented:

We do need someone in overall charge and most people know who I think that should be. And I don't mean a Director, but someone to take extra responsibility. For example recently it was delegated by Committee to the Secretary and myself, responsibility to decide or agree to procedures between Committee meetings - although we must obviously report back. Someone in the staff should have this responsibility. Also, I've got too involved in day to day management and staffing issues. (150)

In November 1979, the Staffing Sub Committee proposed to the main Management Committee that RHA should appoint a Coordinator. The Management Committee resolved that RHA would gain from establishing such a post and that the Senior DO should be appointed to the position. However, first they held a meeting to test staff reactions as the appointment of Directors was under discussion in the Union branch.⁽¹⁵¹⁾ In the event certain staff reactions came as a surprise to staff and Committee.

In essence some officials reacted against what they perceived as the Chairman's assumptions about the existence of consensus over the appointment. They requested the Committee to clarify the responsibilities of the new post and its implications for their own work and authority relations. Some staff questioned whether it was really necessary to abandon the attempt at Corporate Management, so soon. They argued that the two senior staff in Housing Management and Development sections were operating an effective system of dual coordination. These critics also argued that all staff are responsible for some responsibilities over and above their job descriptions, so why should one position at RHA be vested with more status, authority and pay because of its coordinating responsibilities? The Committee concluded the meeting by stating that they would clarify the responsibilities of the post and their conception of how the post would relate to staff and Committee responsibilities prior to further joint discussions.

I would suggest that three main factors had influenced the outcome of these joint discussions on the question of appointing a senior official in RHA. First, as RHA's Chairman commented in hindsight about his presentation of the proposal, 'consensus was assumed too quickly on the issue'. Some of those attending the meeting had reacted against their views being taken for granted, and this was a characteristic of policy-making discussions and work relations at RHA. Secondly, we have seen that the issue itself was highly contentious in the Glasgow housing association context during

1979 and certainly RHA's staff had been actively involved in the Union branch discussions on the question of appointing Coordinators or Directors.⁽¹⁵²⁾ In fact, a minority of staff in RHA was both ideologically opposed to such appointments and held reservations about their practical outcomes. One staff member commented that 'the appointment of Directors created conflict and high staff turnover and removed control from the Management Committee'.⁽¹⁵³⁾ Thirdly, it was certainly the case that the Committee had not systematically identified the functions of RHA's Coordinator prior to the meeting. The main reason for this was that prior to the meeting it had been informally recognised by most staff and Committee, and by other agencies in the housing association context, that RHA's senior DO had for some considerable time performed the major functions of internal coordination, Committee support and liaison and negotiation with external agencies.

2.c.5. Organisational outcomes, 1980 to 1983

Debate continued during the following months, after which the Committee resolved certain specific changes in RHA's formal organisational structure at its meeting of June 1980.⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ The Committee's decisions reflected its members' cumulative experience in their collective managerial role between 1978 and 1980 and they had evolved out of participants' intentions to formalise RHA's system of internal control and accountability. In general at this stage in RHA's development the Committee was in agreement about formalising and extending the association's structure of hierarchical control in order to increase the effectiveness of coordination and

control in the longer term. The positions in which the Committee chose to formalise additional responsibilities can be seen to have been influenced by past problems of control which had stemmed partly from the dynamics of organisational growth, but which had also reflected the key role of individuals in influencing tensions at RHA.

The Committee's discussions also suggested participants' awareness of the possibility that trust can be misplaced and their concern that authority (positional power) is open to abuse. Further, against the background of recent staff turnover and of tensions and conflicts, the Committee took its time to resolve how best to distribute authority and to ensure that consensus prevailed over key appointments in RHA.

