Pearl Jephcott: Reflections, Resurgence and Replications

John Goodwin and Henrietta O'Connor

Abstract
100-150 words

Keywords: Pearl Jephcott, Women Sociologists, Research Methods

Contact details

John Goodwin
School of Media, Communication and Sociology
University of Leicester
107-111 Princess Road East
Tel: 0116 2525922
e-mail: jdg3@leicester.ac.uk

Henrietta O'Connor (corresponding author)
School of Media, Communication and Sociology
University of Leicester
107-111 Princess Road East
Tel: 0116 2525952
e-mail: hso1@leicester.ac.uk

Introduction

This special issue of the *Women's History Review* is dedicated to the work of Pearl Jephcott (1900-1980) and draws upon papers presented at a conference held at the University of Leicester in July 2015: *Gender, Youth, Community, Methodology and More: A Symposium Celebrating the Life and Work of Pearl Jephcott*. Pearl was a social researcher whose work spanned much of the twentieth-century and her work and publications can be categorised as being focused on the themes of social justice, inequality, ethnicity, gender, work, leisure time, the 'everyday' experience, children and young people, housing, education, crime and health – both physical and mental. Pearl was also concerned with the lives of girls and women in a period when little attention was paid to their experience of everyday life and, as Oakley suggests below, her approach was 'trailblazing'. Pearl forged a pathway for later researchers not only in her focus on women but also in her innovative research methods, her desire to foreground the voice of the researched and her shift away from the large-scale quantitative surveys of the period to focus on individual experiences of everyday life.

> 'Then there was Pearl, an absolute pearl among all the LSE women for her trailblazing social research into the lives of girls and women' (Oakley 2015: 117-8)

Yet despite being an innovative researcher and a prolific writer, much of Pearl's work now tends to be neglected by those working in similar fields today. Unlike many other social researchers of the same generation her commitment to social research and her innovative, forward thinking research projects were not rewarded with a high profile, high status academic career. Her research trajectory largely comprised short-term, insecure contracts working on externally funded projects often led, on paper at least, by senior men. Notwithstanding her professional precarity she was a prolific researcher and published widely over a period spanning five decades. Her seemingly unorthodox path contributes to what is, in many respects, her 'forgotten legacy' for she has rarely been given credit for the outstanding contribution made during her lifetime. As such, the aim of the conference, and subsequently this special issue, was to provide a corrective to this neglect and to shine a light on the value of Pearl's work for contemporary social science research. Although in recent times there has been some resurgence of interest in Pearl's extensive body of work – *Clubs for Girls* (1942) *Girls Growing Up* (1942), *Rising Twenty* (1948), *Some Young People* (1954), *Married Women Working* (1962), *A Troubled Area: Notes on Notting Hill* (1964), *Time of One's Own* (1967) and *Homes in High Flats* (1971) – this volume is significant because it enables us to pay tribute to Pearl's contribution, to learn more about why her work has often been forgotten and to show how her work is should be revisited by those social scientists who recognise the value and relevance of research work that has gone before.

In the remainder of this introduction to the special issue we offer a brief biographical sketch before reflecting on why we should revisit past studies, and previous generations of researchers such as Pearl Jephcott. We then briefly illustrate some of Pearl's core concerns and approaches as detailed in her exemplary book *Time of One's Own* (1967). We then go on to examine some of introduce the remaining papers in this special issue of *Women's History Review*.

Brief Biographical Sketch

Pearl Jephcott was born in 1900, at the tail-end of the Victorian-era and grew up in Warwickshire. She attended the local grammar school before graduating with a first degree in History from the University of Wales, Aberystwyth University in 1922 (Turnbull, 2004) and later a master's degree (1949). Although her academic life was productive she did not enter professional academia until 1950 at the age of fifty. Her early professional life was spent working in the youth and community sector for organisations such as the National Association of Girls Clubs. Her research and writing expertise were, however, evident during this early period and before taking up her first university post she had already published a series of books on the subject of young women and leisure time. In 1950 she accepted a post at the University of Nottingham where she worked on the research project *The Social Background of Delinquency* (1954) and later published *Some Young People* (1954). In 1954, she moved to the London School of Economics to work with Richard Titmuss who had secured funding for a large-scale study of married women's work and employment in Bermondsey, south-east London. This project culminated in the publication of the book *Married Women Working* (1962). Pearl's employment at the LSE was on a series of temporary contracts which came to an abrupt and possibly controversial end in 1962 (see Oakley 2015; Goodwin and O'Connor 2015; Martin 2016). Despite her temporary lack of institutional affiliation Jephcott continued her research and some years later took her final academic post at the University of Glasgow leading a project on youth leisure in Scotland and later carrying out the research for her highly influential studies on youth leisure and high-rise living published as *Time of One's Own* (1967) and *Homes in High Flats* (1971) respectively. She left Glasgow in 1970 but continued her research career with projects in the West Indies, Guiana, Hong Kong, Birmingham and elsewhere, until her death in 1980.

Reflections: What look Back at 'Past Studies'?

