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INTRODUCTION

The sites of the present research are planned communities called Danchi in Japanese. Ever since they appeared about twenty years ago, they have attracted attentions from the general public, journalists and sociologists.

A conceivable reason for this general interest in Danchi is that they are unconventional as settlement type, both physically and socially. They consist of only apartment buildings which, as housing type, were seldom seen before the World War II. A large number of apartment buildings constructed on a single site must have been a novel phenomenon to most of the Japanese. Besides, Danchi in their initial stage of development at least, were occupied for the most part, by young couples and their children. They moved into newly-built Danchi in a large mass from somewhere and started a new social life all of a sudden. It must be this combined presence of physical and social features of the communities that have aroused such an interest. And many people have, more or less, believed that a Danchi subculture has emerged.

It may be of interest to ascertain if this popular belief is justified. But the author is more concerned with a general question of whether or not there is any interaction between man-made physical environment and social conditions. He felt that Danchi
would be most suited for inquiries of this nature.

The purpose of the research is practical as well. Today, planning communities without appropriate empirical data is no longer valid. The data obtained in one project should be fed back into the next, so that they will be improved on cumulative basis. The planned communities as they exist are far from complete. It is no exaggeration to say that man's innovativeness is at stake in planning communities.

Here the author presents the outcome of his research in the hope that it could be a modest contribution which bridges the often existing gap between the worlds of sociology and planning.
CHAPTER I

THE BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DANCHI AS PLANNED COMMUNITY

Its History and Development

The word "Danchi", the field of our survey, made its first appearance fifteen years ago in a Japanese dictionary in which it is defined as "land on which modern mass housing stands". Danchi can be safely called planned community in Japan, in that the housing and the needed facilities are planned and constructed as a package.

It was in 1955 that Japan Housing Agency, the biggest and the most influential constructor of Danchi was established by the government to cope with chronic housing shortage of post-war Japan. Since the problem of housing shortage was especially serious in wide areas surrounding big cities like Tokyo and Osaka, piecemeal efforts by local government were considered unsuited and inefficient in light of the scale of problems involved. Thus the purpose of establishing the Agency was to plan and construct the housing projects for the country as a whole ignoring administrative boundary. Besides, the Agency was to attain the goal by constructing fireproof apartment buildings in a mass on single sites. Since its establishment, the Agency has constructed approximately one
million apartments which now house about three and a half million people.

Some maintain that the work done by the Agency has been successful and others blame it for the poor planning. But one thing is clear: Danchi as a phenomenon have had a profound influence on the lives of people to a degree unprecedented in the housing history of post-war period of this country.

Harbinger of Housing Modernization

Formerly, living in Danchi used to be a status symbol. People were envious of those who drew lucky lots and entered Danchi. When asked, a woman aged forty-seven recalled the day when she had moved into Danchi some twenty years ago: "You couldn't imagine how much I was moved by the apartment! It was made of concrete, you know. We had a bathroom and flush toilet. Besides, the kitchen was so nice."¹

The things mentioned above were not all the innovations Danchi brought into being. People were provided with a kitchen-dining room and bedrooms, so that they no longer had to eat and sleep in the same room. Along with this, the so-called feudalistic vestiges were all eliminated in the process of housing rationalization. Things such as Kamidana (a home altar), Tokonoma (a recess in a room where pictures are hung) and wooden shutters - all so imbedded in the Japanese life style - totally disappeared.
Its Physical Characteristics

The followings are physical characteristics of Danchi as a settlement.

First of all, it consists of only apartment type buildings. Secondly, it is densely populated. The population density of Danchi is twice or three times as high as the other unplanned residential areas. Thirdly, although formerly Danchi used to be located in the central city, the majority of the dwellers now live in the Danchi located in the suburbs. Danchi often has, on and around the site, a variety of facilities necessary for daily life of the residents, such as play lots, grocery stores, coffee shop, restaurants, post-office, hospital and so on. The kinds and number of these facilities increase as the distance from the city-center and the size of the Danchi increase.

But, the fact that the residents share space and facilities on the site to a greater extent than elsewhere is the most important characteristics of all.

Social Characteristics of the Dwellers

Post-war housing policy of this country consists of three parts and different organizations have played their roles for a particular income group. First, local governments have taken care of people of lower income group for whom wooden houses have been provided at low rent. Only those whose income is below a certain level are qualified to apply. On the other
hand, Danchi has catered to people of middle income bracket. Only those whose income is more than four times as much as the rent are qualified. Third, people belonging to middle or upper income group are simply financed and asked to build houses themselves.

Because of this selection system, Danchi dwellers tend to be similar not only in terms of their socio-economic status but of some demographic characteristics as well.

White collar people are over represented in Danchi in contrast to working class people whether they be skilled or unskilled. In terms of the level of education attained, nearly half of the household heads are college graduates and more than half of the housewives are high school graduates. Thus, the dwellers' educational status is higher than the average Japanese adults, in accordance with their income and occupational status.

More characteristic is the family composition of Danchi households, which consist mostly of couples in their twenties and thirties with one or two children. The existence of nuclear families is predominant. The adolescent and the old are missing. Danchi is really a community for women and their children, at least in the daytime on week days.

Danchi and American Suburbs

There are some similarities and dissimilarities between Danchi and American suburbs.

As for the similarities, it can be pointed out that both are
residential in nature and are what Schnore calls "suppliers of labor and consumers of commodities". Furthermore, both are inhabited by middle class people. The high extent of population homogeneity and familism are also common to both settlements. In addition, many Danchi as well as American suburbs are located away from the city-center.

As for the dissimilarities, Danchi consist of apartment buildings, whereas American suburbs consist of single-detached homes. Also, renters are predominant in the former but only homeowners live in the latter. More important is the fact that Danchi dwellers are more pushed than pulled, whereas American suburbanites are more pulled than pushed. While Danchi dwellers are hardly satisfied with living in Danchi and hope to move out as soon as the resources are available, the suburban residence for most Americans is the result of the positive choice on the part of the residents. The difference between the two groups of residents in terms of the achievement levels with respect to housing aspirations is expected to affect the various aspects of their lives.

The present research is based on the assumption that these physical and social characteristics peculiar to Danchi might interact with each other, thus molding a social as well as family life unique to it.
NOTES: CHAPTER I
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CHAPTER II

PROBLEM ORIENTATION AND
THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH

The present research is an attempt to investigate if man-made physical environment could have any effect on the social as well as family life and residential satisfaction of the residents, and also to find out whether or not the residents of different social attributes respond to a given environment in different ways.

The first part of the question is ecological in nature in that ecological variables such as settlement type, its location with respect to the central city or the housing type are conceived as independent variables while in the latter part, sociological explanations predominate. These two different approaches to social life roughly correspond to two schools of human ecology, which are the orthodox approach and the socio-cultural approach, respectively. In this inquiry, the two approaches are combined to yield nine testable hypotheses.

Human Ecology and Physical Environment

It is only natural to refer to human ecology when we try to explore the sociological relevance of man-made environment,
because in human ecology, "physical environment" has been treated as one of the key concepts if not variables ever since R. Park defined the problems and scope of the discipline. In fact, the relationship between the physical and the social (cultural) has been mentioned by many ecologists.

Park wrote, for instance, that "city possesses a moral as well as a physical organization, and these two mutually interact in characteristic ways to mold and modify one another". Meanwhile, McKenzie stated that "in society physical structure and cultural characteristics are part of one complex". More recently, Duncan and Schnore saw environment as one of the four variables constituting the "ecological complex". Likewise, Schnore wrote that "as a result of its conceptual heritage from biology, human ecology has a rather full appreciation of the role of physical environment as it affects social structure".

Despite this consistent usage of the concept of environment by human ecologists, social implications of the environment have not been fully explored. A couple of theoretical and methodological problems ought to be pointed out in this regard.

First, human ecologists have been mainly concerned with depicting the macroscopic pattern of human settlement such as natural area and have overlooked the microscopic processes that would lead to that pattern.

Second, the macroscopic pattern has been conceived of as an end product (dependent variable) of the ecological processes...
but not as initiator (independent variable) of any subsequent social processes within the subarea.

Third, too much emphasis has been put on economic factors; social changes and the consequent change in spatial pattern have been explained by a series of ecological concepts such as competition, symbiosis, invasion and succession. Economic factors do seem to play a crucial role at a certain stage of ecological processes, but they can hardly explain the specific configuration of environment.

Fourth, due to these problem-orientation and assumption underlying the research, most human ecologists except those who belong to the socio-cultural school have dealt with only aggregate data external to individuals. The aggregate data may be appropriate for depicting the overall distribution pattern of ecological factors but not for describing and explaining the above-mentioned processes of micro-scale, which call for behavioral data.

An assumption underlying the present study is that, in addition to economic factors, a variety of social or psychological variables could determine where people live and why they move.

Sociology of Planned Communities

Planned Communities as laboratory of Social Research:

In this age, nothing can be just the result of natural
process. Everything is more or less deliberately planned. This is becoming increasingly true for human settlement. The massive interventions into housing project by central and local governments as well as large private developers are cases at hand.

Planned communities are exceptional laboratories for social research precisely because they are controlled. They are controlled in the sense that anything which is not delineated in the blueprint is not realized in the actual planned community, the end product of the planning. Even the sociological variables can be manipulated to a certain extent by the tenant or purchaser selection system. This controlled situation means, for the sociologists, that both physical and sociological variables are relatively few in kinds and number, as compared with unplanned communities. Besides, planned communities with their sites marked sharply from the surrounding area meet the boundary requirement exceptionally well, a condition necessary for the ecological research. Thus, sociologists can expect to study the interaction of these two kinds of variables as if they occurred in a goldfish-bowl.

Planned Communities as Living Things:

At least, it can be said that more variables are "known" in planned communities than in unplanned communities. However, as time passes after their opening, unknown variables invade the planned communities and begin to upset the temporary equili-
brium assumed to have been attained at the outset between the physical and social systems constituting the communities. This happens because the cresive elements always make their appearance even in a typical enacted environment like a planned community. Besides, despite the meticulous calculation on the part of planners, the unintended effects always make their appearance. Therefore, planned communities can be seen as a process rather than fixed entity. It is the task of social scientists to identify and explain these cresive elements as well as the effects unintended in the planning stage.

These unplanned factors thus identified in one project should be evaluated properly and fed back into the next as important data. Thus, studying planned communities in terms of sociological aspects will have practical significance as well.

**Relationship Between the Physical and the Social: Its Conceptualization**

It is necessary, before going further, to review how investigators have conceptualized the relationship between physical and social factors in their research. Two different positions are recognized among those investigators who, more or less, admit the existence of interrelations between the two. One of the positions is a sort of environmental determinism, an idea that environment controls the occurrence of social phenomena. The other is a position that presupposes a looser relationship be-
tween the physical and the social.

Environmental Determinism:

Instances of spatial determinism, a form of environmental determinism, were given by Festinger et al, Merton, Whyte, Caplow and Foreman who demonstrated that physical distance or positional relationship between the dwelling units almost exclusively determined the residents' interaction pattern. But as time passed, this deterministic idea became questionable, and finally it turned out that distance whether it be physical or functional played a significant role only when population involved was homogeneous. Although this type of determinism is no longer supported, investigators have provided cases in which independent effects of environment on social phenomena were demonstrated. That is, some findings consistently indicated that substandard housing and environment caused pathology. Thus, Rosow concluded that "the correlation between poor housing and the incidence of crime, disease, juvenile delinquency, mortality, et cetera, had been established beyond doubt". Michelson, on the other hand, being more cautious about this point, stated as follows: "Improvements in the condition of housing, therefore, do not revolutionalize the lives of people, particularly when they start with severe problems that are primarily social in origin. Nonetheless, changes in condition may affect particular aspects of health (i.e., severity of illness), which may have a
limited effect on social effectiveness\textsuperscript{6}.

Besides housing conditions, high population density as one of the environmental factors has often been related to pathology. For instance, sociologists, inspired by animal ecologists and suggested by the historical incidents of high population density, hypothesized that it might cause pathological states in human population as well. But the findings of research showed again that it was culture operating as an intervening variable that was a determinant of the relationship.

More relevant to the present research is the environmental determinism underlying physical planning, the most typical of which is the so-called neighborhood unit theory. Broady, for instance, in attacking architectural determinism typically found in neighborhood unit theory, asserts that "even if it be admitted that architectural design may influence, it can not be said to determine social behavior" and that "it has, at most, only a marginal effect on social activity"\textsuperscript{7}.

All these findings and generalizations have suggested that environmental determinism is no longer valid, thus calling for the reconceptualization of the relationship between the physical and the social.

Reconceptualization of the Relationship: Intersystem Congruence Model

Newman, in his \textit{Defensible Space}, attempted to identify and
propose crime-tree spatial organization. Fearing that some might read into his work the implication that architectural design has a direct causal effect on social interaction he wrote in it as follows: "Architecture operates more in the area of 'influence' than control. I can create a setting conducive to realizing the potential of mutual concern. It does not and can not manipulate people toward these feelings, but rather allows mutually beneficial attitudes to surface".8

Michelson's position is similar to Newman's in that he also denies the deterministic idea. Suggested by Parsonian scheme that there are intersystem relationships among cultural, social, personality, organic and environmental systems, he proposes what he calls "intersystem congruence model". According to him, "the model is not of determinism or the dominance of one system over another, but rather one of congruence - of states of variables in one system coexisting better with states of variables in another system than other alternative states".9 The point is not to discover strict causalities among variables of different systems but to find out the relationship of congruence - incongruence, match - mismatch, one variable encouraging another to occur but not others.

Since this idea tends to emphasize the limiting power of physical environment, he proceeds to introduce the concept of "opportunity" to complement the model but not necessarily revise it. The physical environment is given here by him a more posi-
tive role in the sense that it is conceived of as making latent behaviors manifest.

The kinds of behaviors subject to environmental influence may be limited, however. Newman suggests that the occurrence of crime is dependent upon the spatial organization of buildings and the site in so far as the crime is crime of opportunity rather than premeditated. The same thing may be true for neighboring and children's behavior. They are seldom premeditated. And to the extent that they occur by chance, they may be subject to the influence of environment.

