

## Housing Estates as Experimental Fields of Social Research\*

YASUSHI SUKENARI | THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO

*This paper discusses researchers' relationships with their research object and its transformation in empirical sociology by examining "danchi" (housing estates) studies conducted by Japanese sociologists. The Japanese housing policy system was quickly established in the early 1950s, and the reinforced concrete housing complexes stimulated journalistic interest. Most influential researchers in postwar Japanese sociology launched into research on these newly constructed housing estates. One reason was that social surveys with standardized questionnaires to individual respondents were compatible with the new housing form. Danchi became experimental fields of social research. Some early researchers emphasized the sparsity of neighbor relationships in danchi and the surviving kinship across geographical boundaries. However, the image of danchi as pictured by sociologists transformed around 1960. Studies of residents' associations showed that danchi communities were being formed through cooperative solutions found for residents' common problems. Whether or not a housing estate was formed as a community depended on how the residents related to the space. This change was also reflected in the relationships between the researchers and the respondents in that the distance between them under the standardized attitude and opinion survey was lost. The change in the image of housing estates in the 1960s can be said to overlap with a turning point in social research.*

**Keywords:** housing estate, history of social research, attitude and opinion survey, planned community

---

\*Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology 2014 and the SNU-UT Joint Sociological Forum 2014. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP26380644.

## 1. Introduction

This paper discusses researchers' relationship with their research object and its transformation in empirical sociology by examining studies on "*danchi*" (housing estates) conducted by Japanese sociologists.

In the 1950s, housing policy was quickly established in Japan to deal with the postwar housing shortage, as well as the concentration of population in metropolitan areas that accompanied economic reconstruction and industrialization. Japan's post-war housing policy is characterized by a system of housing provision that loosely corresponds to residents' economic stratification, with the "Government Housing Loan Corporation" (*Jūtaku Kin'yū Kōko*) promoting home ownership for people of higher income, "municipal housing" (*Kōei Jūtaku*) providing subsidized rental housing for people of lower income, and the "Japan Housing Corporation" (*Nihon Jūtaku Kōdan*) supplying high-quality rental housing for people of middle income in metropolitan areas.

Of these, the newly emerging urban landscape of the reinforced concrete housing complexes constructed by the Japan Housing Corporation attracted inquisitive media interest. Housing estates comprising such buildings were labelled "*danchi*," and their dwellers dominated by white-collar workers with young families "the tribe living in *danchi*" (*danchi-zoku*).

Several influential postwar Japanese sociologists began studying *danchi* during the mid-1950s and 1960s<sup>1</sup> (see Table 1). One reason for this was that this new form of housing was compatible with the facilitation of new social research methods requiring the random distribution of standardized questionnaires to individual respondents. Thus, *danchi* became experimental fields for social research.

## 2. Front Lines of Social Change: Urbanization and Atomization

A precursor to *danchi* studies was the Toyama *Apāto* study (1956–57),

---

<sup>1</sup> It became commonplace in postwar Japan for dwelling forms to be used as a basis for field selection for sociological surveys. Such housing developments had been attracting a lot of controversial attention and became the subject of much research, such as that on the "housing estates" (*danchi*) of the 1950s–60s, the "new towns" (*nyū taun*) and "high-rise apartment complexes" (*kōsō apāto*) in the 1970s, and the "inner-city redevelopment districts" (*saikaihatsu chiku*) in the 1980–90s. This paper reviews some of the early research on *danchi*.