Our interest in Pearl's work stemmed initially from our other research and the restudies we conducted of school to work transition projects, from the 1960s through to the 1980s. During the course of this research we discovered the rich and varied nature of Jephcott's collection of publications that overlapped in so many ways with our own work. However, the discovery of Pearl's work caused us to reflect on both the necessity of 'looking back' at past research and to consider the reasons why, problematically, much of contemporary social science often ignores 'legacy research' and past studies, or what Law and Lybeck (2015) have called 'selective sociological amnesia'. For us looking back was a real necessity as the need to revisit what had been done before was

central to aiding our understanding of the nexus of inter-relationships in which these legacy projects we were exploring were developed, funded, operationalised, researched and disseminated. In so doing we were exposed to a range of studies previously unknown to us (including Jephcott's work) and, we suspect, which have now simply become obscured by the passage of time for many others. For us, these dusty book jackets of 'studies past' hide a veritable treasure trove of what was once 'state of the art' research but which is now largely forgotten or just simply ignored. Yet this seems both wasteful and saddening as there is so much still to learn from legacy research and there are so many studies which deserve to be revisited or reconsidered. The fact that they are not, and that such legacy studies are so readily overlooked is, we would argue, problematic for a number of reasons.

First, the process of 'disregarding' is part of a broader tendency that assumes that all that legacy studies, and associated research monographs contain, are 'old' not only in a chronological sense but also in terms of their utility i.e. that these studies have nothing 'new' to articulate of offer that is not already known. This relates to the dominant progress model of scientific knowledge that undergirds much of social scientific research – a model of research which posits that knowledge is a linear product that 'flows' in one direction towards greater 'clarity and truth', with each discovery building upon the last. Dunning and Hughes (2013:126) illustrate this approach by evoking Elias's metaphor of swimmers diving into the 'stream of knowledge at particular times and places'. The stream of knowledge 'flows' yet the dominant trend is to view the place we 'dive in' as the point from which all advancements originate. What about the accumulated knowledge downstream? As such a re-reading of any text, be it five years old or fifty-five years old, has the potential to offer new and original insights or to prompt new thinking when the ideas contained within are considered via a 'contemporary lens' or are reconsidered in the 'present context'. Indeed, these legacy studies, as with other materials that document social life, have 'considerable value as both the subject and object of subsequent research' (Hughes and Goodwin 2014: XX).

Second, the overlooking of past studies is not simply a process of moving on but is also reflective of the 'fetishisation the present' (see O'Connor and Goodwin 2013) Such an approach implies that the 'here and now', or the issues of contemporary interest are somehow hermetically sealed off from what went before. Or more problematic, 'issues' for research emerge out of 'nowhere'. Such an epistemological fallacy prompts us to consider more and more 'what is now' rather that how did we get here/how did this come to be? Yet discussions and explanations are narrowed if research remains focused only

> '…on contemporary problems. One cannot ignore the fact that every present society as grown out of earlier societies and points beyond itself to a diversity of possible futures' (Elias 1985: 226)

Third, unless past research has attracted the sobriquet of 'classic' then for many it is simply not worth bothering with. Why re-read it? However, who is it that determines what is or becomes classic study (or otherwise) in social science research? Of course, there are those studies that have moved debates and ideas forward or have

operationalized ground-breaking research designs or where findings have significantly shaped subsequent research agendas for many years to come. Yet these are often value judgements. However well-intentioned or deserved in some respects the 'classic' tag may be unhelpful in that it could detract from those perfectly useful 'other' studies which still have a great deal to offer.

The social sciences are replete with past research studies, books, monographs and reports worthy of a 'second look' in connection with what they can offer to our understanding contemporary debates and, for us, and those connected with this special issue, Pearl Jephcott is a prime example of a researcher whose work is now largely ignored but which should be reconsidered. Yes, it is chronologically correct that most of Pearl's publications are to be found largely located mid last century, yet a re-reading of Pearl's books has real potential to offer new and original insights. For example, while working on this special issue the Grenfell Tower tragedy occurred. We were struck by her foresight as we re-read *A Troubled Area: Notes on Notting Hill* (1964) and what Pearl wrote about that part of North Kensington and the housing conditions in the neighbourhood some fifty years earlier. When read in tandem with the reports and comments emanating from the aftermath of the catastrophe it is clear that there were issues identified in 2017 mirrored many of Pearl's concerns highlighted in 1964. She wrote 'many houses are sub-standard. The difficulty of finding any home at all is such a commonplace situation in London that it needs no labouring … As far as the Borough of Kensington is concerned its own housing list is long and moves slowly' (p.32). Yet who is reading *A Troubled Area: Notes on Notting Hill* (1964) now? Who is making the connections between a book written and researched over fifty years ago and the genesis of this recent human tragedy? Instead, most commentaries focused on the here and now or, at best, the very recent past, as if these issues emerged from nowhere. Yet we could gain some insights into this particular tragedy by looking back at past social science studies. It may well be the case, with Pearl's work specifically, the fact here books may not be deemed to be 'classics' is the product of the patriarchal structures of male social science which both diminishes her contribution and hides her books from view for subsequent generations – for which we are all poorer. Any reading of Pearl work shows her to be highly topical and her analyses remain both important today and remarkably prescient sociology.