Thus far, we have overviewed some generalizations and conceptions concerning the nature of interaction and interrelation between the physical and the social. The theoretical positions ranging from sheer determinism to looser relationship between the two epitomized in such concepts as congruence or opportunity will be examined through the hypotheses to be stated later.
NOTES: CHAPTER II

1. Park, Human Communities, p. 16
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Prior to the statement of our hypotheses, we must review some past findings and generalizations considered most relevant to our topic. Theoretical viewpoints implied in the previous research are also examined. The hypotheses are formulated and the test outcomes are interpreted in light of these past efforts.

Place of Residence and Its Effect on Social Participation

Place of residence or residential location among other ecological or environmental factors has been used most often as independent variable, as over against the social participation as dependent variable. Martin writes that suburbs' unique ecological position with respect to the central city is one of the most important and strategic variables that structure suburban social relations. Fava, while asserting that many studies which showed distinct social organization or interaction in suburbs are not necessarily convincing because suburban data alone were presented without comparable urban data, conducted a research herself to contrast three groups located in New York City and its adjacent area. The research sites of her study included central city, outer city and suburban area.
Fava first tried to ascertain "what" of suburban social structure and found out that the residents of suburban area have significantly higher neighboring scores. Then she proceeded to answer "why" of suburban social life. The various factors indicative of "settling down" processes like "being or having been married", "home-ownership", "stability of residence", "ages between thirty and sixty-five" were found related to the high level of suburban neighboring. Then controlling for these variables which are not necessarily unique to suburbs, she tried to test whether place of residence was the real cause of differential neighboring of the three areas. The result turned out to be in the affirmative. The data have revealed that neighboring gradually increases with the distance from the central city.

What Tomeh has found is similar to Fava's conclusion. In an attempt to distinguish area effect from population effect on the informal group participation in suburbs, she contrasted three areas close to the city of Detroit. Utilizing data collected by Detroit Area Study, the researcher tried to isolate the pure residential effect by holding population characteristics constant and found out that although population type was a primary factor in determining the level of informal participation, zone of residence had a small but independent effect on such activity.

Tallman and Morgner compared urban-suburban differences in terms of several life style variables, using the blue worker
samples. One of the research sites was located north of Twin Cities and the other was the central district of Minneapolis. Their conclusion was also similar to those of Fava and Tomeh. The levels of neighboring were found different between the two areas. Although no significant differences were found to exist in the initial analysis with respect to the average time spent in attending service organizations and meetings, subsequent analysis revealed that women with previous suburban residence attended meetings of service organizations and participated in group recreational activities more frequently than those who moved either from city to suburb, or from city to city. Here again, the effect of community was seen to operate, though indirectly. However, question of whether the change might be attributed to the physical or non-physical aspects of new community remained unsolved.

Berger tackled the same problem but came up with the findings different from those mentioned above. His respondents were blue collar workers who moved from city to suburb. As for the participation in formal organizations, both the membership and activity were not very pronounced among these suburbanites just as before the move. Besides, there was no evidence that their participation in formal organizations had increased since the move to the suburb, although the women were more active in organizations than before and men less in this respect. As for the informal social relations, the picture was not so different.
Berger wrote that the pattern of informal social participation manifested by his samples seemed to be much the same as he would expect from working class population. For instance, most people entertained friends not as often as they did in previous residence, although there was a marked increase in entertaining among previous renters due to more room being available for the guests than before moving in. And he noted that suburban residence itself did not lead to a significant increase in the amount of entertaining people do. Thus, the conclusion Berger reached was that working class people retained their life style even after the move to the suburb and that class rather than place of residence shapes their lives.

Gans reports on the change of social participation that occurred among people after their move to Levittown, a bedroom community near Philadelphia. The change in the direction of more participation was quite evident. According to Gans, about half the Levittowners interviewed said that they were visiting more often with neighbors than in their former residence; about a quarter said less, and the remaining quarter reported no change. Couple visiting also increased. Forty percent of the Levittowners reported more couple visiting than in their former residence. As for organizational participation, fifty-three percent of the random samples and forty-four percent of the Philadelphia sample (former city-dwellers) considered themselves more active in secular and church-related organizations than in
the former residence. In interpreting these data, however, Gans attributes the change not to suburb as place of residence but to non-physical aspects of the move such as newness or population mix of the suburban community. He writes that "most of the changes following upon the move to Levittown can be traced to the social community, to the impact of people on each other, and that the increased visiting, organizational activity ..... resulted neither from the move to the suburb nor from the suburbaness of Levittown or its physical environment, but from the contact or lack of contact with other people in Levittown, and this in turn can be traced ultimately to the population mix." Even when physical environment seemed relevant, Gans attributes the increase in neighboring more to the move from apartment to house than from city to suburb.

Thus, the past findings here reviewed, except Berger's, indicate that the levels of social participation differ among the settlements of different types. But as far as the source of the difference or the change is concerned, there is no agreement among the researchers.

One methodological problem should be noted. Although all of the above-cited researches are the same in their attempt to identify the effect of place of residence, the research methods are different between Berger and Gans on one hand and other researchers on the other. While Berger and Gans conducted a "be-
fore and after" study about the residents of a community in
order to measure the effect of the move, other researchers
studied populations of two or more communities at a time and
tried to isolate the effect of place of residence by controlling
for other variables. In present research the former method was
employed because it was considered more suited to the effect
study.

Newness of Community

Time factor plays an important role in determining the
nature and the extent of interactions among neighbors.

According to Keller, two phases of neighboring and social­
izing can be identified. The first phase is characterized by
eager interaction and mutual helpfulness, whereas the second is
characterized by restricted interaction, selectivity, and with­
drawal. A couple of reasons will be given for the high level of
neighboring in the first stage. The reason most important among
others is that class distinction is lost temporarily in the
initial stage of living in newly-built community.

Mowrer, by interpreting the data obtained from the research
in Chicago suburb, suggests that many of the characteristics
considered unique to suburban life is due to the newness of com­
munity. According to him, it is the loss of class distinction
characteristic of the initial stage of suburban life cycle that
leads to intensive neighboring in that stage. But as the initial
stage passes, the class distinction appears, bringing about the reduction of neighboring and a condition of secondary relations.

Rosow also states that "the longer people stay and more diversified the group, the more is solidarity affected by status differentiation". Other characteristics such as difference in age, life style and personal characteristics that are simply put aside in the midst of overwhelming new experience may come to be recognized sharply in the second stage.

Newness of community brings about the need for mutual aid among neighbors, which also results in high level of neighboring. The residents of new community face many problems which they do not know how to cope with and turn to neighbors for help and information. But as time passes, the level of interaction decreases as the need for mutual help diminishes.

However, newness of community may not be a necessary and sufficient condition of high level of neighboring in the first stage. If people who have moved into the community are very heterogeneous in background and characteristics, even the newness of community would not lead to the blurring of these differences. Put it another way, a certain level of population homogeneity seems to be a prerequisite so that newness of community might work.
Proximity and Population Homogeneity

A number of studies published one after another at around 1950 were intended to test the hypothesis that spatial arrangement of dwelling units determine the extent of interaction among neighbors.

For instance, Festinger, Schachter and Back tried to measure the effect of particular spatial arrangements in two housing projects served for married veterans who were studying at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It was found in Westgate, one of the projects, that the physical distance between the front doors of housing units was the major determinant of friendship pattern. In Westgate West, another project adjacent to Westgate, the researchers found that a different unit of distance, what they called "functional distance", determined the neighborly relationships. Thus it was concluded that friendship formation depended upon the passive contacts, the pattern and frequency of which were determined by the physical or functional distance.

The similar research findings demonstrating the striking relationship between spatial organization and sociometric choice were reported by White, Caplow and Forman, Merton as well as by Tsujimura and Kurihara.

But as time passed, spatial determinism of a sort mentioned above began to be challenged. The independent role of distance in this respect became questionable in light of data obtained hereafter.

Major bulwark against the spatial determinism is the posi-
tion that homogeneity of population is more crucial than proximity in determining the neighborly interaction. For instance, Gans, in his *Levittowners*, cites the cases in which propinquity and positional relationship among each other's residences are not the determinants of visiting pattern. As a preliminary conclusion about the social effect of propinquity, Gans states as follows: "although propinquity initiates many social relationships and maintains less intensive ones, such as 'being neighborly', it is not sufficient by itself to create intensive relationships. Friendship requires homogeneity."¹⁹

As a matter of fact, most of the communities where proximity was shown to play a significant role by the researchers were extremely homogeneous, not only along sociological and demographic dimensions such as educational status, income level, age, marital status and family background but also along the line of interests and aspirations. This was also true for the residents of Park Forest whom Whyte studied. They were all what Whyte called "organization man", highly mobile junior executives.

The reason why homogeneity is a necessary condition for the proximity to play a significant role in determining neighborly relations is that if the residents feel their neighbors are much like themselves, they do not have to go farther afield for friends. Here the law of least effort operates.

But, as Keller writes, "a group may be homogeneous with respect to one set of factors but may be heterogeneous with
respect to others"²⁰. Among other background characteristics, similarity of educational status may be most important because it leads to behavioral similarity with respect to child-rearing method, leisure time preferences and taste level²¹. However, this question of what specific aspect of homogeneity is most crucial for the sustained interaction among neighbors as well as the level of homogeneity needed is yet to be answered by previous research.

Thus, as far as previous research indicates, it could be safely concluded that physical or functional distance can be a determinant of neighboring only when condition of homogeneity as an intervening variable is met. In high density planned communities where residents are often very similar to one another in terms of education and life-cycle stage, the level of interaction among them is likely to be high in a given physical space.

Familism and Housing Type: Multiple Dwellings vs. Single-Family House

There is no other choice than to build high-rise apartment buildings today when land on which to build dwellings is so scarce. For public housing agencies as well as for private developers, building high-rise is almost an inevitable choice. In fact, more than ninety-nine percent of Danchi dwellings consist of high-rise and low-rise. Despite this fact, the studies that tried to explore the sociological relevance of this mass
phenomena have been relatively few in number. There seems to be two types of sociological studies with respect to high-rise.

One is a study that posits the physical structure of high-rise as independent variable and examines its potential effect on mental health and delinquency or criminal rates\textsuperscript{22}. In his research conducted in New York City, Newman attempted to identify those features that are prone to invite crimes and proposed remedies for them\textsuperscript{23}.

The studies of the second type to be reviewed below do not aim at strict causal analysis but rather try to discover congruence-incongruence relationship between the physical structure of a housing type and the social attributes of the dwellers. Sociological variable deemed most relevant to housing type is stage in life cycle.

Stage in life cycle has been employed in explaining the preference of one housing type over another in popular articles as well as in academic literature, in which the presence or absence of children has been seen as determinant of housing choice. For instance, according to the findings of research conducted by Fortune magazine and ACTION (the American Council to Improve Our Neighborhood) in Philadelphia, Chicago and New York where twelve high-rise apartment buildings having two hundred units or more were selected and studied, people with children, younger people, and those who formerly lived in suburbia tended to prefer low-rise (to high-rise). Similarly, they
found that there were children in twenty one percent of the low-rise households, but in only thirteen percent of the high-rise. (Proportion in total U.S. households: Thirty-six percent)

Hoover and Vernon also report that in New York City, in any given income bracket, a larger proportion of children is associated also with a greater preponderance of single-family dwellings. The researches by Kumove and Willis referred to in Michelson's book seem to suggest that high-rise apartment buildings are incongruent with children's behavior and familistic life style centering around them.

The similar findings are reported by Michelson whose study was based on secondary analysis of the original data collected by Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. Among a couple of aims which Michelson pursued in his analysis, the one most relevant to our subject is his effort to identify "those who now live in a single-family home but who desire to move to some type of multiple dwelling." And a test was made in order to know whether these people were significantly related to a certain stage in life cycle. Three different types of family composition, that is, single person households, households without children currently resident and those with children were dealt with. What Michelson found was that "the overwhelming majority of those wishing to change to an apartment do not have children living at home, a direct contrast to the rest of the population, the majority of whom are living with children in
their households. He also found that age was not related significantly to housing choice, neither was income nor occupation.

These findings are usually interpreted in light of the two features of high-rise, the one of which is less privacy due to sharing of walls and the other is difficult access to outdoors. These features have been seen more incongruent with families having children than those having no children. Less privacy discourages indoor family pursuits involving children and the difficult access to outdoors brings to their mothers a considerable trouble in supervising children playing out. In addition, the mothers must take constant care of their children, being afraid of possible accidents due to the height of the buildings. For children whose behaviors extend from indoors to outdoors without restraint, apartments with sharp distinction between the two spaces are simply not convenient.

There is a qualification to the above-reviewed findings, however. That is, housing type, occupancy status and the distance of a dwelling from the central city are far from independent of one another. Especially, type of a dwelling and its distance to and from the central city go hand in hand, in that high-rise tends to be located in and close to the central city and the reverse is true for single-family dwellings. Therefore, it is difficult to know from the researches which of the two aspects of dwelling has been found congruent or incongruent with a particular life stage. For instance, the aged tend to prefer apart-
ment to single-family house, but this is not because they gain more satisfaction from the former than the latter, but because in most cases apartment buildings are located in the central city, the easy accessibility to it being their greatest concern. In order to isolate the effect of housing type, controls have to be introduced at least for the distance to and from the central city and for occupancy-status.

**Occupancy Status and Social Participation**

Owned dwelling whether it is apartment or house means almost permanent residence for most of the Japanese. This is especially true of owning a single-family house with garden. Theoretically, to own a house means to have a stake in the community in which it is located. The greater stake a resident has in the community, the higher level of neighborly interaction and organizational participation is expected to result. Fava made a point that neighboring is associated positively with home-ownership\textsuperscript{29}. But for settlers, organizational participation ought to be more important than neighboring, because unlike neighboring, organizational participation is more or less concerned with livability problems of community such as noise-pollution, repair of housing, lack or insufficiency of various communal facilities.