In June 1980 it was finally resolved that RHA's senior DO would be appointed as RHA's Senior Officer. Secondly RHA's Senior Housing Officer was given overall responsibility for the Housing Management section, including authority over any technical housing management staff. Both officials had worked at RHA for four years by 1980 and they were still employed in their modified respective roles by 1984. Despite earlier expressions of dissent regarding the appointment of someone with overall responsibility within the staff structure, staff expressed no opposition to the Committee's June decision. The appointment of a Senior Officer at RHA was made some time after the experience of open internal conflict within the staff structure.

Over three years after the appointment, while no-one would suggest that relations are totally harmonious, it would appear that there are no significant or contentious issues relating to internal control at RHA. (155)

This does not mean that amongst staff there have been no dissenters. For example as in all associations staff have placed varying priorities on the different aspects of RHA's work. Clearly the advice and approach of long-experienced officials and members mediates between external constraints and controls in affecting policy-making and its outcomes, and this influence is inevitably recognised by newer staff who may be more or less appreciative of external constraints. At RHA certain staff have commented that while recognising the improvement programme as a priority, they would have preferred to see more liaison between Housing Management and Development sections, as well as a greater emphasis on the association's role in establishing structures which would serve to extend resident involvement in the longer term, for example a system of close and block representation. In May 1980, however, it was resolved that RHA should organise street meetings to provide information about the improvement programme and to stimulate interest in the work of the association, and public meetings have been held spasmodically since that time. (156) As in most other CBHAs there is a dominant view that the staff complement is largely insufficient to embark systematically on any attempt to devolve control, and that aims of extending participation may be most effectively pursued after the rehabilitation

programme is complete, in the "management phase". Therefore staff resources, participants' priorities and the presence of apathy have on certain fronts inhibited the evolution of stated policies into operative goals, and this has at times been a source of dissention within the organisation particularly amongst newer members who are unaware of, or impatient about, constraints. We saw that this pattern was also evident in Govanhill. On the question of extending participation, both RHA and GHA joined a minority of CBHA representatives who participated in a series of discussions in 1983 to 1984, which focused on new strategies of increasing tenant participation and of devolving control. Interestingly, only a minority of associations have been active in this respect. (157)

Despite differences of priorities and opinion, it is noteworthy that within RHA's organisation there is a considerable degree of mutual trust and respect and this characteristic has been well recognised in the wider housing association movement. Further, RHA has become increasingly involved and represented in key positions in external bodies which have sought to affect the political, economic and administrative environment in which associations operate. An active Committee member had chaired the Glasgow Forum, the West of Scotland's Regional Sub Committee of the SFHA for over five years by April 1984; RHA's Chairman was a coopted member of the SFHA Council between October 1979 and April 1984 and I should note that he received

the MBE for his services to 'the housing association movement in Scotland' in December 1983; RHA's Senior Officer was a member of the Council of the SFHA between May 1980 and April 1984; RHA's Housing Manager was invited in 1983 to join the Management Committee of a national housing association aiming to meet the special housing needs of the mentally handicapped; and finally one of RHA's DOs chaired the Union branch between 1978 and 1983.

As well as these external involvements, RHA's officials and Committee have at different times become involved with the varied local groups which operate in the neighbourhood centre, such as the Youth, Football and Pensioners' clubs and more recently a local action group to save the local primary school from threatened closure, and a group for the mentally handicapped.

There has been a vibrancy and sense of fun which observers cannot fail to recognise as characteristic of the organisational culture in Reidvale HA. This pattern, I would suggest, has helped to ensure continuity and cumulative experience of RHA's personnel. It is these same characteristics which have operated alongside the "commitment" aspect of participants' involvement to influence the staying power of many of GHA's staff and Committee. And it is this qualitative aspect of commitment which implies that in the voluntary housing movement, voluntarism is not solely a characteristic of Committee involvement. Despite changing attitudes and expectations on the industrial relations front, there is no doubt that commitment and actions beyond that specified in job descriptions are both

expected and received from paid officials in CBHAs.