Resurgence: 'Jephcottian' Core Themes, Concerns and Approaches

As suggested above, Pearl Jephcott's concerns were wide ranging, her approach to research creative and her research sites both multiple and diverse. She researched social justice, inequality, ethnicity, gender, work, leisure time, children and young people, housing, education, crime and health via a concern for capturing the everyday lived experiences of those she researched. To give voice to her respondents she let them 'speak for themselves' and was not constrained by the conventional epistemological or ontological proclivities of the time. Instead she used art, ethnographic immersion, biographical methods and participatory action research at a time when all of these approaches were not particularly fashionable in the survey-dominated atmosphere of post-war British social science. Hers is a sociology based on

rigorous research design where the sociologist documents and explores in order to explain. It is a sociology where the researcher offers evidence-based recommendations rather than political tracts. Given its originality and significance her book *Time of One's Own* (1967) is perhaps the prime exemplar of this and Pearl's core themes, concerns and approach (contributors to this special issue also return to this work later in the issue).

At the heart of a Time of One's Own was a very simple research question - 'how do young Scots use their free time nowadays?' (Jephcott 1967: 1). The origins of the research emerged from the Standing Consultative Council on Youth Service in Scotland and the Scottish Education Department who contracted, and funded, the University of Glasgow's Department for Social and Economic Research to undertake a project on how 15-19 years olds used their spare time. Jephcott (1967) reports that the aim was to move leisure away from just being a footnote to work but to become more of an area of study in its own right. Proving to be an early forerunner of what is now referred to as studies of the missing middle, the ordinary kids or the 'typical', as opposed to focusing on these young people at the margins, (see, for example Goodwin and O'Connor 2013) the study was:

> …particularly concerned with the middle group of critical and non-conforming young people who remain unaffected by organised youth activities and at the same time avoid becoming part of the delinquent or actively anti-social minority (Jephcott 1967:3).

The fieldwork was located in three areas: a ten-year-old housing estate in north-west Glasgow (Drumchapel), an established urban district of Glasgow (Dennistoun) and an 'expanding' industrial town in the Scottish central belt (Armadale). Jephcott developed quite a complex, and thorough research design that began with 43 volunteers interviewing 15-19 year olds in the three areas, using their 'own' research schedules. A further six 'young researchers' were enlisted to collect data in cafes, pubs, youth groups, dance halls and so forth via 'casual contact'. Based on this data an interview schedule was devised and a pilot study of 123 interviews was then conducted in adjunct districts to the areas of research. A main sample of 600 interviews were then completed in the study areas with the interviews mainly taking place in respondents' homes, with the homes being chosen via a simple random sample of addresses. This material was then supplemented with detailed research notes collected during 76 informal small discussion groups, written commentaries from 1,600 young people and through meetings with an additional 40 youngsters and, finally, diaries from 'just a few adolescents' (Jephcott 1967: 43). This rich, detailed web of data revealed an increasingly complex picture of youth leisure in the 1960s and the bourgeoning opportunities leisure brought for some whilst others, least able to voice their needs, remained shut off from leisure. The use of young researchers, the strategy of recruiting via casual contacts, the written commentaries, diaries and group discussions are all illustrative of Pearl's commitment to creative research practice. A mosaic of data collections methods used in combination to illuminate the research problem. Yet despite the depth and breadth of her approach here it is not, perhaps, this 'textual'

data that grabs the reader's attention. Instead, a key feature of the book is Jephcott's use of very distinctive and unique images.

INSERT TABLE ONE ABOUT HERE

There are twenty-four images in the book and Jephcott, in the first instance, adopts a fairly conventional visual method approach by incorporating black and white photographs as representations of each of the research areas: Drumchapel, Dennistoun and Armadale. These images depict fairly drab urban scenes, public housing of the period so typical of central belt Scotland or the residential/industrial landscape of Armadale. However, this was not the limit of her approach and Jephcott evidently had something more innovative in mind:

> In exploring the how and why of the youngster's leisure one experimental method tried was to get young professional artist to make sketches of how the adolescents in the three areas were spending their hours after work. This technique was used on the assumption that the artist sees much deeper than the man [sic] in the street. These sketches, together with certain ones produced by boys and girls aged 14 and 15 suggest that adolescence in the three areas were far less uniform that implied by the blanketing and vaguely denigratory image evoked by the word 'teenager'. (Jephcott 1967: 9)

As Jephcott suggests the 'standard' area photographs reproduced in the book are supplemented with nine half tone plates printed on high-quality, 'photographic' style paper, two maps and twelve distinctive black and white line drawings. There are an additional thirteen images that were collected as part of the research, but not used in the book. The published and unpublished paintings, drawings and photographs from *Time of One's Own* are so evocative of time when the 'teenager' was coming into his/her own and distinct 'youth cultures' were emerging. From the clothes they wore, to the places they socialised, to the work they did, Pearl's writings and accompanying images offer a real insight into the lives 1960s teenagers. The images are vivid and, in certain instances, have a photo-realism about the leisure experiences of young people.