It can be said that the researches which tried to test the possible correlation between occupancy status per se and the level of neighboring or organizational participation are few
in number, partly due to the fact that, as stated above, distinction has not been made between occupancy status of a dwelling and its physical structure. But the greater reason for the scarcity of the research in this respect is that occupancy status has been simply conceived as dependent variable as opposed to stratification variables and therefore seldom hypothesized to have independent effects on social participation.

Even when it was used as independent variable in previous research, we cannot know exactly whether a given level of social participation is solely attributed to occupancy status because in measuring its effect, controls have been seldom introduced for such variables as income, education and occupation. With this reservation, a couple of research findings are reviewed below.

Mather found, in his research of Franklin, Indiana, that those who lived in owned homes averaged higher in number of memberships and much higher in number of leadership with income level held constant.  

Similar findings were reported by Scott who tried to determine the relationship between variations in home-tenure along with other socio-economic and demographic variables and variations in the degree to which persons participate in voluntary associations, taking samples from the residents of Bennington, Vermont. He found in his research that home-owners have significantly more association memberships than renters. But the independent role
home-tenure plays in this regard was not fully isolated, because other variables that proved to be associated with participation such as sex, marital status and the indices of socio-economic status were not controlled.

Wright and Hyman, by conducting secondary analysis of the data collected in the surveys both on national and local levels, found that none of the residential factors showed a systematic relationship with the incidence of affiliation with voluntary associations. But they wrote that only home-ownership, among other residential factors seemed related to voluntary association membership. But here again, full significance of occupancy status remains unexplored for the same reason mentioned above.

**Socio-Economic Status and Social Participation**

Propensity to neighboring and organizational participation seems to differ from one individual to another, depending upon the social class to which he belongs.

If the need for mutual aid is the basis of neighboring as a number of studies have pointed out, it may be hypothesized that people of higher socio-economic status are engaged in neighboring to a less extent than those of lower status. The reason is that the former is more self-sufficient than the latter, thus needing less help from neighbors.

People of higher socio-economic status may be engaged in neighboring to a less extent also because they are more involved
in a larger system of society than those of lower socio-economic status. They tend to pursue their principal life interest along the occupational line and make their friends with job colleagues rather than with neighbors. They tend to be cosmopolitans who, according to Michelson, are not bound to one place. On the other hand, people of lower socio-economic status excluded from the larger system are apt to be locals, their interest centering around neighborhood.

The relationship between socio-economic status and the level of neighboring may not be that simple, however. Retailers even if they are rich tend to be locals and have associational ties with the people around the neighborhood. But still, the above-mentioned generalization seems valid. It is truly said that "the higher the level of prosperity, the higher the fences". 

The aspect of neighboring most related to class factor may not be the degree of interaction but its nature. In general, the neighboring of working-class people is neither selective nor personal but more crisis-oriented than middle class people, for whom personal compatibility is of greater importance. As Keller aptly describes, "middle-class individuals place relatively greater stress on sociability; upper-class residents, on the preservation of class code and traditions; and working-class residents, on help in crisis". 

The findings of previous studies, on the other hand, have consistently showed that people of higher socio-economic level
are more active in organizational participation than those lower in this respect. A number of interpretations have been undertaken for the findings.

Foskett writes that the higher class participates more simply because it is expected to play such a role. To this class, participation "may be a matter of gaining recognition or publicity or insuring policy decisions that will be favorable to one's economic endeavors". Similar view is presented by Reissman. What he maintains is that while the higher class regards organizational participation as the necessary steps for successful mobility and takes advantage of it, the lower class does not. The reason more commonly given for the differential social participation is that the higher class people have more skills and financial resources needed for the participation than the lower class people.

The researches that attempted to explore the relationship between socio-economic status and the level of neighboring have been relatively scarce. The data collected by the Detroit Area Study and reported by Axelrod showed that the level of association with neighbors was not related to socio-economic status of people. The percentages of those who have frequent association with neighbors are 37, 39, 40, 35, 29, 44 percents respectively as the level of family income increases from under $3,000 to $7,000 and over, with four divisions of $1,000 interval in between. Likewise, educational levels when stratified into four
categories from lower to higher correspond to 26, 40, 39, 37 percents respectively.

On the other hand, research literatures abound that tried to establish the relationship between socio-economic status and the level of organizational participation both formal and informal.

Mather found that there was a marked difference between lower and higher income groups in terms of their number of membership in various organizations. For instance, percentage of men in the income class less than $100 per month having no affiliations at all was eight times as great as that of the men in the higher income class. In the case of women, the difference was not as great but still remarkable. And he concluded that in every type of group without exception - church, fraternal, service, recreational, patriotic, political and cultural - the number of membership held by the lower income group was markedly smaller than that held by the higher income group.

Komarovsky reports the similar findings in her classic article, the aim of which was to determine the class difference with respect to the level of organized group affiliations. The sample was taken from the adult residents of New York City. She found, in this research, that economic classes defined in terms of occupation and income differed greatly in the extent of participation and that the relationship generally persisted even when certain other factors were held constant.
The data obtained in the research conducted by Reissman in the city of Evanston, Illinois showed the same result. That is, regardless of whether occupation, income or education was used to measure class position, the higher class groups tended to show higher participation level as measured by church attendance, the number of memberships held in organizations and the frequency of attendance at meetings.

The findings reported by Foskett are somewhat different from those mentioned above. Originally, both income and education levels were found to correlate positively with the participation level when no controls were introduced. But when income and education levels were cross-tabulated, a more complex picture was revealed. For those whose education did not go beyond the ninth grade, income is not related to the level of community participation. But for those whose education level was tenth grade or higher including college, the level of participation increased as their level of income increased. With income level held constant, the level of participation increased as that of education increased. However, the increase in participation score with rise in educational level was most marked for those in the highest income category. Thus the researcher concluded that neither income nor education was the independent determinant of the participation level and that the apparent simple relationship first observed between both education and income and participation score might be due to the combined presence of these two
Wright and Hyman also found, by conducting secondary analysis of survey data, that on national level, voluntary association membership was directly related to socio-economic status as measured by the level of income, occupation, home-ownership, interviewer's rating of the level of living and education.

Educational Status and Residential Differentiation

The place and grade of residence has been hypothesized to correlate with occupational rank significantly. But the question should be more specific because occupational rank itself consists of two components, one of which is economic status and the other is educational status as a measure of life style or value system implied in each of the occupational categories. Then, the question is which of the two variables is related more strongly to the place and grade of residence.

Feldman and Tilly, using data from the 1950 census for Hartford, Connecticut, tested the identity of residential proximity and social similarity measured by occupational rank. What they have found employing rank-order correlation, Kendall's tau is that those who are similar to one another in terms of occupational rank live closer together than those who are dissimilar in this respect. But when controls were introduced, differential effects of income and education were revealed. That is, the reduction of the correlation coefficient with income held constant
was less than with education held constant. This test outcome means that education is a more powerful determinant of residential segregation than income. But in the case of craftsmen, the reverse is true in that income is more potent than education.

Tilly, in his research at New Castle County, Delaware reached a similar conclusion, this time with grade of residence as dependent variable. That is, grade of residence as measured by dwelling rating was found to rise as the occupational rank rose. Besides, the analysis of data indicated that education was the better predictor of the grade of residence than income level. It was also found that education was more powerful as the determinant of residential grade for white-collar workers than for blue-collar workers.

These findings seem consistent with those of Bell, Fava and the socio-cultural school of human ecology, in pointing out that life style or value is more powerful than economic resources in explaining the residential differentiation.
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CHAPTER IV

STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

From the above mentioned theory, past findings and generalizations plus variations in settlement type, housing characteristics and in population involved, nine hypotheses were formulated.

The first half of the hypotheses was advanced to test whether or not the physical aspects of Danchi communities could have any effect on the residents' interaction among themselves and on their family life and activities. These hypotheses may be of interest to physical planners, because their practice is often based on the assumption that the physical could affect the social or the behavioral.

The latter half of the hypotheses was intended to identify the differential responses to a community by the residents of varied social backgrounds. The conventional sociological variables like income and education were posited here as independent variables.

As Martin suggests, place of residence seems to have a significant effect on the structuring of social relationship. A couple of deductions can be made in this respect.

First, Danchi becomes more isolated from the surrounding communities, as its distance from the center of the city increases. One of the reasons is that the gap widens between the demographic and social characteristics of Danchi dwellers and those of people
living outside the Danchi. The reason for the gap is that while population of Danchi regardless of its location remains fairly homogeneous internally due to the tenant and purchaser selection system, rural characteristics of people living around the Danchi become more salient as the distance from the center of the city increases. Thus, neighborly interaction of Danchi dwellers and their organizational life are expected to be concentrated within the boundary.

Another reason for Danchi to become more isolated from the surrounding communities as its distance from the center of the city increases is that physical demarcation between Danchi and the surrounding area becomes clearer. While high-rises and low-rises built on the small sites of Danchi in the central city look like those of the adjacent area, there is a sharp visual contrast between Danchi and the surrounding areas in suburbs, which may help develop the sense of community belongingness among Danchi dwellers.

Second, as the distance from the center of the city increases, Danchi becomes more self-sufficient with regard to facilities and strengthens its character as a packaged community. Everything from grocery store, pharmacies, restaurants, post-office to nursery school tends to be located on the site, in the case of Danchi remote from the central city. Few housewives would dare to go afield to the center of the city for shopping or recreational purposes. This concentrated use of facilities within Danchi by the dwellers
would bring about the increased contacts among them that may lead to sustained neighborly relations.

Third, the longer the husbands' commuting time is, the more likely it is for the wives to spend their time alone. The loneliness and boredom resulting from this situation are expected to encourage women to engage in more neighboring and to participate more in recreational, cultural and other organizations of the community.

Fourth, as the distance between a Danchi and the center of the city increases, the Danchi is likely to be newer. It is becoming increasingly difficult to construct Danchi in the central city due to the high land cost which forces Danchi to be located farther away from the city limit year after year. As Keller, Mowrer and Rosow suggest, new communities are characterized by the loss of class distinction and the need for mutual help and cooperation that would facilitate interaction among the resident and social participation in general. This should be also true for suburban Danchi. Thus it is anticipated that:

\[ H_1 \] Both levels of neighboring activities and organizational participation are greater for people who live in planned communities in suburbs than those who live in planned communities in the central city.

Danchi as planned communities containing high-rise and low-rise buildings are more densely populated than unplanned communi-
ties. Per capita open space outside the buildings in particular is smaller than in most unplanned residential areas. Therefore, it is anticipated that high density living both inside and outside the buildings brings about what Greer calls "intersecting trajectories of action". However, living in proximity is not sufficient to cause high level of neighboring. Intensive neighboring is brought about only when the second condition, population homogeneity is also met, as suggested previously. Danchi dwellers are similar to one another not only in terms of economic status but also with respect to stage in life cycle considered crucial by Gans and others for active neighboring. Nuclear families with one or two children are overrepresented in Danchi as compared with Tokyo Metropolitan Area and Japan as a whole.

Thus, people who have moved into a Danchi wherever it may be located live closer to one another spatially and are expected to have met more people of similar socio-economic as well as family status, than in their previous residence. So current Danchi dwellers must have, more or less, experienced the increase of neighboring, but the extent of the increase is determined by the location of a particular Danchi with respect to the central city. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

\[ H_2 \text{ Once people have moved into planned communities of any location, their level of neighboring activities increases, but the extent of the increase is greater for those who have moved into planned communities in the} \]
suburbs than those who have moved into planned communities in the central city.

One of the principal characteristics of Danchi as physical community is that Danchi is blessed with more and better facilities for children's play and outdoor relaxation than most other residential areas. Danchi dwellers do not have their own gardens, the lack of which seems to be compensated by the shared parks and play lots. Young women chatting with each other with their children playing around nearby is the most popular image everyone has of Danchi. It seems as if family life inside the apartment were extended to the outside. With no through traffic, Danchi is probably the best among other types of settlements in providing a favorable environment for joint family activities on daily basis. There are some differences between Danchi in suburbs and those in the central city. As is easily imagined, better facilities, more open space and greenery for recreation and relaxation are found more often in the former than in the latter. Along with this better environment for family pursuits available in Danchi located in suburbs, more strict segregation of land uses in suburbs seems to play a significant role in facilitating joint family activities. With no bars and other facilities for male enjoyment in and around Danchi, men have no other choice than to join family activities, once they return home. The same is even more so for women. Having burdens of raising children and housekeeping drudgeries everyday, they do not bother
to go afield a long way to the center of the city for shopping and recreational purposes. Thus they are apt to spend most of their time in activities with their children and fellow neighbors. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H$_3$ Once people have moved into planned communities of any location, the amount of family pursuits increases but the extent of the increase is greater for those who have moved into planned communities in suburbs than those who have moved into planned communities in the central city.

The ecological variables posited as independent variables in hypotheses (1), (2) and (3) exert their influences equally on all the residents of a given community. On the level of housing, however, variations make their appearance. One of the variations is space, which is different from one apartment type to another. Some live in more spacious apartments than others. The amount of space a family occupies seems relevant to the level of neighboring both directly and indirectly.

First, the residents of spacious apartments simply have more space for entertaining neighbors at home than those living in less spacious units. Although Japanese seldom invite guests to their homes, the Danchi dwellers living in proximity to one another and being more involved in communal life on neighborhood level than people of other settlement type may be an exception
to this general rule.

Second, living in more spacious apartments leads to more residential satisfaction which, in turn, is one of the indispensable conditions for "settling down" in a given community. And if the process of settling down is related to the level of neighboring as previously suggested, the amount of space a family occupies is considered to have an effect on neighboring in this rather indirect way. The following hypothesis is intended to discover whether or not interaction exists between residential satisfaction and neighboring which are house-related and community-related, respectively. Thus it is hypothesized that:

\[ H_4 \quad \text{Residents living in spacious housing units are more active in neighboring than those who live in less spacious living units.} \]

Now that it is becoming increasingly difficult to buy single-family house, many turn to apartments. But the level of residential satisfaction with apartment living differs among them, possibly depending upon their background characteristics. Among other background characteristics, family status measured by the presence or absence of children has been shown to relate significantly to the level of satisfaction with apartment living by previous research.

In the present investigation, in addition to the presence or absence of preschooler, work status of women is posited as
an indicator of family status. And test is made to know if family status is correlated with the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the level of floor on which one lives.