By March 1984, of RHA's 11 Committee members, five had been members for between seven and eight years; and five others had been members for between three and five years. RHA's Committee is therefore considerably experienced at the present time. Similarly on the staff side, RHA's three senior staff are amongst the longest serving officials in Glasgow's CBHAs.⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ Further, five of RHA's 13 staff had joined RHA between 1978 and 1980.

In general we have seen in this section that, in both associations at different stages, different staff and Committee members in RHA were most influential. RHA's Chairman has clearly acted as a key figure throughout RHA's history to date. He has assumed and been vested with a major role in confronting ongoing issues on a daily basis. This "day to day" presence has meant that he has established important links with staff and in particular with senior officials. Similarly for much of GHA's history key individuals in Committee and staff have jointly influenced the association's development to date. Since the 1978 to 1979 turnover on GHA's Committee, GHA's Chairman and certain Committee members have become more intensively involved in monitoring their association's affairs.

We have seen that amongst staff during the Development phase, the most senior DOs who had access to, and control over, the association's improvement programmes most influenced the development of policy, and we have seen that this pattern was duplicated in other

associations. It is also evident that this pattern resulted in certain tensions and resentments. Further, it is significant that this pattern was challenged. Authority vested by Committee was at times defined by certain participants as illegitimate power, in that it was perceived as based on insufficient expertise and experience, or as unrelated to association objectives in the longer term.

It is significant that, in both associations, challenges to existing practices of control came from two directions. First, they came from officials who possessed the technical expertise relevant to key technical problems and uncertainties. Secondly, they came from Committee members, particularly from those more recently involved or active, who could not relate to the role and approach of Development staff. Out of both these patterns, in both associations, evolved liaisons between participants which crossed the member-official divide and which challenged established power relations. Other important similarities have stemmed from conflicts of interests focused on wages and work conditions, and from disputed ideological and practical concerns about the structuring of internal control and the extension of hierarchy within the staff structure.

Differences in management practices and organisational relations between the two associations have partly been influenced by individuals, their personalities and their conceptions of their role. These factors have influenced the recognised commitment of participants,

their organisational "fit" and their preferences about future employment or involvement. Also influential has been the interplay between organisational goals and external constraints. For example, both associations staffed up to service the improvement programme, and RHA did so optimistically in relation to a smaller programme than GHA. As a result of the slower pace of the programme than had been earlier projected, RHA has contracted its Development section, choosing not to replace two DOs who left in 1981 and 1983. Since 1980 the building programme has progressed more speedily.

I would conclude that the interaction of personalities, external conditions and conflicts of interest, will continue to influence the organisational development of both associations. Also the case studies would suggest that "control over uncertainties", which may be enabled by participants' expertise or position, is a key variable influencing power relations and tensions in CBHAs. In these respects, as we saw in Chapter Nine, CBHAs are no different from other organisations. In Part Five of the thesis I shall draw some further conclusions from the case studies of Reidvale and Govanhill Housing Associations.

Notes and References to Chapter Twelve

- (1) See Chapter Five for a discussion of the early development of CBHAs in Glasgow.
- (2) RHA was registered, under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1965 in April 1975, and with the Housing Corporation, January 1976.
- (3) These "uncertainties" were mentioned in interviews which were held during 1979 with almost all of RHA's early participants.
- (4) See Appendix to Chapter 12 which details the growth of RHA's capital expenditure.
- (5) Information sources for this section included Minutes of meetings of the Committee of Management of Reidvale Housing Association Ltd., which were held fortnightly between 1975 and 1977 and interviews with early participants, 1978 to 1979.
- (6) Management Committee Minutes, 22 October 1975 referred to RHA's projected promotional finance of £5,500.
- (7) As recorded in Minutes of RHA's Management Committee Meetings, June to December 1975.
- (8) These views were expressed in interviews with RHA's Chairman and Committee members, held December 1978 and January 1979.
- (9) See Chapter Ten for an account of RHA's formation. I interviewed the community worker, A Ohri, in December 1978. Ashok also provided me with access to his work reports, for 1973 and 1974.
- (10) Minute of RHA Committee Meeting, 26 November 1975. This Minute documents the Committee's discussions about the appointment of Accountants; about the need to approach the local bank manager for overdraft facility; and about the Committee's role in monitoring properties advertised for sale in the area.
- (11) Minute of RHA Management Committee Meeting, 7 January 1976.
- (12) These views were expressed in interviews by members of RHA, GHA and Assist, who had been active between 1975 and 1976.
- (13) Reidvale Residents' Association Gazette, (RRAG), February 1976.
- (14) Interview with RHA Committee member, October 1978.
- (15) As quoted in article 'Rehabilitation is People', Voluntary Housing, Summer 1976.