Such an approach, we would argue, is innovative for three main reasons. First, Jephcott started to use images at a time when 'visual sociology' was not that fashionable, especially in British empirical 'survey oriented' sociology of the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s. Strangleman (2008:1492) reminds us that visual sociology has a rich tradition from the '19th century to the great war' and as many have pointed out (see, for example, Becker 1982; Henry 1986; Harper 1988) while in early years of the American Journal of Sociology, the use photographic illustrations was commonplace, the use of images in this journal had disappeared by the 1920s. Hughes (2013) argues that the decline in image use reflects significant trends within 'habits of good sociology'. For many the use of images began to be perceived as 'un-scientific', frivolous devices that should be kept separate from 'serious' sociological enquiry. Hughes argues that this trend away from images 'appears to echo a more general belief that images are

'involved' and text is 'detached' (Hughes 2013: 5). For Rose (2007) it was the 'cultural turn' that emerged in the 1970s that led to visual representations returning to social and cultural analyses. Jephcott was slightly ahead of this curve. Second, while there is an establish tradition in visual methods of interpreting 'art' in the form of famous paintings and craft-based images (see, for example, Elias 2012: Berger 1972: Becker 1982) it remains unusual for a researcher to
commission drawings and paintings of their respondents. It is more usual for researchers to request that their respondents produce drawing, paintings or capture images (see, for example Bolton *et al.* 2001) but the commissioning of professional artists to produce artwork specifically for analytical representation is rare. Finally, Jephcott's combination of commissioned images, respondent generated images and documentary photography, used alongside 'text' makes a *Time of One's Own* an incredibly powerful book, but a book nonetheless that does not appear in any of the standard introductions to visual methods, image-based research of visual sociology.

As it stands Jephcott does not explain or 'textualise' the images, she does not explain, nor does she interpret. However, the images are so interesting when considered from the prism of present and we are mindful of Fyfe and Law's (1988:1) assertion that 'a depiction is never just an illustration…it is the site for the construction of social difference'. As such in these images of youth leisure what Jephcott, via the artists, is offering is a whole series of relational clues, multiple subject positions in 'ethnographic scenes' that were never stated in the text and a myriad of open-ended possibilities for interpretation and 'reading'. The temptation to 'say what you see' is very powerful when confronted with these images and the question of what you see

> …can lead to new understandings of the importance of visual evidence… if visual texts were used, not as mere illustrations, selected to confirm what has been previously determined through written sources, but instead as points of entry and springboards for speculation. (Kasson 1998: 95)

The images are so rich that they 'invite' us to interpret and, in this spirit, we tentatively 'speculate' briefly what two of images tell us[1].

IMAGE ONE HERE

The first image is 'Leisure at Home'. This is a black and white line drawing depicting leisure within the living room of a 'typical' male respondent in the book. The 'telly' is foregrounded in the image is highly suggestive of evenings sat watching television as family group, as Jephcott suggests. However, there is much more to be seen here. There are two characters featured in the drawing – a young male standing and an older female sitting, slightly forward, on a sofa. The assumed relationship within the picture is that the sitting female is the mother to the standing male.

> A good many youngsters gave the impression that almost the only answer on how to spend one's time when at home was to watch the telly. It was practically always on and in a one living-room home can hardly be disregarded. (Jephcott 1967: 3)

The woman in the image is wearing ankle boots and a scarf, there also appears to be a thick coat draped over the back of the sofa. The suggests that she has just come in from the outside, where it is cold, or that she is just about to stand up from her sitting position and is on her way out. Her position on the sofa, sat slightly forward suggests that she is about to leave. In general, her manner of dress is an older style that the young male and this is perhaps used as a signifier of her age. Her hairstyle is also that of older women. Her handbag is to left on the sofa and it appears she has her hands on some papers also placed on the sofa. The young male in the image is standing, hands on hips in a very confident style. His chest is slightly puffed out and he is looking out of the image towards the viewer/artist. He has short cropped hair of the 'mod style' popular in the 1960s. He is wearing a fashionable striped jumper and black jeans or trousers with 'turn ups'. The turn-ups, while fashionable, indicate that the trousers were too long for the male but that he had not chosen to have them tailored. It may be the case that he had returned home from work earlier in the day and changed or could also be that he is getting ready for a night out given what appears to be an aftershave bottle (reminiscent of an old 'Old Spice' bottle) placed on the mantle above the fire. In the foreground of the image there are cufflinks and a hanky placed on the top of the TV.

The room in which the picture is 'set' is also very interesting. There is a large corner cupboard or 'press' that is very typical of this period. The fireplace and mantelpiece are evocative of the 'tile style' fire surrounds typical of houses built from the 1930s onwards. There are the accoutrements of an open fire placed on the hearth of the fireplace – a poker and a brush, however, while the objects of an open fire are apparent there is an electric fire in the grate, which appears to be plugged in. On the mantelpiece there is a teacup placed. If we have any doubt that this is a drawing of a Scottish living room the tartan motif of the female's skirt and the thistle pattern of the carpet should leave the viewer of the image with little doubt.

The table is set for 'tea'. There is a teapot and a milk bottle set behind it. The teapot looks like a metal pot/wooden handle pot so typical of the era. Teacups, not matching, are placed either on top of the veneer-clad television or on the mantle – they had finished their drinks and placed them down. At the right of the picture on the table is a stack of plates and a bottle of sauce. What is not is clear whether they have eaten or whether these things are here for use later – the sauce being easily accessible as opposed to being kept away in a cupboard. The teapot, the cups, the clothes, the fireplace, the cupboard are all signifiers that this is a working-class home. In our previous analysis of the field notes from the 1960s, researchers often made the disparaging remarks where 'pots and pans', or other vestiges of food consumption, were so conspicuously left out of the table. The fact that the teapot, cups, plates and a sauce bottle are left out on view is somehow reflective not of refined manners or taste but of something 'lower' (Elias 2012). Indeed, there are echoes of what Orwell describes *The Road to Wigan Pier* of the 'several bottles of Worcester sauce' left on the table in the common boarding house (see Orwell 1937).