Our expectation is that it will be more difficult to take care of children in apartments on the upper floors than on the lower floors. Likewise, women who are not working and staying in Danchi most of the time may feel more inconvenienced about living on the upper floors than those who are working and spend less time there. Thus it is considered likely that:

\[ H_5 \text{ Living on upper floors of an apartment building is incongruent with familism.} \]

There are two groups of researchers who are concerned with the relationship between ecological factors and social relations: One group consists of those who stress the significance of physical variables as determinants of the relation, first and foremost, whereas the other group consists of researchers who consider social or cultural characteristics of people involved as more important in this respect.

But there is almost no disagreement between the two groups, in pointing out the effect population homogeneity or heterogeneity has in determining the level of neighborly interaction.

However, uncertainty is found among the researchers about the measure of homogeneity or heterogeneity. Two kinds of variables are conceivable: one is social and the other is be-
havioral. In Danchi where residents tend to be similar to each
other in terms of class and stage in life cycle, the actual level
of neighboring may depend more on the similarity or dissimilarity
of behaviors like taste and child rearing method, and also
on personality, urban or rural origin, generational differences
and so on.

There is another uncertainty, which is concerned with the
definition of neighborhood where population homogeneity and
living in proximity might interact to produce a high level of
neighboring. As Keller repeatedly maintains, there are almost
no common measures to determine the physical boundary of neigh-
borhood. Even more nebulous is the social definition of neigh-
borhood, the boundary of which differs from one individual to
another, depending upon the range of interaction he has with
his neighbors. In addition, even though physical and social
neighborhoods could be demarcated, both seldom coincide to the
regret of planners. The only thing which is agreed upon is
simply that neighborhood refers to the level of environment
existing between household and community.

For these reasons, subjective definitions of population
homogeneity and neighborhood as conceived by the residents are
to be employed in our research.

Danchi as a whole can hardly be considered a single neigh-
brorhood but a congeries of neighborhoods. The following hypo-
thesis is intended to complement with hypotheses (1) and (2).
Thus it is expected that:

\[ H_6 \] The level of neighboring is higher in homogeneous neighborhood than in heterogeneous neighborhood.

For most of the people in Japan just as others living elsewhere in the world, to own a dwelling whether it be a house or an apartment is an ideal. Since homeowners are less likely to move than renters and besides property value of their dwellings is at stake, they are expected to participate in neighboring and community-related organizations more actively than renters.

Gans maintains that "ownership incorporates people into the block and gives some a feeling of community belongingness which may result in church, organizational, and political participation". The findings reported by Mather, Scott, Wright and Hyman have consistently showed that homeowners are more prone to social participation than renters. However, as stated before, the independent effect of occupancy status per se is difficult to isolate, since it is closely bound up with social stratification variables. With these variables held constant, it is still expected that:

\[ H_7 \] Homeowners are more active in both neighboring and organizational participation than renters.

People different from one another in terms of economic status are also expected to differ in their level of social
paticipation. Although people living in Danchi are relatively similar with respect to income status as compared with those living elsewhere, some differences do exist. To reiterate the reasons for the differential social participation, the residents of higher income status, having less need for mutual aid on neighborhood level and being more involved in a larger system of society are expected to make their friends more often in places other than neighborhood. The same thing will also hold true for women. Although organizations that exist in Danchi are few both in kinds and number, the differential organizational participation may be still evident among the residents of different income statuses for the reasons stated previously. Thus it is anticipated that:

\[ H_8 \] Residents of higher economic status are less active in neighboring but more active in organizational participation than those of lower economic status.

Previous studies have shown that the level of education one has attained rather than income level is more positively correlated with the housing quality of his residence. This is probably because the quality of one's residence is more the function of his value or life style than of his economic status. And the likelihood of his moving out from Danchi will of course depend on the level of satisfaction with his present residence. Thus it is anticipated that:
Residents of higher educational status are less satisfied with living in planned communities and hope more strongly to move out than those of lower educational status.
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CHAPTER V

METHODOLOGY

This chapter includes explanation of independent and dependent variables, the sampling procedures used to obtain a representative sample of Danchi dwellers and the process of devising questionnaire items intended to tap information necessary to test the hypotheses previously stated.

Independent and Dependent Variables

The variables dealt with in this research and their operational definitions are as follows:

Independent Variables:

1. Settlement Type -----

planned communities in the central city, and planned communities in suburbs. The central city is defined as the area comprising twenty-three wards (Ku), the core of Tokyo.
The suburbs are defined as the areas adjacent to the central area, regardless of administration boundaries of prefectures. Time needed to commute
to the central city ranges from one to two hours.

2. Types of Apartment Units
   a. one room with a kitchen-dining room (1K)
   b. two rooms with a kitchen-dining room (2DK)
   c. two rooms with a living room and a kitchen-dining room (2LDK)
   d. three rooms with a kitchen (3K)
   e. three rooms with a kitchen-dining room (3DK)
   f. three rooms with a living room and a kitchen-dining room (3LDK)
   g. four rooms with a kitchen-dining room (4DK)

3. Floor ----- the nth floor on which the respondent lives.

4. Homogeneity or Heterogeneity of Population
   population homogeneity or heterogeneity subjectively defined (perceived) by the respondent.

5. Socio-Economic Status
   a. economic status: measured by annual income of the household
   b. educational status: measured by the number of years of schooling attained by the respondent
   c. occupational status: managerial, professional, clerical, sales and service, security related job, skilled and unskilled.
6. Occupancy Status ---- homeowners and renters

7. Familism (family status) ---- measured by
   a. whether or not the respondent is working
   b. whether or not the respondent has preschoolers

Dependent Variables:

1. The Level of Neighboring Activities ----
   kinds of exchanges (recognition, information, services, visiting, entertaining) and their frequency

2. The Level of Organizational Participation ---- measured by
   a. the frequency of attendance at meetings and functions of the Dwellers' Association.
   b. whether or not the respondent is holding office or has held it before.
   c. the extent of interest the respondent has in community affairs.
   d. whether or not the respondent is attending recreational or cultural groups.
   e. whether or not the respondent desires to participate in recreational or cultural groups.

3. The Level of Residential Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction ---- measured by
   a. the scale of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with housing and its environment in which the
respondent lives.

b. the extent of prospective mobility.

4. The Level of Familism (family pursuits) -----

measured by the frequency of joint family activities.

Sampling Procedures

Two stage random sampling was used. First, fourteen Danchi as primary sampling units were drawn at random from the list of Danchi in Tokyo Metropolitan Area. Second, the households as secondary sampling units were drawn also randomly from each community. The details of the sampling procedures are as follows:

A list of all Danchi in operation as of March 1976 was obtained from Japan Public Housing Agency. Of the 495 Danchi located all over Kanto Area consisting of Tokyo and its four adjacent prefectures, 132 were excluded from the sampling list because they are located in Kanagawa Prefecture having two big cities (Kawasaki and Yokohama) with populations of over one million, where the influence of Tokyo is thought to be less salient than in other three prefectures (Saitama, Ibaragi and Chiba). The remaining 363 Danchi were set up as universe of sampling.

Then a number was chosen randomly to set up a starting point and every twenty-sixth Danchi was selected, supplying a 3.8 percent sample of the Danchi located in Kanto area excluding Kanagawa
Prefecture. Fourteen Danchi thus sampled are distributed fairly evenly all over Kanto area, the distance from the core of Tokyo (Nihonbashi) being from 4.73 to 26 miles. Six of these fourteen Danchi have turned out to be located in the central city, the remaining eight being located in suburbs. The ages of these Danchi range from 1.41 (17 months) to 14.16 years (170 months), the average being about six years (71 months). Also, they have a total of 29,996 households, the average being 2,142 units.

At first, it was decided to draw a total of 550 samples, which was a maximum to be afforded when time and the amount of expenditure was considered. Then, the number of households drawn from each of the Danchi was made proportionate to the size of Danchi which they belong to. For the selection of households, the same procedure was taken as the one taken in selecting Danchi. Thus, 1.83 percent sample of the population of the fourteen Danchi was supplied. The housewives of the households were selected as respondents.

Collection of Data

Construction of Pilot Questionnaire

Since most of the previously constructed scales were found not suited to the aim of this research, the scales were devised anew by the present author himself. Before constructing a pilot questionnaire, the author conducted brief, unstructured interviews
to about ten housewives at four Danchi located at the periphery of the central city to discover the unexpected variables which might be useful to the research. A pilot questionnaire consisting of ninety-five items thus constructed was administered by two university students to sixty respondents at two Danchi, one of which was located in the central city and the other in the suburbs. The aim of this preliminary research was to test the responsiveness of the respondents prior to the construction of the final questionnaire. More specifically, it was intended to discover the unexpected variables and to find out those questions which were ambiguous, impossible to answer or considered unrealistic by the respondents. The wording of each item was also checked. The time needed for the respondents to answer all of the ninety-five questions were thirty minutes on the average.

Construction of Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire was then constructed based on the outcome of this preliminary investigation. Some items were eliminated in light of the above-mentioned points while others were added. Special care was exercised to reduce the time needed to answer the questions. The order of the items was rearranged so that respondents could move from one question to another more smoothly and quickly. The final questionnaire thus constructed ended up with ninety items, only five items less than the pilot questionnaire.
Danchi Dwellers' Questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of the following three parts:

Face sheet items are for obtaining information on the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the respondents. Preliminary questions are intended to provide the data on the respondents' previous residence, the reason for the move out and an item that corresponds to the question in the next section contentwise (Q.6 and Q.31). The main body of the questionnaire measures the respondents' levels of (1) neighboring activities, (2) organizational participation, (3) joint family activities and (4) residential satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

A couple of items included in the face sheet were borrowed from Research Report of Japan Public Housing Agency published every five years. Questions 55 to 57 were taken from Japanese sociological literature. Most of the items were constructed so as to constitute interval scale.

Execution of Survey

Prior to the initiation of survey, the author visited the research sites to draw samples from the dwellers' list and to get a better understanding of the sites to be studied.

The interviewing method was adopted, first of all, to prevent the occurrence of a large amount of unusable answers and secondly, to provide some explanation without which the respondents may not
answer some of the items such as those concerned with their socio-economic status.

Seven university students majoring in design or architecture were employed to conduct research. All of them had to be female, because housewives as respondents might feel threatened by male researchers.

The researchers were instructed to visit the sampled respondents the next day, in case they happened to be away from home. If they were not at home again the next day, their next-door neighbor was chosen as a substitute. Similar substitution was also made in case the researchers were refused interviews.

Once allowed to have an interview, researchers read the questions one by one and checked the answer items for the respondents. The average time needed was about twenty-five minutes per household. The survey started at the beginning of October 1977 and ended a month later.

Computation of Scores

The responses to the answer items were scored in the usual manner where an answer indicating the most favorable response towards the question was given the highest score of five. Conversely, an answer indicating the least favorable response was given the lowest score of one.

Prior to the analysis, it was decided that each respondent's total scores on the levels of neighboring, organizational partici-
pation, residential satisfaction and familism were to be computed by adding her item scores. The procedures taken were as follows:

**Neighboring**

(1) = \(Q.09 + Q.10\) (neighboring in previous residence)

(2) = \(Q.14 + \ldots + Q.24\) (neighboring in present residence)

(3) = \(Q.25 + Q.26\) (neighboring in present residence identical with \(Q.09 + Q.10\) contentwise)

**Organizational Participation**

(1) = \(Q.35 + Q.35-1 + Q.37 + Q.38\)

(2) = \(Q.36 + Q.39\)

(3) = (1) + (2)

**Residential Satisfaction**

(1) = \(Q.48 + Q.50\) (satisfaction with the environment and the apartment, respectively)

(2) = \(Q.52 + Q.54\) (prospective mobility)

(3) = (1) + (2)

**Familism**

. The Level of Joint Family Activities

(1) = \(Q.44 + Q.45\) (in previous residence)

(2) = \(Q.44-1 + Q.45-1\) (in present residence identical with (1) contentwise)

. The Level of the Increase of Joint Family Activities

= \(Q.41 + Q.44-2 + Q.45-2\)
The responses were analyzed to find out if each item differentiates clearly between the highest and lowest quartiles of total scores, by means of a t test. In most cases, however, it was not possible to precisely determine both quartiles due to uneven distributions of frequencies among the scores. With this reservation, all of the items were found to have discriminative power (P < 0.001).

Q.14 ~ Q.24 were designed so as to constitute the Guttman Scale. An effort was made to increase the coefficient of reproducibility more than 0.9 by changing the division point between the answer items or by totally eliminating some questions from the scale. Consequently, the coefficient of reproducibility turned out to be 0.8726 after Q.21 had been discarded from the original items.

Analysis of the Data

The Danchi dwellers' responses thus obtained were coded and placed on punch cards, which were then put into the computer to get frequency distributions and to conduct a series of statistical tests. The data were processed by HITAC 8800/8700 of Tokyo University's Computer Center. The procedures of the tests made are the same as those described in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, by Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Bent.

The major statistics used were t test, chi-square, rank-order correlation Kendall's tau and partial correlation. Even when the
relationships between independent and dependent variables were found significant, efforts were made to identify the true source of variations on the part of dependent variables, by introducing control variables.
Overview of the Survey Results

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The size of the household is almost the same as the average of all Japanese households (3.47, 3.45 respectively). But it is greater than the average size of households in Tokyo (2.90). The high family status of the sample is revealed when the presence or absence of preschoolers is used as its measure. According to the 1975 census, the percentages of families that have children under 6 years of age in Japan as a whole and in Tokyo are 41.19 and 42.14 respectively. But the figure is almost 60 in case of our sample.

### TABLE 1
Distribution of Households by the Number of Occupants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
Distribution of Households by the Presence or Absence of Preschoolers
(N = 547)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>have preschoolers</th>
<th>have not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But the fact that the percentage of those who had children of this age group at the time of moving into the present residence is 47.1 suggests that a large number of households have undergone the change in age structure of the family after having moved into the Danchi.