- (16) Interview with RHA Committee member, November 1978.
- (17) Interview with Development Officer, January 1979.
- (18) Interview, January 1979, op. cit.
- (19) Staff paper to Management Committee on Staffing Strategy, 29 March 1976.
- (20) Minute of RHA Management Committee Meeting, 26 May 1976 and interviews with RHA's staff and Committee members, between December 1978 and May 1980.
- (21) See Chapter Eleven.
- (22) Minute of Management Committee Meeting, 18 February 1976 records that although the association had negotiated an overdraft of £2,500 with the bank, the delay in registration with the Housing Corporation held up RHA's receipt of promotional funding.
- (23) Minutes of RHA Management Committee Meetings, 4 August 1976 and 15 September 1976. In September 1976 the Housing Corporation (HC) recognised RHA's cash flow problems by guaranteeing an overdraft of £16,500.
- (24) Reported by RHA Committee Member in interview, March 1979.
- (25) Letter from RHA's first Development Officer (DO) to senior officer of the HC Glasgow office, 14 October 1976.
- (26) Interview with RHA's Senior Development Officer, June 1979.
- (27) All CBHAs have faced this problem. However since 1980 associations have approached other housing agencies (e.g. SSHA and GDC) to provide empty houses for decanting.
- (28) Letter from thw HC Glasgow office to RHA's Chairman, 24 March 1977 and RHA's reply, 1 April 1977.
- (29) Minutes of Finance and General Purposes Sub Committee, 18 April 1977 and 18 May 1977. Also report by Finance Officer, Housing Corporation to RHA Management Committee, May 1977.
- (30) RHA Annual Report 1977, pp. 10 - 11.
- (31) I was employed as an Assistant DO in RHA during 1977 and attended the "opening".
- (32) These options were discussed at meetings of RHA's Management Committee, 17 and 31 March 1976.
- (33) The "showhouse" consisted of a ground floor tenement house which was improved by RHA to enable local people to visualise what rehabilitation might mean for them.

- (34) I interviewed Assist architects who worked with RHA in March and April 1979.
- (35) Interview April 1979 with J. Johnson, Director of Assist.
- (36) I attended the meeting at the HC on 14 April 1977.
- (37) Development Sub Committee Minutes 1979.
- (38) See J.G. Davies, The Evangelistic Bureaucrat, Tavistock Publications, 1972, Chapter 24, pp. 204 - 209.
- (39) See Appendix which documents trends affecting owner-occupation in Reidvale.
- (40) I have reached these general conclusions from my involvement in RHA's social survey of residents' housing conditions and preferences in one Action Area in 1977; from discussions with owner-occupiers in Reidvale and from interviews with owner-occupiers in 1979, including two who were active on RHA's Owner-Occupiers' Sub Committee.
- (41) I experienced both these responses as a DO in 1977.
- (42) Interviews with staff and Committee members in seven CBHAs, during 1979 and 1980.
- (43) These criticisms were evident in Minutes of RHA's Management Committee Meetings, 14 July 1976, 4 August 1976 and 6 April 1977. They were discussed in interviews with the community worker and the Chairman of Reidvale Residents' Association, January and February 1979.
- (44) For example, following discussions between Committee and staff, on work conditions, pay and relativities, Spring 1977.
- (45) My own experience as a DO in 1977.
- (46) See Chapter Eleven.
- (47) Interview with local resident who was active on the Community Council and in local politics, March 1979. Similar comments were expressed at residents' meetings, for example at joint meeting of Reidvale Residents' Association and Camlachie Community Council, 12 November 1979.
- (48) On the question of access to compensation in demolition areas, see 'A Guide to Housing Action Areas for Demolition', Community Projects Foundation, Information Sheet No 1., Sept., 1979.