**TABLE 1**  
**SELECTED SOCIAL RESEARCH ON *DANCHI*, 1955–1965 (SUKENARI, HIRAI AND NISHINO 2012, P. 314)**

From	To	Site of Research	Leader	University	External Fund
56.11	57.12	Toyama <i>Apāto</i> , Tokyo	Koyama, Takashi	Tokyo Metropolitan University	Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research, JSPS
57.8	57.8	Nishinomiya-Kitagichi <i>Apāto</i> , Hyogo	Masuda, Kokichi	Konan University	
58.6	58.6	Mure <i>Danchi</i> , Tokyo	Isomura, Eiichi	Tokyo Metropolitan University	
58.6	58.7	municipal housing estates in four prefectures (Osaka, Aichi, Gifu, Shiga)	Oyabu, Juichi	Osaka City University	
58	58	Nishinomiya-Kitagichi <i>Apāto</i> , Hyogo	Masuda, Kokichi	Konan University	
59.2	59.7	Ogikubo, Aoto, and Oshima <i>Danchi</i> , Tokyo	Isomura, Eiichi	Tokyo Metropolitan University	
59.12	60.3	Hibarigaoka and Aoto <i>Danchi</i> , Tokyo	Tsujimura, Akira	The University of Tokyo	Japan Housing Corporation
60.5	61	Tamadaira <i>Danchi</i> and three other areas in Hino Town, Tokyo	Nakamura, Hachiro	International Christian University	
60.6	60.7	Tamadaira <i>Danchi</i> , Tokyo	Yasuda, Saburo	Tokyo University of Education	
60.12	60.12	Kori <i>Danchi</i> , Osaka	Tsujimura, Akira	The University of Tokyo	Japan Housing Corporation
62.9	62.9	76 housing estates provided by Japan Housing Corporation	Tsujimura, Akira	The University of Tokyo	Japan Housing Corporation
62.11	63.11	4 housing estates in Osaka and Hyogo	Oyabu, Juichi	Osaka City University	Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research, JSPS
65.7	65.8	Hibarigaoka <i>Danchi</i> , Tokyo	Morioka, Kiyomi	Tokyo University of Education	Ford Foundation

conducted by family sociologist Takashi Koyama for the “Research Group on Family Issues” (*Kazoku Mondai Kenkyūkai*). To help clarify the effects of urbanization and modernization on lifestyles and family attitudes and to gain insight into the gradual social changes from traditional to modern society, this research group chose to study three distinguishing fields: a mountain village where traditional ways of life remains strong, a city where modernization has progressed, and an intermediate outlying farming village.

Toyama *Apāto* is a community representative of the newest housing forms of apartment buildings that have appeared along with the development of urban society, including narrowing of land, inflation of land price, and differentiation of occupations. The residents are of relatively lower age, and are characterized by the middle-class, intellectual workers, and salaried workers (Koyama, ed. 1960, p. 19).

The researchers interested in the form of housing known as “apartment houses” (*apāto*) as a field of research relied on the presupposition that “the apartment lifestyle greatly nurtures the tendency towards modern families” (Koyama, ed. 1960, p. 52). They found these households to be relatively small, and the apartment residents typically to be heterogeneous and mutually isolated, but also to be lacking historical identity and a sense of community. Residence was generally temporary, which made the population fluid.

The main focus of social statistician Saburo Yasuda’s study on the Tamadaira *Danchi* (1960) was on the conformism and careerism of white-collar workers. He states that “I chose *danchi* residents as my research objects because I thought the rapid development of mass society made them appropriate” (Yasuda 1962, p. 161). *Danchi* was considered as a convenient study area where the latest social phenomenon could be captured.

However, it seems that the relationship between *danchi* and social research is more complicated, as urban sociologist Michihiro Okuda suggests:

It is clear that the method and sociological analysis of ‘attitude and opinion surveys’ (*ishiki chōsa*) was inspired by the ‘*danchi*’ studies, and has developed since. This does not simply mean that sociological ‘attitude and opinion surveys’ were effective in ‘*danchi*’ research, but that the method of ‘attitude and opinion surveys’ has an inescapable aspect of compatibility with ‘*danchi*’. (Okuda 1983, p. 179)

The residents of *danchi* applied for housing via information circulated by the

mass media, and were placed in uniform dwellings on a first-come-first-serve or sortition basis by housing providers and administrators. *Danchi* was thought to be ideally suited to facilitate the undertaking of social surveys requiring numerous stylized questionnaires to be randomly distributed to individual respondents. This is perhaps not surprising as the emergence of the phenomena of the mass media, the *danchi*, and randomized questionnaires, all emerged as a consequence of the social changes of individualization, equalization, and democratization.