The age structure characteristic of our sample is further evidenced by the fact that while the percentages of married women in Japan who are under the age of thirty, in their thirties, forties and beyond the age of fifty are 20.16, 28.09, 24.45, 26.7 respectively, majority of the respondents is in their twenties and thirties as shown in TABLE 3.

TABLE 3
Distribution of Households by the Age of Housewife
(N = 540)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>below 29</th>
<th>30 - 39</th>
<th>40 - 49</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Socio-Economic Status of the Sample

As is well publicized, more than two-thirds of the heads of households in Danchi are engaged in white collar occupations. While the percentage of those who are engaged in either professional and technical or managerial or clerical is only 27 for all Japan, that of Danchi is 68.5. On the other hand, while the percentage of skilled and unskilled workers is 33 for all Japan, it is only 10.4 in our sample.

TABLE 4
Distribution of Households by the Occupation of the Head
(N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, service</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security-related</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled, unskilled</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The income level of our sample seems to be similar to that of average households in Japan. While annual income for all households in Japan is estimated to be 3,470,000 yens or 15,772 dollars (one dollar 2220 yen) on the average, households in the
3,000,000 to 3,500,000 income bracket show the highest percentage (26.35 percent) in our sample. Suppose that the mid-point of each income bracket is the average annual income of the households belonging to the category, the average for all our samples is estimated to be 3,305,000 yens or 15,094 dollars.

**TABLE 5**

Distribution of Households
by Total Income
(N = 528)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than ¥1,500,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥1,500,000 to 2,000,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥2,000,000 to 2,500,000</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥2,500,000 to 3,000,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥3,000,000 to 3,500,000</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥3,500,000 to 4,000,000</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥4,000,000 to 4,500,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4,500,000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The educational status of the respondents appear to be higher than the average Japanese females. While women who have graduated from junior college or beyond is about 5.8 percent for Japan as a whole, our respondents belonging to this category is 30 percent. This big difference is, for the most part, attributed to the fact that the respondents are much younger than the average age of married women in Japan. When compared with the same age group, the difference would be much smaller.
TABLE 6

Distribution of Respondents by the Number of Years of Schooling Attained
(N = 533)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years of schooling attained</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 to 8 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>54.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Previous Residence of the Respondents and the Reasons for the Move to Danchi

It is noted that places where the respondents lived for the longest time before the move are mostly urban. Fifty-four percent of them referred to the ten biggest cities in Japan, whereas 36 percent mentioned medium-sized cities. These figures strongly suggest the urban origin of Danchi dwellers which is thought to give Danchi its characteristic feature as a neighborhood. Besides, the overwhelming majority of the respondents used to live in Tokyo and its adjacent prefectures before the move (92.4 percent).
Nearly 60 percent of the respondents used to rent privately-owned single detached houses or apartments before the move and 15 percent used to live in rented apartments of Danchi, majority of whom changed their occupancy status from tenants to homeowners. With respect to housing type, only about 30 percent of the respondents used to live in fireproof concrete apartments, whereas 70 percent used to live in free-standing houses or apartments made out of wood and mortar. This means that for most of the respondents, living in apartment buildings is a new experience.

When asked about the principal reason for the move into present residence, almost two-thirds of the respondents mentioned the house-related reasons among which the smallness of the previous residence was pointed out most often (33.6 percent). Likewise, 46 percent of the respondents, when asked why they chose Danchi among other choices, mentioned the house-related reasons like the appropriateness of rent or price or quality of the housing facilities. It is noted that about 13 percent of them mentioned the relative excellence of the environmental conditions of Danchi as the principal reason for the choice.

General Profile of Social Life of the Respondents

Nearly all of the respondents have at least a few neighbors to say "hello" to and chat with on the street. (0.14, Q.17) They give a mutual aid to each other to a certain extent. Ninety-five percent of them keep the mailed packages for their neighbors who
are away from home. (Q.16) But as was expected, the level of mutual aid decreases as the exchange entails a deeper, psychological involvement. Fifty percent of the respondents have no neighbors with whom to exchange things like tools, foods or medicines when the need occurs. (Q.18) However, this figure may simply mean the fact that there is not so much need for the exchange of this sort in the first place, now that most of them keep these things for their use and if they do not, can buy them at the neighborhood stores without much trouble. On the other hand, the extent of mutual visiting and entertaining is relatively high. Seventy-three percent of the respondents have at least one neighbor with whom they chat in the living room of each other's apartment. (Q.21) And almost two-thirds of them invite their neighbors to tea or dinner party at times. (Q.22) It seems true that housewives in Danchi are engaged in interaction to a greater extent than those in other neighborhoods. But this does not mean that they are really intimate. In fact, only 2.4 percent of the respondents considered family-like neighborliness often found in small towns or villages as most desirable. (Q.29) Furthermore, less than one-third of the respondents who would suffer from the noise the neighbors make, go and ask them directly to do something about it. The rest simply let them know the predicament more indirectly or goes to the Dwellers' Association for a solution or does nothing at all, probably wishing to avoid any conflicts that may arise. (Q.30)
Lastly and characteristically, 5.7 percent of the respondents have got to know their most intimate neighbors through their children. Seventy percent of their most intimate neighbors are reported to live in the same buildings as those of the respondents.

The level of organizational participation is low as shown by the data that only 14.4 percent of those who have memberships in the Dwellers' Association attend the meetings when requested. (Q.35) Women's organizational participation is almost limited to recreational and cultural groups that exist in and around Danchi. About 32 percent of the respondents currently participate in groups of some kinds, like those of tea-ceremony, flower arrangement, calligraphy, music or sports. Fourteen percent reported they would like to participate if there were clubs of some interest or if they were less busy. (Q.40) Twenty five percent of the participants reported that they were motivated to become a member of the club by their neighbors or friends whom they met at nursery school or kindergarten. (Q.40-4)

Family Life in Danchi

For most of the respondents, the level of joint family activities has increased since they moved into the present residence. For instance, 26 percent of them reported an increase, in contrast to 15 percent who reported a decrease in this respect. (Q.44-2) Men have come to play with their children more often than before. (Q.45-2)
The nature of the activities has also changed. The activities best performed in the countryside away from downtown such as going on a picnic, driving, taking a walk or playing sports around homes were cited to have increased the most among other family activities by 50 percent of the respondents. On the other hand, only 26 percent of them mentioned shopping, enjoying movies and eating out as activities which increased the most. (Q.46) In a word, the respondents have not only increased the level of joint family activities but have also changed the kinds of activities.

Residential Satisfaction

In general, the respondents are more satisfied with Danchi as an environment than with the housing itself. While 42 percent of them are more or less satisfied with environmental aspects of Danchi such as facilities on the site or its scenery (Q.48), only 23 percent of the respondents express satisfaction with their apartment. (Q.50) Sixty-seven percent of those who have expressed dissatisfaction to any extent have mentioned the smallness of their apartment as the major reason. Unexpectedly, the majority of the respondents do not feel inconvenienced about the height of the floors on which they are living. It is noteworthy that 65 percent of them find Danchi a good place to raise children. (Q.49)

Finally, 56 percent of the respondents regard Danchi as temporary residence. (Q.54) And nearly one-third of them reported
that they would like to move out as soon as possible. (Q.52)
These figures strongly indicate that Danchi as a whole harbor
a large number of potential movers.
Tests of the Hypotheses

Here the outcomes of the statistical tests are to be presented. Throughout the whole tests, a $p > 0.05$ was considered not significant. In some cases, the size of $N$ is less than 550 because of the unusable answers that occurred.

$H_1$ Both levels of neighboring activities and organizational participation are greater for people who live in planned communities in suburbs than those who live in planned communities in the central city.

Here the hypothesis was advanced to test the possible effect the locations of the planned communities with respect to the central city have on the level of social participation.

Expectedly, clear difference was found to exist between Danchi located in the central city and those in the suburbs in terms of the level of neighboring.

But more salient is the difference between the two groups of Danchi in terms of the level of participation in the Dwellers' Association. The outcomes of the $t$ test indicated that the difference was significant at the 0.05 level or better with direction predicted for both actual organizational participation and interest in the community affairs. (TABLE 7) However, with respect to the level of actual participation in recreational or cultural groups, there does exist a difference between the two groups of Danchi, but unexpectedly, in favor of Danchi located in the central
city. (TABLE 8) The same thing holds true for the level of desire to participate in such groups. (TABLE 9) Therefore, it can be said that place of residence may or may not have the effect on the level of organization participation of the residents, depending on the kinds of organizations involved.

Thus it could be safely concluded that place of residence may affect the level of neighboring but not that of organizational participation necessarily.

TABLE 7
NEIGHBORING ACTIVITIES AND ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATIONS SCORES OF DANCHI IN SUBURBS AND IN THE CENTRAL CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Type of Community</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb (N = 302)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighboring Activities</td>
<td>Central City (N = 246)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Participation (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.01</td>
<td>25.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Participation (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8
THE NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO ARE PARTICIPATING OR NOT PARTICIPATING IN RECREATIONAL OR CULTURAL GROUPS - BY TYPE OF COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Community</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Not Participating</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 4.43
Sig. Level = 0.05

TABLE 9
THE NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO DESIRE OR DO NOT DESIRE TO PARTICIPATE IN RECREATIONAL OR CULTURAL GROUPS - BY TYPE OF COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Community</th>
<th>Desire to Participate</th>
<th>Do not Desire to Participate</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 6.74
Sig. Level = 0.01
Once people have moved into planned communities of any location, their level of neighboring activities increases, but the extent of the increase is greater for those who have moved into planned communities in suburbs than for those who have moved into planned communities in the central city.

Unexpectedly, the Danchi dwellers in general were found not to have increased the level of neighboring since they move to present residence. (TABLE 10)

Our samples include two groups of residents distinguished by the existence or non-existence of previous experience of Danchi life. One group consists of those who used to live in Danchi before the move to the present community and simply changed their occupancy status from renters to owners. This group can be thought of as control group in our tests. The other group, the overwhelming majority of our samples consists of residents who moved to Danchi for the first time.

When t test was performed for the first group, the difference turned out to be negative although not significant at the 0.05 level. This outcome does not fall short of our expectation necessarily, because actually they did not change either the type of settlement or that of housing in which to live. But, even for the people who moved to the present location from places other
TABLE 10
NEIGHBORING ACTIVITIES SCORES - BEFORE AND AFTER THE MOVE TO DANCHI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>301^b</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that did not change the type of settlement to live in.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>1.22^a</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that changed the type of settlement.</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that did not change family status.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>3.60^a</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that changed family status.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that did not change either occupancy status or family status.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>0.55^a</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Difference is in the unpredicted direction.

^b The size of the N was reduced because of the elimination from the sample of all respondents who gave contradictory answers to two sets of questions. The procedure for eliminating respondents was as follows: If a respondent gave answers to Q. 13 which contradicted their answers to questions 9, 10, and to questions 25, and 26 (see page 65), they were eliminated from this part of the analysis.
than Danchi, significance of the difference was below acceptable level. Control was also introduced for family status and t tests were applied separately to the households with or without preschoolers both before and after the move, and to those which have got preschoolers after the move. When t test was applied for the first group considered most suited to identify the effect of settlement to which they moved, the difference was found significant at the 0.01 level or better but not in the expected direction. This means that they have decreased the level of neighboring since the move. As for the second group of people who have got preschoolers after the move, the difference was found significant at the 0.001 level or better in the expected direction.

For further examination of the effect of settlement type on the level of neighboring, households whose family status as well as occupancy status had been the same as before were selected and t test was applied. The test outcome indicated that this particular group might have even decreased the level of neighboring since the move, although the difference was found not significant at the 0.05 level.
Thus it is evident, against our expectation, that the move to Danchi which seem to have social and physical features favorable to neighborly interaction, has not brought about the increase of neighboring. One conceivable reason for this finding could be pointed out. That is, despite the assumed population homogeneity in terms of demographic characteristics and social status, the level of perceived homogeneity deemed most relevant to that of neighboring did not actually increase after the move to Danchi. Even the decrease of the level of perceived homogeneity may be suggested by the finding that although about fifty-seven percent of the respondents used to see themselves more or less similar to their neighbors in previous residence, the figure dropped to fifty-one percent in the present residence.

Now that even the predicted direction let alone the difference was not found to exist, it would not be very meaningful to go ahead with the latter half of this hypothesis.

In light of these test outcomes, the second hypothesis is rejected.

H3 Once people have moved into planned communities of any location, the amount of family pursuits increases, but the extent of the increase is greater for those who have moved into planned communities in suburbs than those who have moved into planned communities in the central city.
As was anticipated, Danchi dwellers as a whole were found to have increased the level of family pursuits since the move to Danchi. For all the respondents, the difference between the levels of joint family activities before and after the move turned out to be significant at the 0.001 level or better. (TABLE 11) When t test was applied separately to the residents who used to stay in Danchi before the move and those who moved into Danchi for the first time, it was found that the former might have even decreased the level of joint family activities significantly, whereas for the latter the difference is significant at the 0.001 level or better in the predicted direction. In light of these outcomes, it seems evident that Danchi as a settlement is favorable to family activities. In order to identify the source of the difference between the two points in time, t test was performed separately for the residents whose family status has remained the same in terms of presence or absence of preschoolers and for those who changed in this respect. The outcome of the test turned out that the former might have even decreased the level of familism as defined by that of joint family activities although the difference was not significant at the 0.05 level (t value being 0.76 not significant at the 0.05 level), while the latter clearly changed it. Now we are not sure as much as before of the effect of settlement type on family activities. Instead, the presence or absence of preschoolers seems to have more salient effect in this respect.
### Table 11

**Joint Family Activities Scores - Before and After the Move to Danchi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>365(^b)</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that did not change the type of settlement to live in.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that changed the type of settlement.</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that did not change family status.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.76(^a)</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that changed family status.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households that did not change either occupancy status or family status.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Difference is in the unpredicted direction.