IMAGE TWO HERE

The second image is 'Young Girl Serving in Café, Dennistoun'. This black and white line drawing depicts a scene from a café in the 1960s. Cafes were a key site for spending leisure time for all young people but in contrast to dancing, which was favoured by girls, cafes were more popular amongst boys. They were seen as a safe space for young people to meet others in a setting not associated with 'trouble' in the same way that dance halls could be, and long opening hours and low prices made them accessible for young people.

> The café is very much the youngster's own world. As a group of apprentices pointed out, you can swear at your ease in place where there is neither a bunch of weans nor a lot of old people. A nice, cosy rounder-off of the evening's main event…(Jephcott 1967:71).

The young woman in the foreground looks, on first impression, to be sitting at a table, perhaps as a customer. A closer viewing reveals that she is actually working at the café as a waitress– she is holding a cloth in her hand and appears to be wiping the tabletop and wearing a jacket with a pen in the top pocket. On the table there is an empty cup and saucer, a bowl and a saltcellar along with some papers, which may be the menu. Behind the young woman there is a short menu posted on the wall suggesting a limited choice of food and drink options. The café furniture is simple and basic: formica topped tables fixed to the floor and bench style seating. A very distinctive period style lightshade is suspended from the ceiling, resembling a bell-shaped paper Christmas decoration. On the next table there is a young woman sitting with a man who is leaning across her, perhaps playing with a spoon in the sugar bowl or helping himself to sugar for his drink. On the floor next to him is a tartan duffle bag, again very evocative of the period and place. Jephcott (1967: 71) describes cafes as having an 'intimate atmosphere' and this picture suggests an environment where the couple felt comfortable and at ease in their surroundings. Jephcott ends her discussion of café life with a week-long diary entry for a young person in her study. This account reveals regular visits to a café after school, in the evening and at the weekend. The respondent describes meeting friends, spending pocket money, showing off new clothes and meeting his girlfriend to resolve an earlier argument. This diary account gives a clear sense of how important cafes were to young people during this period.

As suggested above, an enigmatic feature of the book is Jephcott does not appear to analyse the images produced by the artists. Instead, she uses them as images to illustrate the 'typicality' of a scene, activity or event. One can only surmise as to why this may be. It may well be that Jephcott thought that to supplement they images with analytical text may have meant that key themes captured in the images might become lost or over/understated. We could venture that her view of the artist being able to see deeper into social reality may have led Jephcott to a position that she felt she had had nothing to add, no need to augment these striking images with additional narrative. The images are very direct, particularly the black and white line drawings in which aspects that might have been incidental in more stylistically complex/nuanced images are 'laid bare' here. The images are literal, very matter of fact, with no attempt to manipulate the viewer. Could it be that Jephcott almost viewed the artist as a more powerful observer and recorder of social life than the social researcher? Alternatively,

it could be that Jephcott regarded these images, as 'ethnographic sketches' in their own right and, in deploying such visual methods, she did not feel the need to reduce the images to text as, in doing so, would 'fix' the meaning of the images for the reader. In so doing she may also have been ahead of her time in letting the images speak for themselves, as Hughes (2012) suggests the dominant trend up until the 1970s and 1980s led images to be '…relegated to a supporting role. Lacking symbolic autonomy, they are conventionally understood as in need of text to be rendered meaningful' (Hughes 2012: xxi). Alternatively, as Chaplin (1994) suggests images are 'intrusively punctuated by verbal discourse' (Chaplin 1994: 207) and perhaps Pearl wanted to avoid this. Whatever the interpretation the images are important here, and are central to Jephcott's approach as they capture the mundane, the everyday, the minutia – and aspect picked upon by those who replicate, restudy and extend Pearl's work.

Replications: Taking Pearl Jephcott's Work Further – The Papers in this Special Issue

The remaining papers in the special issue all take Pearl's work further. They are united by a recognition of the importance of her work and a desire to ensure due recognition for her significant contributions to a number of fields of sociological enquiry. It is important to note that this collection includes three papers from teams based at the University of Glasgow. This skew towards Scotland reflects the importance of the work that Pearl carried out when she was based there from 1967 – 1971. This period saw the publication of two of her most influential and enduring works: 'Time of One's Own', a study of the leisure time of young people in Glasgow in the 1960s and 'Homes in High Flats', her study of high rise living in the city. It does not, therefore, come as a surprise that researchers at the University of Glasgow should have a keen interest in revisiting this Scottish work that chimes with their own contemporary work in the same area. However, more than this simply being a matter of geography piquing their interest, the Glasgow academics also have at their disposal an extensive archive collection of Jephcott's papers held by the University library. Although Pearl left Glasgow in 1970 her personal archive was bequeathed to the University on her death in 1980.