### 3. Distribution and Density of Social Relations: Privacy and Sociability

Unlike Koyama's research, the surveys of Mure *Danchi* (1958) and Ogikubo/Aoto/Oshima *Danchi* (1959) conducted by urban sociologist Eiichi Isomura, attempt to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the lifestyles and social consciousness of *danchi* residents. Isomura's research particularly emphasizes factors such as social status, residential preferences, areas of activities and social relations. Social relations are a common theme of many *danchi* surveys of the time, and this section will focus on their findings in this respect.

Isomura and his collaborators divided residents' attitudes toward their neighbors into two categories almost evenly. The one was named "solitary" (protecting one's own lifestyle as far as possible), the other was named "harmonized" (friendly association with neighbors). "Solitary" attitudes are far more common among residents of *danchi* than other forms of housing. Approximately 80% of interaction within *danchi* is between people living in the same building, and the majority of such interaction only occurs between people who share a staircase. This generally takes the form of simple associations that go no further than greetings and small talk. However, 70% of survey respondents sought to maintain the status quo with regard to this narrow and shallow fellowship based on proximity. On the other hand, residents' friendships widely spread throughout the city, mostly with work colleagues or former classmates from school. They also had strong psychological connections with relatives (Oshio 1965, pp. 126-32).

The series of surveys of Nishinomiya-Kitaguchi *Apāto* (1957-58) conducted by family sociologist Kokichi Masuda provide a more thorough analysis of the correlation between neighbor relationships and kinship relationships. The 1958 study, in particular, investigates the determinants of neighbor relationships in detail. It shows that children are the most

influential factor, and “strong familism” was the obstructive factor in such relationships. Familism, not necessarily related to traditional family systems, is “the dependence on the ‘family home’ (*jikka*) or relatives based on economic solidarity, culminating in psychological identification” (Masuda 1960, p. 10). Masuda shows that the more passive housewives’ attitudes towards neighbor relationships are, and the lower their income classes are, the more frequently they visit their family home than other residents. He concludes that dependence on relatives inhibits neighbor relationships.

In these studies, researchers often refer to the seminal text *Organization Man* by American journalist William H. Whyte (Whyte 1956; with Japanese translation published in Tsujimura et al., 1959). According to Whyte, new white-collar residents in Park Forest, a newly developed suburban residential area in Chicago, form active neighbor relationships. Masuda emphasizes the contrast between the rarity of neighbor relationships in Japanese *danchi* and the norm in the American suburb. He alleges that “instead of making an effort to develop a social life in a new land and region, people [living in *danchi*] are intensifying their dependence on vanishing blood relations” (Masuda 1960, p. 4).

The Hibarigaoka/Aoto Housing Estate Study (1959–60) was conducted by social psychologist Akira Tsujimura upon commission from the Japan Housing Corporation. After an overview of contemporary American literature on mass society, social psychology, and community research, his study group, who also translated *Organization Man* into Japanese, make the identification of the personality types of *danchi* residents its central research focus. In addition to discovering the predominance of “privacy” types, as opposed to “sociability” types, Tsujimura finds that men have a close psychological attachment to their work colleagues and women to their relatives, and neither particularly stresses the importance of neighbor relationships.

Family sociologist Kiyomi Morioka’s Hibarigaoka *danchi* study (1965), which was a pioneering study using the refined analysis method, focuses on gaining a comprehensive understanding of the family life history, social participation, and relations of housewives both within and outside the *danchi*. Morioka classifies social participation within the *danchi* as either “formal” (group enrollment) or “informal” (neighbor/friend relationships) and social participation outside the *danchi* as either “formal” (group enrollment) or “informal” (relative/friend relationships). He analyzes the strength, correlation, and determinants of social participation, and shows that the relative weight of social participation can take the following order of

priority: parents, siblings, friends, neighbors, and groups. While kinship relationships do not correlate with neighbor relationships, they are negatively correlated with friend relationships both within and outside the *danchi*.

Morioka shows childcare responsibility, educational background, household income, and orientation (social type/intermediate type/privacy type) to be factors determining social participation. Childcare responsibility was found to be a particularly strong determinant. However, Morioka does not define orientation in the same way as Tsujimura. Instead of using personality type to define a respondent's intrinsic orientation, Morioka emphasizes their circumstances as determinants. For instance, younger people with childcare responsibilities are more likely to be privacy type: retreating from neighbor and friend relationships, and often dependent on relatives. This result indicates that as their children get older and childcare responsibilities lighten, they are more inclined towards social participation.