\(^b\) The size of the N was reduced because of the elimination from the sample of all respondents who gave contradictory answers to two sets of questions. The procedure for eliminating respondents was as follows: If a respondent gave answers to Q. 44-2 which contradicted their answers to questions 44, 45, and to questions 44-1, 45-1 (see page 65) they were eliminated from this part of analysis.
Since the move to Danchi often involves not only the change of the settlement type but also that of occupancy status, in order to reexamine the effects of settlement type, the only households whose family status as well as occupancy status had remained unchanged were selected and t test was applied. The test outcome indicated that there was not a difference significant at the 0.05 level or better with respect to this particular group, making the effect of settlement type more dubious than before.

Thus it can be safely concluded that, while the residents did increase the level of joint family activities after their move to Danchi, the increase may be more attributed to the change of family status rather than to that of settlement type, although the effect of the latter could not be denied.

Then we proceed to the latter half of the hypothesis in which a t test was applied to the differential degree of increase of joint family activities between Danchi located in the central city and those in suburbs. The test outcome indicated that the level of the increase appeared to be greater for those who moved into the latter than the former, but, the difference was not significant at the 0.05 level (t value being 1.46 significant at the 0.144 level). This means that although people increased the level of joint family
activities after the move to Danchi, the locational difference of the settlements does not seem to have a particular effect on the increase.

$H_4$ Residents living in spacious housing units are more active in neighboring than those who live in less spacious housing units.

Unexpectedly, the test outcome indicated that space of the apartment in which one lives had nothing to do with the level of neighboring she is engaged in. (TABLE 12) In fact, it was found that the residents living in spacious apartment did not necessarily invite their neighbors for tea or dinner more often than those living in less spacious units. (TABLE 13)

Certainly, space of apartments correlates positively with the level of housing satisfaction which, in turn, correlates negatively with that of prospective mobility. (TABLE 14, 15) But, it turned out, against our expectation, that the residents with greater prospective mobility was more active in neighboring than those of less prospective mobility. (TABLE 20) It is at this point where the anticipated chain of successive influences is disrupted.

Thus, the fourth hypothesis is rejected.
TABLE 12

THE LEVELS OF NEIGHBORING ACTIVITIES - BY TYPE OF APARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Apartment</th>
<th>The Levels of Neighboring Activities</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4DK</td>
<td>1 0 2 1 2 2 1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3LDK</td>
<td>1 4 1 6 4 6 8 6 6 0 1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DK</td>
<td>6 16 8 17 16 21 26 24 14 3 5</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DK</td>
<td>8 13 14 21 26 17 26 34 26 9 12</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals b</td>
<td>16 33 25 45 48 46 61 65 46 12 18</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau = 0.05 not significant at 0.05 level

- See page 58 for key to apartment type designation.
- Only the most prevalent types of apartment were selected for analysis in this table.
TABLE 13
THE NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO INVITE THEIR NEIGHBORS TO THEIR HOMES - BY TYPE OF APARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Apartment</th>
<th>Responses to Q. 22</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4DK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3LDK</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DK</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DK</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau = -0.047 not significant at 0.05 level.

a See page 58 for key to apartment type designation.

b Only the most prevalent types of apartment were selected for analysis on this table.

TABLE 14
THE LEVELS OF SATISFACTION WITH HOUSING - BY TYPE OF APARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Apartment</th>
<th>Responses to Q. 50</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied Very Much</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Dissatisfied Very Much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4DK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3LDK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau = 0.22 significant at 0.001 level.

a See page 58 for key to apartment type designation.

b Only the most prevalent types of apartment were selected for analysis in this table.
### TABLE 15

**THE LEVELS OF RESIDENTIAL SATISFACTION - BY THE EXTENT OF SATISFACTION WITH HOUSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with Housing</th>
<th>The Levels of Residential Satisfaction (2)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied very much</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied very much</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kendall's Tau = 0.26 significant at 0.001 level*
$H_5$ Living on upper floors of an apartment building is incongruent with familism.

In general, people seem to feel inconvenienced to live on upper floors of an apartment building. When Kendall's tau was performed for all respondents without controls, it was found that people living on upper floors feel more inconvenienced than those who live on lower ones ($r = 0.15$, $p < 0.001$). (TABLE 16) Controlling for the presence or absence of preschooler in this test, the effect of age composition of families became evident. That is, when Kendall's tau was performed, correlation coefficient between the responses to Question 20 of face sheet and Question 51 turned out to be 0.09 significant at the 0.05 level for households without preschoolers, whereas the correlation coefficient was 0.19 significant at the 0.001 level for those with preschoolers.

When work status of women, another measure of family status was introduced as control variable, it was found that women who were working were more affected by the location of their apartments than those who were not, although the difference was quite small.

Thus, it could be safely concluded that in general people feel more inconvenienced as the height of their apartments increase, but the members of households of higher family status feel more so than the members of households of lower family status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Floors</th>
<th>No Control (N = 548)</th>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Work Status</th>
<th>Part-time + Full-time (N = 104)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Kendall's Tau | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.09 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.19 |
| Sig, Level    | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
The level of neighboring is greater in homogeneous neighborhood than in heterogeneous neighborhood.

Here perceived homogeneity or heterogeneity was dealt with as independent variable and the level of neighboring as dependent variable. Even though population homogeneity in terms of demographic characteristics and other variables concerned with socio-economic status prevails among the residents, it can hardly facilitate neighboring unless it is translated into perceived homogeneity, subjective definition of population homogeneity. The test results meet our expectation. Correlation between the two variables when tested by Kendall's tau turned out to be 0.14 significant at the 0.001 level or better. (TABLE 17) Zero-order partial performed for further examination yielded coefficient of 0.176 significant at the 0.001 level or better. The sixth hypothesis is therefore accepted.

**TABLE 17**

**CORRELATIONS OF POPULATION HOMOGENEITY OR HETEROGENEITY WITH THE LEVEL OF NEIGHBORING**

(N = 550)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Test used</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived homogeneity or heterogeneity</td>
<td>Neighboring</td>
<td>Kendall's tau</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-order partial</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homeowners are more active in both neighboring and organizational participation than renters.

In this hypothesis, there is no need to control for housing type and place of residence in determining the effect of occupancy status, not only because apartment buildings are almost the only type of dwellings that exist in Danchi, but also because they are not tied to any particular location with respect to the central city.

TABLE 18

NEIGHBORING ACTIVITIES AND ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATIONS SCORES - BY OCCUPANCY STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Occupancy Status</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renters (N = 367)</td>
<td>Owners (N = 180)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighboring Activities</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>0.59(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Participation (1)</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Participation (2)</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Participation (3)</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Difference is in the unpredicted direction.
The outcome of the t test showed that the difference between renters and homeowners in terms of the level of neighboring was not significant at the 0.05 level. (TABLE 18) When chi-square test was performed with income level held constant, the difference between the two groups was found not significant for any of the income brackets. (TABLE 19) With the presence or absence of preschoolers held constant, the difference was not significant at the 0.05 level for the households with preschoolers, whereas for those without preschoolers, the renters were engaged in neighboring more than homeowners, the difference being significant at the 0.001 level or better. When education was introduced as control variable, no significant difference was found to exist between renters and owners of any educational status except the residents of middle educational status.

Thus the outcomes of these tests were found rather consistent. But the difference so salient for the households without preschoolers is hard to interpret. Despite this reservation, it can be safely concluded that there is no difference between renters and homeowners in terms of the level of neighboring. One thing should be noted. While homeowners are less likely to move out than renters, the correlation between the level of neighboring and the extent of prospective mobility is positive. This finding seems to provide reason for the no difference between the two groups. (TABLE 20)
### TABLE 19

**THE LEVELS OF NEIGHBORING ACTIVITIES - BY OCCUPANCY STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Status</th>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Educational Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (N = 110)</td>
<td>Low (N = 68)</td>
<td>Low (N = 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle (N = 217)</td>
<td>Middle (N = 395)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N = 200)</td>
<td>High (N = 219)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Pre-schoolers (N = 328)</td>
<td>Without Pre-schoolers (N = 219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low (N = 68)</td>
<td>Middle (N = 395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High (N = 69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The Levels of Neighboring Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renters</th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The columns in the table represent different statuses and levels, with specific counts and statistical measures provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy status</td>
<td>Prospective mobility (Mean Scores)</td>
<td>T test T-value = 4.07</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Renters and Owners)</td>
<td>Renters: 5.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners: 4.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Mobility</td>
<td>Neighboring</td>
<td>Zero-order partial r = 0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Mobility</td>
<td>Organizational participation (1)</td>
<td>Zero-order partial r = -0.18</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational participation (2)</td>
<td>Zero-order partial r = -0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational participation (3)</td>
<td>Zero-order partial r = -0.18</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 20

OCCUPANCY STATUS, PROSPECTIVE MOBILITY AND THE LEVELS OF NEIGHBORING AND ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION IN DWELLERS' ASSOCIATION

(N = 548)
As for the participation in Danchi Dwellers' Association, homeowners seem more active than renters. The outcome of t test showed that there was a difference significant at the 0.001 level or better in the predicted direction between the two groups in terms of actual organizational participation.

As far as the interest in community affairs is concerned, the difference was not significant at the 0.05 level. But at any rate, there did exist a marked difference between the two in terms of overall involvement with the community in which they live.

(TABLE 18)

When controls were introduced, a somewhat complex picture was revealed. (TABLE 21) There was no difference in terms of actual participation for people who belong to either low or middle income bracket. But for the higher income group, the difference between homeowners and renters was found salient. Controlling for educational factors, the only significant difference was found for the group of people who attained twelve to fifteen years of schooling. With respect to the interest in the community, there is no consistent pattern at all when controls were introduced for economic as well as educational status.

The only exception for these inconsistent outcomes is that for both groups belonging to lower socio-economic status, no significant difference was found in the level of participation.
TABLE 21

THE LEVELS OF ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION IN
DWELLER'S ASSOCIATION - BY OCCUPANCY STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Status</th>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Educational Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (N = 110)</td>
<td>Middle (N = 217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N = 200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (N = 68)</td>
<td>Middle (N = 395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N = 69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Levels of Organizational Participation (1)

| Renters | 53 | 44 | 78 | 89 | 47 | 47 | 29 | 28 | 136 | 137 | 13 | 17 |
| Owners  | 4  | 9  | 16 | 34 | 24 | 82 | 2  | 9  | 36  | 86  | 8  | 31 |

df 1 1 1 1 1 1
Chi-square 1.82 3.40 16.28 2.76 13.33 3.15
Sig. Level N.S. N.S. 0.001 N.S. 0.001 N.S.

The Levels of Organizational Participation (2)

| Renters | 20 | 77 | 34 | 133 | 23 | 71 | 15 | 42 | 58 | 215 | 5  | 25 |
| Owners  | 1  | 12 | 3  | 47  | 8  | 98 | 2  | 9  | 7  | 115 | 3  | 36 |

df 1 1 1 1 1 1
Chi-square 0.56 4.63 9.63 0.03 6.83 0.59
Sig. Level N.S. 0.05 N.S. 0.01 N.S. N.S.

The Levels of Organizational Participation (3)

| Renters | 38 | 59 | 43 | 124 | 28 | 66 | 24 | 33 | 81 | 192 | 5  | 25 |
| Owners  | 2  | 11 | 6  | 44  | 12 | 94 | 1  | 10 | 20 | 102 | 0  | 39 |

df 1 1 1 1 1 1
Chi-square 1.87 3.40 10.61 3.02 7.12 4.71
Sig. Level N.S. N.S. 0.01 N.S. 0.01 N.S.
Certainly, to own a dwelling is more or less to have a stake in the community in which it is located. The outcomes of the analysis seem to indicate, however, that neighboring has nothing to do with that commitment. On the other hand, the participation in Danchi Dwellers' Association which is concerned with the livability problems of community is almost the only channel available through which the residents can improve their environmental conditions. In light of this point, it is only natural that homeowners with less prospective mobility is more active in the organizational participation in the Association than renters with greater prospective mobility. (TABLE 20) The finding that there is no significant difference between the owners and renters of lower socio-economic status in terms of the participation level seems to indicate that the homeowners of this class may be no more aware of the relevance of community to their residential satisfaction than the renters.

With respect to the level of desire to participate in recreational or cultural groups, no significant difference was found to exist between renters and owners. (TABLE 22), but in actuality, the former are not participating as much as the latter. (TABLE 23) This discrepancy seems to suggest that renters cannot afford to participate for some reasons, which may be possibly related to their relatively lower economic status. To sum it up, it can be safely concluded that in general, there is no significant difference between renters and homeowners in terms of the level of neighboring, but the there exists a difference between the two groups with respect to level of organizational participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Status</th>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Educational Status</th>
<th>Economic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Control (N = 281)</td>
<td>With Preschooler (N = 196)</td>
<td>Without Preschooler (N = 83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire</td>
<td>Don't desire</td>
<td>Desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters Owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Level</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters Owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Level</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 23

**OCCUPANCY STATUS AND THE LEVELS OF ACTUAL PARTICIPATION IN RECREATIONAL OR CULTURAL GROUPS (Responses to Q. 40)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Status</th>
<th>No Control (N = 548)</th>
<th>With Preschooler (N = 327)</th>
<th>Without Preschooler (N = 219)</th>
<th>Low (N = 356)</th>
<th>High (N = 176)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>df</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chi-square</strong></td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. Level</strong></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Low (N = 110)</th>
<th>Middle (N = 216)</th>
<th>High (N = 222)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>df</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chi-square</strong></td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. Level</strong></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents of higher economic status are less active in neighboring but more active in organizational participation than those of lower economic status.

There seems to be no significant correlations between the level of neighboring and economic status in our samples. Zero-order partial correlation between the level of neighboring and income was not significant at the 0.05 level. First-order partial controlling separately for the work status of women and the number of years of schooling attained by them was not significant either at the 0.05 level. Second-order partial controlling for educational and work status of women also produced a similar result. (TABLE 24)

On the other hand, there does exist a marked difference among people of different economic status in terms of the level of actual organizational participation in the Dwellers' Association. Partial correlations convincingly and consistently indicate that there are positive correlations significant at the 0.05 level or better in this respect. One thing should be noted, however. As for the interest in community affairs, the correlation turned out to be negative, although it was not significant at the 0.05 level.