Against that context we begin our collection with a paper by Hazley and Wright, both housing scholars at the University of Glasgow, that explores one of Pearl's best known studies: *Homes in High Flats* (1971). This volume, perhaps Pearl's most well-known contribution to social research, came towards the end of her career, published when she was in her 70s. The book was the largest study of the everyday experience of living in the newly built tower blocks erected in Glasgow. A seminal text at the time it was published, it remains a key resource not only for housing scholars but also sociologists and social historians interested in the impact of the changing social housing landscape of the post-war era. In their paper Hazley and Wright explore Pearl's innovative approach to the study of housing conditions; specifically, her approach of trying to understand the 'feelings' of residents housed in these new developments. Her interest was very much in the everyday experience of living in modern housing as opposed to other research at the time which was preoccupied with the physical aspects of housing for example 'slum dwellings'. Like most (all) of the authors who have contributed to this special issue Hazley and Wright made extensive use of rich and previously little-explored archived material relating to the original project housed in the University of

Glasgow library. The archive reveals the exhaustive research work Pearl carried out and the authors draw our attention to the remarkable amount of material that was not included in the published account yet from which we can learn so much about everyday life in the tower blocks. Amongst the archived materials are collections that illustrate Pearl's passion for understanding lived realities with a particular focus on women and children's experiences, for example data on waiting times for lifts in the high-rise buildings, (lack of) play areas for children and the mental well-being of young mothers. Hazley and Wright explore much of this material in depth and in doing so uncover fascinating insight to the ever-present challenges of the 'observer' representing the 'observed'.

A second aim of their paper lies with one specific aspect of the Homes in High Flats research known as the Royston Project. This element of the research again illuminates Pearl's abiding interest in the well-being of mothers and their children. The Royston Project was a 'minor' study that Pearl led as part of the larger project. Such an approach had come to characterise her work and we see a similar project design, whereby small-scale projects aimed at improving everyday life often for young families, ran alongside the main research project, in her earlier work in Notting Hill. Her success in facilitating the setting up of mother-led playgroups in Notting Hill surely informed her efforts to mirror this in Glasgow where she had quickly identified that high-rise living did not lend itself to the provision of play areas for young children. Hazley and Wright provide a fascinating insight to this philanthropic side of Jephcott's work. Although they recognise that her proactive concern with improving living conditions was pioneering they do begin to critique certain aspects of Peal's approach, not least the lack of insight to the views of the women Pearl was hoping to empower. This is a theme returned to in other papers in the volume.

The second paper revisits Pearl's earliest work and covers the period of her life before she entered academia. In this paper Jeffs explores this lesser known part of Jephcott's career but he argues, very persuasively, that this chapter in her life laid the foundations for much of what was to come. What we learn from Jeffs' contribution is how Pearl's career trajectory was established and how this ran in parallel with changes in the world of youth groups. He begins by providing a brief history of the girls' club movement and its development before moving on to describe how Jephcott's appointment as a member of staff was led to transformational work taking place within the organisation and led, characteristically by her. When she left the girls' club movement she relocated to Durham and worked with girls' clubs there and, in 1938, soon after she arrived there, she carried out a small-scale piece of research on the leisure activities of young women, going on to present a paper on her findings the following year. It is this study that perhaps marks her first foray into academic life and to which most of her later work can be traced back. In the Durham study her concerns were around the everyday lives of young women which became a familiar motif, albeit in different manifestations, in all her later work. Jeffs draws our attention here to a little known early experience of Pearl's which may have informed her later work. He has uncovered evidence to suggest that her first paper which was based on findings around this study and presented at a conference in Sheffield in 1939, was not well-received by the residents of the mining villages on which it was focused. He suggests that her later concern for ensuring that

the voices of the researched are not only heard but also that their concerns were acted upon can be traced back to this difficult experience.

What is striking about Jephcott's style and approach to research and more so to 'action' is that she was concerned with the well-being of the residents she was researching. In contrast to much of the activity at the time which, in common with current government policy, focused blame on the families and residents themselves, Jephcott's concern was far broader. Throughout the study she highlights the challenges faced by the residents and the inequalities in society. Her interest lies with the individuals often most maligned or ignored at the time – single mothers, adolescents, young children, newly arrived citizens, people of colour. Indeed, Jephcott is critical of those who place the blame on the residents 'it is easiest of all to put the blame for the bad conditions on the people themselves…'.

Batchelor's paper is the only contribution here which recognises the international focus of some of Pearl's later work. We know that Pearl travelled extensively and her research diaries reveal her meticulous record keeping and attention to detail when she travelled often overlapping with her UK based projects. Her earliest international work was a trip to British Guiana in 1956 where to carry out commissioned research on young people, recreation and informal education. In the early 1960s she travelled to the Caribbean and later, towards the end of her career, she was commissioned again, this time to carry out research on children and young people in Hong Kong. It is her work in Hong Kong that Batchelor *et al.* have revisited in their ESRC-funded 'Reimagining Youth' project. In Batchelor's paper we begin to see how Pearl's fascination with the local and with research that had a small area focus, e.g. Bermondsey in south-east London, local neighbourhoods in Glasgow) she also had international reach. Batchelor takes as her starting point Jephcott's publication *'Time of One's Own'* Pearl's study of the youth leisure habits in Glasgow in the mid-1960s. On completion of the project Jephcott travelled to Hong Kong to lead on a UNICEF funded project of children and young people in Hong Kong. In this paper, Batchelor explores both of Jephcott's projects on youth leisure with an emphasis on her innovative research approach which combined field research, survey work and participatory methods. She goes on then to situate Jephcott's work and her methodological approach with the development of sociology as a discipline. Along with other authors in this volume Batchelor highlights Jephcott's preoccupation with ensuring that her research paid close attention to the everyday lived experiences of the research participants and how she was pioneering in her approach which placed the researched at the centre of the process of knowledge creation.