- (49) Reidvale Housing Association Ltd (RHA), Annual Report, 1978, pp. 18 - 23.
- (50) RHA Annual Report, 1978, pp. 24 - 25.
- (51) Minute of RHA's Annual General Meeting, June 1977.
- (52) RHA Annual Report, 1979 to 1980, pp. 12 - 13.
- (53) Mr N's commitment to ensuring the local monitoring of policy-making and actions by RHA's participants was also emphasised in interviews, March and June 1979.
- (54) See Chapter Nine.
- (55) See RHA Annual Report 1977, especially Chairman's Report, pp. 2 - 3 and Part III, pp. 16 - 19.
- (56) Annual Report, 1977, op. cit., p. 16.
- (57) Ibid. p. 19.
- (58) Ibid. p. 3.
- (59) Ibid. p. 19.
- (60) The 1977 survey identified that in three tenement blocks, pensioners lived in 20% of occupied houses.
- (61) RHA, Report of Survey, 1978.
- (62) See Chapters Six and Seven.
- (63) Interview with RHA's Senior Officer, April 1984.
- (64) See Appendices to Chapters Eleven and Twelve.
- (65) See Chapters Seven and Eight for a general discussion of these influences on associations.
- (66) Interviews with RHA's DOs, 1979 and 1980, a period during which I spent two days per week in RHA's office and was therefore closely in touch with developments.
- (67) RHA, Annual Report, 1979 to 1980, 'The Problem of Shops', pp. 29 - 31.

- (68) Interview with RHA's Senior Officer, April 1984.
- (69) Interviews with DOs, July 1981 and September 1982.
- (70) See Chapters Six and Seven.
- (71) These developments were reported in Minutes of RHA's Management Committee, July 1977 to December 1978 and in Improvement Reports by staff to RHA's Development Sub Committee. See also, RHA Annual Report, 1978, pp. 2 - 3 and 6 - 7.
- (72) Reidvale Housing Association Newsletter, February 1978.
- (73) Letter to Secretary of State, 15 January 1978.
- (74) Letter to the Under Secretary of State for Scotland from North Camlachie Community Council, 20 February 1978.
- (75) Letter from Under Secretary of State, Scottish Development Department, 27 January 1978.
- (76) Letter from Private Secretary to the Under Secretary of State to the Chairman of the Community Council, 19 May 1978.
- (77) Discussion after RHA's Development Sub Committee meeting, July 1979.
- (78) These delays were discussed in Development staff report on 'Progress of the Development Programme for first 9 months of 1979/1980, with projections to year end'. Also delays, influences and implications were discussed in interviews with Development staff in May 1980 and June 1981.
- (79) Stated at Development Sub Committee, July 1979.
- (80) These patterns were notably evident when in 1980 I analysed files documenting the progress of six schemes, four of which exceeded cost limits by between 10.5% and 29.46%; and one which exceeded cost limits by 62.67%. On all these schemes, savings were required by the Housing Corporation.
- (81) See Minutes of Development Sub Committee February to August 1979. In August 1979 extra finance of £50,000 was approved by the HC for work to the rear wall.
- (82) Interviews with DOs and Committee members May 1982 and April 1984. See Appendix for details of development progress.