With respect to the levels of desire to participate in recreational or cultural groups, no significant difference was found to exist between the residents of different economic status. (TABLE 25) But the test outcomes convincingly indicated that there was a positive correlation between economic status of the residents and
### TABLE 24

**CORRELATIONS OF ECONOMIC STATUS WITH THE LEVELS OF NEIGHBORING AND ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION IN DWELLERS' ASSOCIATION (N = 528)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Zero-order Partial</th>
<th>First-order Partial</th>
<th>Second-order Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>Education + Work Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r = -0.06</td>
<td>r = -0.07</td>
<td>r = -0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Neighboring</td>
<td>r = 0.12</td>
<td>r = 0.12</td>
<td>r = 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>r = -0.02</td>
<td>r = -0.01</td>
<td>r = -0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation (1)</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>r = 0.09</td>
<td>r = 0.09</td>
<td>r = 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation (2)</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>No Control (N = 282)</td>
<td>Family Status</td>
<td>Educational Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Desire</td>
<td>Don't Desire</td>
<td>Don't Desire</td>
<td>Don't Desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Level</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancy Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renters (N = 205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their level of actual participation in these groups. (TABLE 26) These findings are of great help for us in interpreting the test outcome of the seventh hypothesis.

Thus it could be concluded that economic status of the residents does not correlate with their level of neighboring, but correlate positively with the level of actual rather than the interest in or desire for the participation in organizations.

$H_g$ Residents of higher educational status are less satisfied with living in planned community and hope more strongly to move out than those of lower educational status.

As had been expected, educational status measured by the number of years of schooling attained by women was found inversely correlated with the level of residential satisfaction. (TABLE 27) Zero-order partial correlation between educational status on one hand and satisfaction both with housing and environment on the other was $-0.1048$ significant at the 0.01 level. And, the level of residential satisfaction measured by prospective mobility was correlated negatively with educational status, the correlation coefficient being $-0.1820$ significant at the 0.001 level or better. First-order partials controlling for income and work status of women separately were also significant at the 0.001 level or better. Second-order partial with these two control variables held constant produced a similar result.
### TABLE 26

**ECONOMIC STATUS AND THE LEVELS OF ACTUAL PARTICIPATION IN RECREATIONAL OR CULTURAL GROUPS (Responses to Q. 40)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>No Control (N = 549)</th>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Educational Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Preschoolers (N = 328)</td>
<td>Without Preschoolers (N = 219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15 95</td>
<td>8 71</td>
<td>7 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>59 158</td>
<td>33 114</td>
<td>26 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>101 121</td>
<td>38 64</td>
<td>63 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>38.01</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Level</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Occupancy Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Renters (N = 368)</th>
<th>Owners (N = 180)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
<td>Not Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12 85</td>
<td>3 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>42 124</td>
<td>17 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>44 61</td>
<td>57 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Level</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 27

CORRELATIONS OF EDUCATIONAL STATUS WITH THE LEVELS OF RESIDENTIAL SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Zero-order Partial</th>
<th>First-order Partial</th>
<th>Second-order Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Work Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>r = -0.10</td>
<td>r = -0.11</td>
<td>r = -0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>Satisfaction (1)</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>r = -0.19</td>
<td>r = -0.20</td>
<td>r = -0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Satisfaction (2)</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>r = -0.18</td>
<td>r = 0.20</td>
<td>r = 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Satisfaction (3)</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

In this research, we have first attempted to identify the difference of the level of social participation expected to exist between people living in settlements of different locations, as well as the change of neighboring and family life after their move to the present residence. In case a difference or a change was found, efforts were made to identify the true source of the difference or the change. In addition to the measurement of environmental effects on people's lives, their differential responses to a given environment were also investigated.

With respect to the locational difference of the level of neighboring, people living in the suburbs seem more active than those living in the central city. While differential degree of participation in Dwellers' Association was found to exist in favor of people living in the suburbs, suburbanites were found less active in participating in cultural or recreational groups than those living in the central city.

In the second hypothesis, it was found that the residents in general had not increased their level of neighboring after the
move to planned communities. But there was an exception for this general finding: those families which got preschoolers after the move increased the level of neighboring beyond doubt. And it was found that the increase was most clearly attributed to the change of family status measured by the presence or the absence of children. The type or the location of settlements seems also relevant to the increase, but its effect does not seem to be as great as the one brought about by the change of family status.

Thus, through testing the first three hypotheses, we have reached the following conclusions: (1) Physical aspects of a community affect neither the level of neighboring nor that of organizational participation significantly. Presence or absence of children is the most important determinant of the level of neighboring.

(2) Physical aspects of the settlement affect the level of family pursuits more than that of social participation. But here also, the presence or absence of children is the most significant determinant of the level of family pursuits.

The fourth and the fifth hypotheses were more specifically designed than the first three hypotheses to identify the effect of physical variables on neighboring and residential satisfaction. The type of apartment did not correlate with the level of neighboring. This is because the level of residential satisfaction did not correlate positively with that of neighboring in the first place. On the other hand, the floor level on which the
residents live was found to affect the level of residential satisfaction differentially, depending on whether they have preschoolers or not. It turned out that people with preschoolers feel more inconvenienced about living on the upper floors than those without preschoolers. The reason why women who are working feel more inconvenienced than those who are not is probably that the former are simply annoyed with going up and down the building before and after commuting a long distance.

Consistent with the findings of previous studies, the outcome of the present research has shown that the greater the level of population homogeneity, the higher the level of neighboring tends to be.

Our findings have indicated that occupancy status and economic status do not correlate with the level of neighboring but correlate positively with the level of organizational participation.

Lastly, it has been consistently shown that the level of education one has attained is inversely correlated with the level of her satisfaction with a given residence and its environment. Consistent with this finding, it has been indicated that the higher the level of education, the more likely one is to move out.

As far as the findings of the present research indicate, physical variables alone do not seem to determine the level of
The kinds of variables most affected by the physical environment are residential satisfaction, joint family activities, neighboring and organizational participation in this order. That is, aside from residential satisfaction whose level is definitely determined by physical environment, the kinds of behaviors most subject to environmental influence are those that occur by chance. Joint family activities around homes and neighborly interaction of less intensive nature were found to be cases at hand. The premeditated behaviors are seldom affected by the physical environment. Furthermore, even behaviors of opportunity are affected by the physical environment only when the seeds are already sown. As long as people do not want to engage in family pursuits or neighboring, environment of any kind would not be able to lead them to do so. The role of physical variables in this respect is to allow latent behaviors to surface. In this sense, ours is much closer to the positions of Newman and Michelson than to any deterministic ideas. Physical environment determines the locus in which these behaviors take place. For instance, the women living in Danchi located in the central city tend to engage in neighboring indoors rather than outdoors, whereas the reverse is true for the women living in Danchi located in the suburbs. Furthermore, higher percentage of women living in the suburbs have come to spend more time in their neighborhood and go downtown less often since the move, as compared with those living in the central city. It was truly said by Michelson that "one can
measure relatively objectively whether or not a particular setting provides sufficient opportunity (for particular behaviors to occur). The reason why people are apt to think that suburbanites are active in their neighboring and family pursuits is probably that in the suburbs these activities tend to be performed outdoors more often than indoors, and therefore more visible, as compared with the central city.

However, more salient than the effect of physical environment is the one brought about by the presence or the absence of children, which was found to explain the great part of the variations among the residents with respect to the levels of neighboring and family pursuits. If the residents have preschoolers, the levels of these activities surely tend to be high. But if they do not, even the most favorable environment does not lead to the increase.

According to Gans, choices and demands can best be understood in terms of the characteristics of the people involved, and the most important among these are class and life-cycle stage. The findings of the present research seem to have confirmed not only the independent role life-cycle stage plays, but also the relative importance of class factors as determinants of the level of social participation and residential satisfaction.

**Practical Implications of the Research**

In light of the findings that the presence of children was
found to correlate positively with the high level of neighboring, and children are overrepresented in Danchi, at least one of the social conditions necessary for active neighboring is considered already met. Furthermore, planners of Japan Public Housing Agency have made various efforts to facilitate neighborly interaction among the residents through site-planning. But they are not sure if they should make further efforts in this respect, because of their uncertainty of whether the high level of neighboring activities are really desired by the residents in the first place.

The policy makers of the Agency are to blame most for the failure to meet the changed housing demands of people. The main policy of the Agency has been and still is to construct as many small apartments as possible, while private developers have successfully met the demand of people for housing of better quality. The apartments the Agency construct is not only small but have tended to be located farther away from the central city. In addition, the rent has skyrocketed year after year. Consequently, more than thirty-five thousands apartments were left unoccupied as of October 1977.

Furthermore, the applicants who want to enter Danchi cannot choose among various types of housing, because only apartment type dwellings are provided. The finding of the present research showed that the majority of the current residents preferred to live in owned single-homes to rented or owned condominiums located at the center of the city, when the choice was forced among these
three types of housing (Q. 53). Besides, the desire for owned single-homes was found stronger for families with preschoolers than those without preschoolers. This finding, as well as the test outcome of the fifth hypothesis means that the Agency has continued to build the type of housing incongruent with the characteristics of its major customers.

The unsatisfactory levels of social participation and residential satisfaction are not only true for Danchi but for Japan as a whole. Furthermore, the characteristics of Danchi are clearly bound up with the present state of national economy and culture. After all, Danchi as a social and physical community can not be as independent of the surrounding society as they appear to be. But still, the author believes that planned communities keep their positions as frontiers where man's innovativeness in planning could be most fruitfully applied.

Theoretical Implications of the Research

The first hypothesis was specifically formulated to know if there is any difference between planned communities in the suburbs and those in the central city. And it turned out that the former was more active in both neighboring and participation in the Dwellers' Association.

Then the question is whether the differential degree of social participation can be attributed to socio-cultural factors
or ecological factors such as place of residence. Considerable debate has been undertaken thus far in an attempt to identify the true source of the difference. For instance, residential location vis-a-vis the central city was advocated by Martin, Tomeh, Tallman and Morgner as the determinant of the level of social participation. On the other hand, Dobriner, Berger, and Gans took the reverse position that social or demographic factors are more important in explaining the difference.

At first glance, the outcomes of the test seemed to support the ecological explanation, because the difference between the two areas in terms of income and educational statuses deemed most relevant to the differential social participation was very small. However, with respect to the level of actual participation in recreational or cultural groups as well as that of the desire to participate in them, the difference between the two areas turned out to be in the reverse direction.

These conflicting test outcomes make the ecological explanation rather dubious.

Argument for the primacy of ecological factors has proved to be inadequate also in light of the finding that planned community as a settlement type, regardless of its location with respect to the city-limit, did not produce the significant increase of neighboring activities, except
for the households that changed family status since the move. That is, the ecological characteristics of planned community itself including the sharing of space and facilities, high density living and others thought to be favorable for the higher level of interaction were found not to lead to the actual increase of neighboring activities. This finding seems to have a great significance for the above-named debate.

Thus we cannot but to conclude that ecological factors do not determine the level of neighborly interaction significantly, and that the demographic characteristics of the residents, the presence or absence of children in particular are the major determinant of the interaction level.

Even more difficult is to support the social choice hypothesis or the social psychological selectivity theory advanced by researchers like Bell and Fava. The reason is that suburbanites were not only forced to move to the suburbs against their intentions, but a majority of them moved into Danchi for the house-related reasons.

The physical aspects of planned communities seem to contribute to the increase of familism as measured by the level of joint family pursuits, however. The question arises, then, as to whether this increase of home-centeredness or the more family cohesion suggested by
the findings were intended or unintended by the residents before the move. Our data seems to suggest that this change is more unintended than intended, since most of the respondents mentioned the house-related reasons for their move out from the previous residence. And as the source of the change, at least part of it, can be traced to the physical aspects of the communities, "the planner's concern with altering that environment is justified", as Gans suggested.

It has been often believed that complaints about the smallness of housing units have strong predictive power on future residential mobility. In fact, the respondents most often mentioned the smallness of their previous residence as the principal reason for the move out from it. This residential mobility, in turn, has been associated by many researchers with such phenomena as the weaker commitment to local area, the loosening of primary control or even with social disorganization.

The data have shown that the residents living in smaller apartments are more likely to move out in the near future than those who live in more spacious apartments. But, the test outcome has indicated that, against our expectation, greater prospective mobility does not result in the lower level of neighboring activities. This outcome
is hard to interpret. The best we can say in this connection is that for the urban dwellers of Tokyo today, the level of neighboring is not related to that of their commitment to the place where they live. In case they happen to have any commitment to a given locality, the commitment is most likely to be expressed in organizational activity concerned with their livability problems. This is evidenced by the finding that there is no difference between renters and homeowners in terms of the level of neighboring but there exists a significant difference with regard to the actual participation in Dwellers' Association in favor of the latter.

"Mutual aid" hypothesis has been advocated by many as the basis of neighboring. But, no significant difference has been found between the residents of higher income status who have supposedly less need for mutual help and those of lower income bracket who have more in this respect. This finding leads us to believe that people today, regardless of their economic status, do not usually turn to their neighbors for help, but to commercial as well as public institutions of various kinds which "link individuals directly to the larger community".

In light of this situation, we may be able to say that neighboring activities, having lost their functional basis,
can no longer articulate with stratification variables as much as they used to do.

Suggestions for Further Research

The limitations of the present research, for the most part, lie with the methodology applied here. In general, research utilizing statistical data tends to be more extensive than intensive. We can hardly expect to investigate the interlocking system of variables in this type of study. We may be able to say that width is gained at the cost of depth. Intensive and detailed studies by means of participant observation would make up for the lack of depth apparent in this research.

In an attempt to investigate the impact of community on the residents, we asked the respondents to report on their lives in their previous residence. But the data obtained in this manner are not necessarily reliable, because they tend to be subject to retrospective distortion. Longitudinal study in tune with the growth process of a community is especially pertinent to our subject. But more basic is the problem that we did not have a control group in the true sense of the term.