#### 4. Formation of a Sense of Community: Morale and Attachment

Eiichi Isomura's research set out to discover how "a sense of community" (*kyōdōtai ishiki*) could be achieved in "*danchi* society" (1960, p. 10). The social pathologist Juichi Oyabu and the Osaka City University Housing Estate Research Group (*Danchi kenkyu kai*), also identify a similar, practical problem in terms of the creation of a sense of community.

Oyabu's interdisciplinary study group investigates in detail the effects of building plans on neighbor relationships, for instance, whether physical factors such as types of dwelling and layout planning, have an effect or not. For example, architectural planner Kaichiro Kurihara shows that the terraced houses foster cohesiveness throughout the block, and the associations among housewives in particular, spread to neighboring blocks. On the other hand, the apartments are found to be foster cohesion among those who share each staircase, but this is not as strong as that among those in the terraced houses. Further, the terraced house residents have a high number of associations within the *danchi*, and a high ratio of associations within the surrounding district (Kurihara 1963, pp. 103–6).

It should be noted that only relationships *within* the housing estate were dealt with in Kurihara's analysis. If neighbor relationships have relatively little value among most people, then these survey results have little meaning. Meanwhile, Oyabu's analysis suggests that the location of housing and the

dominant social class of residents are strong determining factors. The rate of social relationships of men within the *danchi* is shown to be high when they live in blue collar *danchi*, and low in white collar *danchi*. Furthermore, expectations of permanent residence and a sense of community are high in suburban *danchi*, and low in inner-city *danchi*. As well as discovering how much impact the *danchi* has on residents' lifestyles, in terms of leisure time or purchasing behavior, Oyabu concludes that "suburban, blue-collar *danchi* tend to foster the most community-based personalities," and that "inner-city, white-collar *danchi* have the exact opposite trend" (Oyabu 1966, p. 117).

However, Oyabu didn't discuss why location and social class affects the formation of a sense of community. The study ends with a proposal for a "new moral community based on consciousness of permanent residence" and "community plans for housing estates with functional community centered on everyday life" (Oyabu 1966, p. 119).

The research project by Oyabu's group is titled "Study on *Danchi* Communities". *Danchi* as a form of physical structure does not necessarily function as a unit of social relationship such as "community". But the concepts of "*danchi* community" or "*danchi* society" (by Isomura) are easily connected to the assumption that the resident's meaning attached to a space corresponds to the structure. The connection is questionable. The social condition of *danchi* might be contingent on the residents' willingness and capability to construct a community. Such perspective could challenge the received thinking that, in operational terms, the problems of community relationships within *danchi* should be approached in terms of their physical structure, and resolved through a physical plan. It was the study of "residents' associations" (*jichikai*) that clarified that a "*danchi* community" is formed not through the plans of suppliers and administrators, but through cooperative solutions to the residents' common problems.

The image of *danchi* presented by social research transformed in the 1960s. The earliest example of change can be seen in urban sociologist Hachiro Nakamura's Hino Town Residents' Association Study (1960–61). Nakamura compared the residents' associations of four locations in Hino Town (the shopping district, blue collar company housing, white collar company housing, and Tamadaira *Danchi*). Of these four, the *danchi* residents' association is found to be the largest residents' organization in the town, despite low affiliation rates, and to display the rational and democratic operations characteristic of interest groups, as well as the strong autonomy from the administrative organizations. The activities of the *danchi* residents' association is seen to present a challenge to the customs and equilibrium of



the town, and to create tensions between it and the traditional residents' associations (Nakamura 1962).

Urban sociologist Susumu Kurasawa's Koganei City Study (1966) compares the original residents, *danchi* residents, and incomers outside of *danchi*, and reports that *danchi* residents have the highest level of "civic consciousness" (awareness of being residents of the town), which overturned popular belief. This civic consciousness is Kurasawa's unique concept, and differs from "regional, territorial or local attachment" (Kurasawa 1968, p. 263). People with a high interest in politics make representations to the municipal government through residents' association activities, and who undertake activity to protect their living environments, are said to be those with a high level of civic consciousness. The federation of *danchi* residents' associations, for instance, was the center of protest movements against the municipal decision on utility charges at the time<sup>2</sup>. *Danchi* became regarded as bastion of the urban social movements and catalyst of the establishment of progressive local government.