- (83) For example, RHA Post Improvement Surveys, 1979.
- (84) Information supplied by RHA's Senior Officer April 1984.
- (85) See Chapters Five, Six and Seven.
- (86) See Chapter Ten.
- (87) Springburn and Possilpark HA was registered in June 1976; Meadowside and Thornwood HA was registered in September 1977; Bridgeton and Dalmarnock HA and Whiteinch and Scotstoun HA were registered in February 1978.
- (88) Interview with official in Glasgow office of the Housing Corporation, November 1978.
- (89) The GDC Feasibility Study was carried out by private consultants between 1975 and 1977 in Reidvale. The same architects surveyed Cardross Street in 1976.
- (90) I began attending RHA's Committee meetings bimonthly, shortly after these representations had taken place. These events were also discussed in interviews with members of Reidvale Residents' Association and of RHA during 1979.
- (91) See Appendix for outline of RHA's development progress.
- (92) Interview with Senior Officer, April 1984.
- (93) For both case study associations, this problem was greatest following the moratorium in November 1980.
- (94) RHA paper on 'New Build Housing Proposals', March 1984.
- (95) Ibid.
- (96) See J. Lambert, C.Paris and B. Blackaby, Housing Policy and the State, Allocation, Access and Control, Macmillan Press, 1978, Chapter 4, pp. 63 - 91 and J. Gower Davies, The Evangelistic Bureaucrat, 1974, Parts II and III.
- (97) RHA Ltd. 'Policy Statement relating to the sale of houses under the provisions of the Tenants' Rights Etc (Scotland) Act, 1980', First Issued September 1981; Revised February 1984, see Clauses 2.c. and 3.b.4.
- (98) Interview with RHA Senior Officer, April 1984.

- (99) Reidvale Housing Association, Annual Report, 1977, p. 20.
- (100) Ibid.
- (101) Reidvale Housing Association Annual Report, 1979 to 1980, pp. 32 - 33.
- (102) Interviews with RHA's Housing Manager and Housing Officers, April 1984.
- (103) Interview with RHA Housing Officer responsible for Maintenance, April 1984.
- (104) Minutes of RHA Housing Management Sub Committee, 1979 to 1981.
- (105) Interviews and discussions were conducted regularly with Housing Management staff between 1979 and 1980, when I worked from a desk in the office.
- (106) Interviews with Housing Officers and DOs, 1979 and 1981.
- (107) Minutes of Housing Management Sub Committee, 1977.
- (108) Minutes of Housing Management Sub Committee, 1980. Also interviews with staff and Committee members, May 1980.
- (109) Staff paper on the 'Involvement of Development Officers and Housing Assistants during Improvements', discussed at staff meetings January 1979.
- (110) Interview with Housing Assistant, May 1979.
- (111) Reidvale Housing Association Ltd., Lettings Policy, 1980, p.2.
- (112) Commented in interviews with Housing Manager and Committee members, May and June 1980.
- (113) Paper on Analysis of Lettings by RHA, April 1984.
- (114) Interview with RHA's Housing Manager, April 1981.
- (115) I attended public meetings jointly organised by Reidvale Residents' Association and North Camlachie Community Council in November 1979 and January 1980.
- (116) For example such comments were made at RHA Housing Management Sub Committee, September 1978 and at public meetings, 1979 and 1980.

- (117) See Chapter Seven.
- (118) Interview with Chairman, North Camlachie Community Council, reported in Reidvale Housing Association Annual Report, p. 12.
- (119) See Chapters Nine and Eleven.
- (120) See RHA Annual Report 1978.
- (121) Minutes of RHA Management Committee Meeting, 18 August 1976 and 17 November 1976.
- (122) RHA's Staffing and Training Sub Committee was formed in 1979.
- (123) RHA's second DO was involved at RHA since early in 1976. Since 1980 he has been RHA's Senior Officer.
- (124) In describing these patterns I have mainly drawn on my experience as a DO employed by RHA in 1977.
- (125) This recognition was evident at meeting of RHA's Management Committee, 25 June 1980, which I attended as observer.
- (126) These conclusions about turnover have been drawn from interviews with Committee members and staff, between 1979 and 1980 and in 1984, as well as from analysis of RHA's Annual Reports.
- (127) Interview with RHA Committee members November 1979 and May 1980.
- (128) Interviews with RHA officials at regular intervals between November 1978 and June 1980.
- (129) During the main period of research and observation, 1978 to 1980, I was involved in regular unstructured discussions with both staff and Committee members.
- (130) See Chapter Eight.
- (131) Interview with Committee member in December 1978. He later became a member of staff at RHA.
- (132) Interview with RHA official, March 1979.
- (133) These perspectives and the events influencing changes in staff and Committee relations were a regular topic of discussions and interviews, between 1979 and 1982.
- (134) Interview with RHA Committee member, December 1978.