Helen McCarthy's interest stems from both women's interests in gender, class and race in the post-war period. Pearl's career began in youth work and young women's lives which developed in to a life-long interest in women's lives particularly the ways that women managed to combine work and motherhood. McCarthy's paper takes two of Pearl's key works: *Married Women Working* and *A Troubled Area* and looks in depth at the representation of gender, race and class in the two studies. McCarthy shows how in Married Women Working Pearl drew very much upon her earlier experiences of working with young women in her role at the young women's groups.

This paper draws out the differences between the two distinct London neighbourhoods studied by Jephcott, 'white Bermondsey' where interviews took place in 'well-kept terraced houses' and Notting Dale, where a quarter of the population heralded from outside the UK, in Ireland, West Africa and the Caribbean and respondents lived in poor quality houses of multiple occupancy and community cohesion appeared to be absent. McCarthy, like Batchelor draws attention to Jephcott's lack of engagement with other sociological literature emerging at the time. While Batchelor notes that Jephcott did not engage with theoretical debates, McCarthy highlights her lack of acknowledgment of work on race and ethnicity by academics such as Glass emerging at the same time. As ever, Jephcott's concern seem not to be focused on contributing to a body of academic work but on improving the conditions of life that she observed when carrying out her research – what we might now call a concern with the impact agenda but driven by a desire to facilitate change and improved living conditions. Indeed, McCarthy, like others in this special issue makes the point that much of Jephcott's emphasis appeared to continue to hark back to Victorian era of social work and social philanthropy rather than what we might now term as sociological problems.

Lynn Abrams and team's contribution takes us back to the notion of high-rise living in Scotland, introduced earlier by Hazley and Wright but her take on this focuses on Jephcott's own passion for understanding more about the everyday concerns of women particularly mothers of young children. That there are two contributions dedicated to Pearl's work on high-rise living reflects the importance of her work in this area. However, Abrams et al's article combines two of Pearl's interests and looks at the particular experience of mothers and children relocated from Glasgow tenements to the promise of modern living in newly constructed tower blocks. Abrams draws our attention to astonishing data on the scale of high-rise living in Glasgow in the early 1970s with some half a million people living in more than 200 tower blocks constructed in order to rehouse communities previously living in rundown tenements were buildings had frequently been condemned. What is fascinating about the data used in this contribution is that it provides insight to the earliest experiences of high-rise living – research carried out with Glasgow residents who had recently been moved in to flats with the promise of modern living in homes with central heating, private bathrooms and laundry facilities – but this was a trend repeated elsewhere in the UK where other similar housing 'solutions' were being rolled out by local authorities. Abrams, drawing on a combination of data from Jephcott's Homes in High Flats research and research carried out at a similar time by the Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, provides great insight to the lives of mothers rehomed in tower blocks. She focuses on factors that were identified as issues faced by inhabitants of the new settlements from early on – social isolation caused by the move from close knit tenement life and economic dependence, linked in part to the lack of employment opportunities for women in the vicinity of the new housing developments and by a lack of access to transportation.

Conclusions

We began this introduction with an argument for returning to past studies and suggested that many more forgotten legacy projects still have much to offer – be it a reinterpretation of past findings or a recasting of these findings from the perspective of the 'contemporary lens'. While we are all keen to acknowledge the contribution of 'classic studies', we should also be mindful of the vast array of 'other' studies which might have something equally valuable to offer. To that end we also to remember the legion of past researchers like Pearl Jephcott who, for whatever reason, have become overlook. We are too quick to forget and move on and, in so doing, we miss out of the richly detailed books of authors like Pearl. Yet these past works offer the promise of new insights and new opportunities for analysis and understanding and should be returned to.

Notes

[1] Permission to reproduce the images 2,3,4 and 5 has been granted by the University of Glasgow Archival Service who is custodian of the images. We have made all possible and reasonable efforts to contact other interested parties in relation to these image 1, such as Oliver & Boyd of Edinburgh. The acknowledgement in the book reveals that two art teachers, one student at the Glasgow School of Art and various boys and girls, aged 14 and 15 who had taken part in the study, produced the drawings. We respect the rights of the creators of the images and allow them to assert their rights if they wish.

Bibliography

Dunning, E. and Hughes, J. (2013) *Norbert Elias and Modern Sociology.* London: Bloomsbury.

Banton, M., 1964. Anthropological Perspectives in Sociology, British Journal of Sociology,15(2): 95-112.

Becker. H., 1982. Art Worlds, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Berger, P., 1972. Ways of Seeing. London: BBC, and Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bolton, A., Pole, C. and Mizen, P., 2001. Picture this: Researching Child Workers, Sociology, 35(2): 501.

Chaplin, E., 1994. Sociology and Visual Representation. London: Routledge.

Fyfe, G. and Law, J., 1988. Introduction: on the invisibility of the invisible, in Fyfe, G. and Law, J. (eds) (1988) Picturing Power: Visual Depiction and Social Relations. London: Routlegde.