Second limitation is concerned with the characteristics of the universe from which samples were drawn. We tried to
examine the effects the varied physical features could have on residents' lives, but the planned communities we have dealt with have so few varieties especially with respect to housing type that we could not reveal the full significance of physical variables for the residents' social as well as family life. Contrariwise, if the residents of planned communities had been more diverse in terms of sociological and demographic dimensions, the differential effects the uniform housing and environment may have on these people might have been made clarified in more clear-cut manner. But neither case was missing in our universe, which made it difficult to fully realize the aforementioned purpose of this study to explore the interaction of physical and social variables. Research situation will be improved, however, now that the Agency is turning to the construction of single-detached houses to meet the diversified housing demands of its potential customers.

Third, although the author assumed at the outset the existence of boundary with regard to planned communities, the assumption itself was not tested directly in this research. Studying the interaction of planned communities and their adjacent unplanned residential areas along behavioral, organizational and political lines would help
clarify this point. The extent of the interaction is likely to differ, depending on the size of a community and its distance from the central city. In the research of this nature, communities as units of analysis will be dealt with and the orthodox ecological approach could be effectively applied.

Fourth, site plans and layouts of community facilities, public and commercial, perhaps most relevant is shaping up the social life on daily basis, were not taken into account as independent variables in our study. The reason was that it was found difficult to classify them into types.

When these insufficiencies are met, further advancements in this field of research could be made possible.
NOTES: CHAPTER VII

1. For instance, while about forty percent of the women living in Danchi located in the central city engage in neighboring indoors such as in the corridor or elevator hall and thirty percent of them do so outdoors, only ten percent of the suburban women engage in neighboring indoors and sixty percent of them do so outdoors.


DANCHI DWELLERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Household Information

1. How many years have you lived here?
   1. less than one year  2. one to two years
   3. three to four years  4. more than five years

2. When did you move into this place?
   1. when this place was opened  2. at the time of vacancy

3. What is the type of your apartment?
   1. one room with a kitchen-dining room
   2. two rooms with a kitchen-dining room
   3. two rooms with a living room and a kitchen-dining room
   4. three rooms with a kitchen
   5. three rooms with a kitchen-dining room
   6. three rooms with a living room and a kitchen-dining room
   7. four rooms with a kitchen-dining room

4. What is your occupancy status?
   1. renter  2. homeowner

5. How many members are there in your family?

6. How old is your household head?

7. What is the occupation of your household head?
   1. managerial
   2. professional and technical
   3. small business owners and managers
   4. clerical
   5. sales and service workers
   6. security-related job (e.g. policeman)
   7. craftsmen, operatives and kindred

8. What is the highest level of education attained by your household head?
Educational system before the World War II

1. elementary school  
2. junior high school  
3. senior high school  
4. college  
5. graduate school

Educational system after the World War II

1. junior high school  
2. senior high school  
3. junior college  
4. college  
5. graduate school

9. What is the number of years of schooling completed by your household head?

10. What is the highest level of education you have attained?

Educational system before the World War II

1. elementary school  
2. junior high school  
3. senior high school  
4. college  
5. graduate school

Educational system after the World War II

1. junior high school  
2. senior high school  
3. senior high school  
4. junior college  
5. college  
6. graduate school

11. What is the number of years of schooling you have completed?

12. Are you employed?

1. not working  
2. side-job at home  
3. part-time  
4. full-time

13. Do you have any preschooler including infant?

1. yes  
2. no

14. Did you have any preschooler including infant when you moved into this place?

1. yes  
2. no

15. How old are you?

16. What is the annual income of your household (including tax)?

1. less than 1.5 million yen  
2. 1.5 to 2 million yen
3. 2 to 2.5 million yen  
4. 2.5 to 3 million yen  
5. 3 to 3.5 million yen  
6. 3.5 to 4 million yen  
7. 4 to 4.5 million yen  
8. more than 4.5 million yen

17. What is your phone-number?

18. Address of the respondent

19. Type of building the respondent lives in:
   1. walk-up (five stories or less)
   2. high-rise (more than six stories)

20. Floor on which the respondent lives.

DANCHI DWELLERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

Preliminary Questions

1. Where had you lived before you moved into this place?
   1. inside the Yamate Line  
   2. outside the Yamate Line but within the 23 wards of Tokyo  
   3. outlying areas (outside the 23 wards)  
   4. prefectures contiguous to Tokyo  
   5. other prefectures

2. Where had you lived before you moved into this place?
   1. parents’ house  
   2. rooming house  
   3. dormitory  
   4. owned house  
   5. rented house (single-detached)  
   6. rented apartment  
   7. Danchi

3. What type of housing had you lived in before you moved into this place?
   1. single-detached house  
   2. fire-proof concrete apartment  
   3. apartment made of wood and mortar

4. Where did you live for the longest time so far in your life?
   1. village  
   2. small town  
   3. medium-size city  
   4. big cities (ten biggest cities in Japan; Sapporo, Sendai, Tokyo, Kawasaki, Yokohama, Nagoya, Kyoto, Osaka, Kobe, Kitakyushushi)

5. Is the place where you live now more convenient for your daily shopping than your previous residence?
1. more convenient  2. about the same  3. less convenient

6. Where the neighbors in your previous residence much like yourself?

1. very much  2. almost  3. don't know
4. a little different  5. very much different

7. What is the principal reason for your family to have moved out of the previous residence?

1. job-related reason like commuting or the change of office
2. the previous residence was too small
3. the rent was too expensive
4. to get married
5. desire to live apart from your parents
6. desire to become a homeowner
7. environmental conditions were bad
8. forced to move out
9. fortunately won a right to live in a Danchi apartment through the lottery administered by Japan Public Housing Agency
10. other reasons

8. What is the principal reason for your family to have applied for this public housing?

1. the rent (or the price) is appropriate
2. job-related reason like commuting or the change of office
3. the apartment is well equipped
4. the environmental conditions are relatively good
5. can have more privacy
6. other reasons

On Neighboring

9. In your previous residence, were there any days during which you never chatted with your neighbors?

1. never  2. occasionally  3. frequently

10. In your previous residence, did you have any intimate neighbors?

1. two or more  2. one  3. none

11. Do you feel lonely more often in this place than in your previous residence?
1. more often  2. about the same  3. less often  4. never feel lonely

12. What about feeling bored?
   1. more often  2. about the same  3. less often  4. never feel bored

13. What do you think of the frequency of your present neighboring as compared with the one in your previous residence?
   1. much more often  2. more often  3. about the same  4. less often  5. much less often

14. How many neighbors do you say "hello" to, when seeing them on the street?
   1. ten or more  2. five to six  3. two to three

15. How many neighbors do you know by their names?
   1. ten or more  2. five to six  3. two to three

16. How many neighbors do you have, who keep the mailed package for you when you are away from home?
   1. six or more  2. four to five  3. two to three  4. one  5. none

17. How many neighbors do you have, whom you chat with, when you see them on the street?
   1. ten or more  2. seven to eight  3. five to six  4. two to three  5. none

18. How many neighbors do you have, with whom you are engaged in the borrowing and lending of tools, foods, medicines and so on?
   1. two or more  2. one  3. none

19. How many neighbors do you have, with whom you go shopping to the neighborhood shopping center?
   1. two or more  2. one  3. none

20. How many neighbors do you have, with whom you take turn baby-sitting the children?
   1. two or more  2. one  3. none
21. How many neighbors do you have, with whom you are engaged in mutual visitation to the extent that you are allowed into their living room?

1. two or more  
2. one  
3. none

22. Do you and your neighbors invite each other for tea or dinner?

1. often  
2. occasionally  
3. never

23. How many neighbors do you have, with whom you go on a picnic or to the movies?

1. ten or more  
2. five to six  
3. two to three  
4. one  
5. none

24. How many neighbors do you have, whom you can consult serious personal problems facing you?

1. two or more  
2. one  
3. none

25. Are there any days during which you never chat with your neighbors?

1. never  
2. occasionally  
3. frequently

26. Do you have any intimate neighbors now?

1. two or more  
2. one  
3. none

27. Where do you chat with your neighbors most often?

1. at mutual homes  
2. in the corridor of the apartment building  
3. elevator-hall  
4. on the street  
5. at parks or play lots  
6. at the shopping center  
7. at other places

28. How did you get to know your most intimate neighbor in this place?

1. through children  
2. through the activities of Dwellers' Association  
3. happened to be neighbors when moving in  
4. knew them before moving in  
5. through your husband (wife of your husband's friend)

28-1. Where does she live?

1. on the same floor of the same building  
2. on the different floor of the same building
3. in a contiguous building
4. in a separate building located in the same Danchi
5. outside this Danchi

28-2. Does she have the same level of education as you?
   1. about the same   2. don't know   3. different

28-3. Is the living standard of her family the same as that of yours?
   1. about the same   2. don't know   3. different

29. What is the neighborly relation most desirable to you?
   1. neighbors just like one's family
   2. easy to consult personal matters or go out together
   3. helping each other in daily lives
   4. chatting on the street
   5. saying "hello" on the street

30. What would you do, if you were annoyed by the noise your neighbors make?
   1. go and ask them to do something about it
   2. let them know indirectly about the trouble you have
   3. go to the Dwellers' Association for the solution
   4. do nothing
   5. do not know

31. Are your neighbors much like yourself?
   1. very much   2. almost   3. don't know
   4. a little different   5. very much different

32. Do you chat face to face or by telephone with your friends who live outside this Danchi?
   1. frequently   2. fairly often   3. occasionally
   4. rarely   5. never

33. What about with your relatives including your parents, sisters or brothers who live outside this Danchi?
   1. frequently   2. fairly often   3. occasionally
   4. rarely   5. never
On Participation in Community Organization

34. In your previous residence, did you participate in community organization of any sort?
   1. often  2. occasionally  3. never
   4. had a membership but did not participate in its activity

35. (To those who have the membership of Dwellers' Association)
Do you attend the meeting when asked?
   1. everytime  2. occasionally  3. never

35-1. Do you hold office at the Dwellers' Association?
   1. yes  2. no

36. Are you interested in the Danchi paper?
   1. very much  2. fairly  3. depending on the articles
   4. not interested  5. never  6. there is not such a paper

37. For whatever reason, do you go to the Residents' Hall in Danchi?
   1. often  2. occasionally  3. never

38. How often do you participate in the various functions held by the Dwellers' Association?
   1. often  2. occasionally  3. never
   4. there are no such functions

39. Do you think that the Dwellers' Association should be more active?
   1. yes  2. don't know  3. no

40. Are you participating in a hobby club of any sort as a member now? What about before you moved in?
   1. participating both before and now
   2. participating before, but not now
   3. not before, but now
   4. not before and do not want to participate now, either
   5. want to participate if there were interesting hobby clubs nearby
   6. want to participate when I will be less busy
40-1. (To the respondents who checked 1. in question 40)
Did the rate of your attendance in such a club increase after you moved in?
1. very much 2. fairly 3. no change 4. decreased fairly 5. decreased very much
(The respondents who checked 1. or 3. in question 40 are requested to answer the following questions.)

40-2. Is the club located in this Danchi?
1. yes 2. no

40-3. What motivated you to participate in the club?
1. to make friends 2. for diversion 3. because the club I had wanted to participate in was nearby

40-4. Who brought you to the club?
1. neighbor 2. member of the Dwellers' Association 3. person whom I got acquainted with at nursery school, kindergarten or school 4. acquaintances living outside the Danchi 5. voluntarily

On Family Life

(Has there been any changes in the way you and your family spend time since you moved in?) Answer the following questions:

41. What about the time you spend on the street, at the park or play lot around your home?
1. increased 2. no change 3. decreased 4. don't do such a thing

42. What about going downtown for shopping, seeing movies or eating out?
1. increased 2. no change 3. decreased 4. don't do such a thing
43. Do you spend more time now in chatting, face to face or by telephone, with your relatives or friends?

1. increased 2. no change 3. decreased

44. Did the members of your family, including your husband, have the opportunity to do something together before moving in?

1. frequently 2. fairly often 3. occasionally
4. rarely 5. never

44-1. What about now?

1. frequently 2. fairly often 3. occasionally
4. rarely 5. never

44-2. Has the opportunity increased for the members of your family to do something together?

1. increased 2. no change 3. decreased

45. Did your husband play with your children before moving in?

1. frequently 2. fairly often 3. occasionally
4. rarely 5. never

45-1. What about now?

1. frequently 2. fairly often 3. occasionally
4. rarely 5. never

45-2. Does your husband spend more time now with your children?

1. increased 2. no change 3. decreased
4. no children before moving in

46. What kind of family pursuit has increased most?

1. going downtown for shopping or seeing movies
2. going on a picnic
3. taking a walk or playing sports around home
4. participating in community functions
5. eating out on weekend
6. no change
7. others

47. You wish for your husband to think that:

1. family is the most important
2. family is rather more important than job
3. don't know  
4. job is rather more important than family  
5. job is the most important  

On Residential Satisfaction  

48. To what extent are you satisfied with this place in terms of facilities or aesthetical aspects? 
   1. satisfied very much  2. satisfied  3. don't know  
   4. dissatisfied  5. dissatisfied very much  

49. Do you think that this Danchi is a good place to rear children?  
   1. very good  2. rather good  3. don't know  
   4. not so good  5. bad  

50. To what extent are you satisfied with your present house?  
   1. satisfied very much  2. satisfied  3. don't know  
   4. dissatisfied  5. dissatisfied very much  

51. Do you feel inconvenienced about the height of the floor on which you live?  
   1. never  2. somewhat  3. very much  

52. Do you want to continue to live in your present residence?  
   1. want to live as long as possible  
   2. intend to live for the time being  
   3. want to move out as soon as possible  

53. Which of the following types of housing would you like to live in, if you had to leave the present residence now?  
   1. rented condominium close to the city-center  
   2. owned condominium close to the city-center  
   3. single-home located in the suburbs  

54. Some people think that Danchi is a temporary residence. Do you agree?  
   1. do not agree  2. do not know  3. agree
(Let us know your opinion of what a living place should be like. Choose either 1. or 2. for questions 55 to 57.)

55. 1. place where you can enjoy the company of your friends  
    2. place where you can have privacy

56. 1. place more well-equipped than blessed with nature  
    2. place more blessed with nature than well-equipped

57. 1. place where a lot of stores or recreational facilities for diversion are provided  
    2. place where only those facilities that are indispensable for daily lives are provided
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