- (135) This was commented in interviews with all staff at RHA during December 1978, apart from the Technical Officer who was unable to grant me an interview.
- (136) Interviews with RHA Committee members, June 1979.
- (137) Stated in interviews by two RHA officials in June and August 1979.
- (138) Stated in interview, March 1979.
- (139) The "coalition" was referred to in discussions with both experienced officials and some Committee members between October 1978 and March 1979.
- (140) These proposals were discussed at a special meeting of RHA's Committee, 24 January 1979.
- (141) These comments by Committee members were stated in discussions after the meeting of 24 January 1979.
- (142) Interview with RHA official, February 1979.
- (143) Interviews with Committee members involved in January meetings, March and May 1979.
- (144) Interview with RHA's Chairman, March 1979.
- (145) Interview with Development Officer, January 1979.
- (146) Interview with Committee member, January 1979.
- (147) Interview with Committee member, April 1979.
- (148) Staff meeting about annual holidays and timekeeping which I attended, 30 March 1979.
- (149) The District Councillor was elected May 1980 and joined RHA's Committee, 2 June 1980.
- (150) Interview with RHA's Chairman, November 1979.
- (151) The joint staff and Committee Meeting was held 4 December 1979.
- (152) See Chapter Eight.
- (153) Staff comment at joint meeting in December 1979.

- (154) Minute of Meeting of RHA Management Committee, 23 June 1980.
- (155) My conclusions here have been drawn from my discussions with key participants, between 1982 and 1983.
- (156) Minute of RHA Management Committee, 7 May 1980.
- (157) The seminars on Tenants' Participation for housing association participants were organised by the Tenants' Participation Advisory Service.
- (158) RHA's Senior Officer and Housing Manager were employed in 1976 and RHA's sole remaining DO was employed in 1977.

APPENDIXREIDVALE HOUSING ASSOCIATION LIMITED

	<u>31</u> <u>March</u> <u>1976</u>	<u>31</u> <u>March</u> <u>1977</u>	<u>31</u> <u>March</u> <u>1978</u>	<u>31</u> <u>March</u> <u>1979</u>	<u>31</u> <u>March</u> <u>1980</u>	<u>31</u> <u>March</u> <u>1981</u>	<u>31</u> <u>March</u> <u>1982</u>	<u>31</u> <u>March</u> <u>1983</u>	<u>31</u> <u>March</u> <u>1984</u>
Units in Housing Action Areas	0	463	1114	1114	1114	1114	1114	1114	1114
Units in Project Areas	0	463	787	1114	1114	1114	1114	1114	1114
Units in ownership	78	350	596	747	870	929	954	981	1044
Units improved									
Pre-improvement	0	0	46	103	160	342	399	539	745
Post-improvement	0	0	43	90	137	280	327	444	606
Units improved (other owners)	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	9	14
Commercial Property									
RHA	0	2+	2	2	3	3	3	3	9
Others	0	0	6	6	6	6	6	22	23
Shareholders	29	147	276	398	465	487	426++	421	
Capital Expenditure (£ million)	0.01	0.52	0.86	0.98	1.92	1.19	1.80	3.26	3.44

+ One since sold to tenant

++ Reduction followed a review of members who had moved away and wished to cancel membership,
and also deaths.