Elias, N., 2012[1939]. On The Process of Civilisation. Volume 3. The Collected Works of Norbert Elias. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Elias, N., 2009. On Sociology and the Humanities: Essays III. Vol. 16 The Collected Works of Norbert Elias. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Goodwin, J. and O'Connor, H. (2015) Pearl Jephcott: The Legacy of a Forgotten Sociological Research Pioneer, Sociology, 49(1) 139-155.

Goodwin, J. and O'Connor, H. (2013) Ordinary Lives: 'Typical Stories' of Girls' Transitions in the 1960s and the 1980s, Sociological Research Online, 18(1) <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/18/1/4.html> 10.5153/sro.2881.

Harper, D., 1988. Visual Sociology: Expanding Sociological Vision, American Sociologist, 19(1): 54-70.

Hughes, J., 2013. Norbert Elias and the Habits of Good Sociology, Human Figurations, 2(1). [http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.11217607.0002.107.

Hughes, J., 2012. Editor's Introduction: SAGE Visual Methods, in Hughes, J. (ed) (2012) Visual Methods, Volume I. London: Sage

Hughes, J. and Goodwin, J. (eds) (2014) Human Documents and Archival Research, (Four Volumes). Sage Library of Research Methods, (Four Volumes). London: Sage Publications.

Jephcott, P., 1967. Time of One's Own: Leisure and Young People. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.

Kasson, J. F., 1998. Seeing Coney Island, Seeing Culture: Joseph Stella's Battle of Lights, The Yale Journal of Criticism, 11(1): 95-101.

Law, E. and Lybeck, E.R. (eds) (2015). Sociological Amnesia. Farnham: Ashgate.

Lybeck, E.R., 2013. Lester Ward and Patrick Geddes in early American and British sociology, History of the Human Sciences, 26 (2): 51-69.

Martin, J. (2016) Intellectual Women, Social Science, and Political Power: Municipal Feminism and Reform at the London School of Economics, 1895-1960. Chapter 5 in Panayotidis, E.L. and Stortz, P. (eds) Women in Higher Education, 1850-1970: International Perspectives. New York: Routledge

O'Connor H. and Goodwin J. (2013) The Ethical Dilemmas of Restudies in Researching Youth, YOUNG: Nordic Journal of Youth Research, 21(3), 289–307.

Orwell, G., 1937. The Road to Wigan Pier. London: Victor Gollancz.

Rose, G., 2007. Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials, London: Sage

Strangleman, T., 2008. Representations of Labour: Visual Sociology an Work, Sociology Compass, 2(5) 1491–1505.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Bharat Mehta, Chief Executive of the Trust for London.
Friends, colleagues and supporters who attended the one day Pearl Symposium held at College Court, University of Leicester in July 2015.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. However, we must acknowledge the support of the University of Leicester College of Social Science, Arts and Humanities who provide research developed funding for a one-day symposium in July 2015 on the life and work of Pearl Jephcott at which some the ideas outlined here were first presented.

Table 1. Illustrations from 'Times of Ones Own'

No.	Title of Image	Photograph (P) Drawing/Painting (D) Map (M) Text (T)	Page
I	Some of the Boys and Girls	D	Frontispiece
II	Female Coal-Bearers in Scotland in the 1840s	P	p. 68-69
III	Cafe Life, Armadale	D	p. 68-69
IV	Dennistoun	P	p. 68-69
V	Drumchapel	P	p. 68-69
VI	Some of the Girls, Drumchapel	P	p. 68-69
VII	At the Bus Stop, Armadale	D	p. 68-69
VIII	Close-up, Drumchapel	P	p. 68-69
IX	Armadale	P	p. 68-69
1	Central Scotland – Study Areas	M	p.4
2	Glasgow – Study Areas	M	p.5
3	Boys' Brigade, Dennistoun	D	p.11
4	Leisure at Home, Dennistoun	D	p. 21
5	'A Really Enjoyable Sunday' As Described by Three School Children Aged 14-15	T	p.36
6	Motorbike Owner	D	p.44
7	Boys Aged 16-17, Unloading a Lorry	D	p.54
8	Service?	D	p.67
9	Club Art Class, Drumchapel	D	p. 77
10	'Trouble'	D	p.93
11	Club Dancing Class, Dennistoun	D	p.103
12	Football	D	p.111
13	'Going To The Pictures'	D	p.121
14	Nowhere to go	D	p. 132
15	Band Class, Dennistoun	D	p. 146
*Not in Book**			
-	Armadale Town Friday Night	D	
-	Sunday Afternoon	D	
-	Hanging Out	D	
-	Boys Brigade Expedition Class	D	
-	Band Practice, Dennistoun	D	
-	Dancing Class, Dennistoun	D	
-	Place of Employment, Dennistoun	D	
-	Young Girl Serving in Café, Dennistoun	D	
-	Football	D	
-	No. 20 Bus to Glasgow	D	
-	The Buck and Lady Buck	D	
-	Dancing at Clelland's Dance Hall	D	
-	Club Band The Pathfinders	D	

Note: Adapted from Jephcott, P. (1967) *Time of One's Own*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, page X. * Images can be found in File Ref: DC127/23/22, Glasgow University Archive

Image 1

Image 2