Whether a *danchi* is a local community depends on how the residents relate to the space. Whether a *danchi* is a community also affects the relationship between the researcher and the research object. Michihiro Okuda, for instance, warns that when the local society (i.e., a group of residents) is "no more than an object arbitrarily extracted to answer to the study's hypothesis" (Okuda 1970, p. 38), the "resident's logic" can never be determined, no matter how well the study seems to be proceeding. Conversely, when the residents are the agents of their own regional society, "how the researcher will give feedback to the residents' logic, instead of the researcher's logic" (Okuda 1970, p. 38) is open to the residents' challenge. The residents are then able, for instance, to question whether the researcher is personally involved in the area on any level, which may result in the distance between the researcher and the respondent (required under the terms of social scientific methodology) being lost, and the validity of the results of the "attitude and opinion survey," jeopardized. Hence, the change in the image of *danchi* presented by social research in the 1960s can be said to overlap with a

---

<sup>2</sup> This study shows *danchi* residents to be socially mobile. However, it also shows a tendency for them to have little contact with distant friends and relatives, and much more contact with neighbors. Contrastingly, incomers living outside the *danchi* district have much of the former and little of the latter. The speed with which neighbor relationships are formed in *danchi* is also revealed. High rates of participation in local groups are found among *danchi* residents. In fact, occupation, age, and educational background are strong determinants of civic consciousness. Further, people who already had a high level of civic consciousness are shown to congregate on *danchi* and to form social groups quickly because of their independence from old regional groups (Kurasawa 1968: 262).

turning point in the research methodology.

## 5. Planned Communities as Laboratories: R. K. Merton's Explorations

In postwar Japan, *danchi* has been a field of vigorous social research. Urban sociologists have attempted to gain an overall understanding of the new lifestyle emerging from this new form of built environment. Social psychologists have introduced the method of "sociogram" to help describe the social relations within these housing estates. Family sociologists have found residents to have strong kinship relations across the boundaries of housing estates. Urban sociologists have also discovered the early stages of progressive grassroots politics. *Danchi* acted as experimental fields of social policy, research and movement in post-war Japan.

The prevalence of social research on newly developed housing estates has not been limited to a Japanese postwar context. From 1944 to 1948, the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University conducted a large-scale study with the theme of social life in the "planned community" (which is almost synonymous with the *danchi* of this paper). The associate director of this bureau, Robert K. Merton, assumed a leading role in the study. Merton's study on planned communities was ground-breaking in terms of research by sociologists and social psychologists working in this area in the 1940–50s. Examples of the further research it initiated are referred to in the extract below:

In 1944, the Lavanburg foundation, impressed by the need for sociological knowledge of planned communities, initiated the preparation of designs for housing research by the **Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research**. This led to a study of human relations in the workers' housing community of Crafttown and in the biracial community of Hilltown, these communities differing in architectural design, tenant composition, and managerial policy. For much the same reasons, the Bemis Foundation at the **Massachusetts Institute of Technology** embarked in 1946 on a program of research in planned communities. Studies of the Westgate housing project, occupied by married student-veterans at MIT, dealt with the relationship between architectural design, group formation, and lines of

communication<sup>3</sup>. And in 1948 the Marshall Field Foundation provided the support for a program of studies in interracial housing by **the Research Center for Human Relations of New York University**. These dealt with relations between Negroes and whites in four housing projects, two in Newark and two in New York.<sup>4</sup> (Selvin 1951, pp. 174-75; emphasis added)

Merton can be said to be one of the most prominent sociologists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. However, his housing study is virtually unknown in Japan (with the exception, perhaps, of Miura, 1991), and probably all but forgotten in the United States as well. Nevertheless, “the Robert K. Merton Papers” at Columbia University were made accessible to the public in 2010, the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his birth, and attention has once again been drawn to his wide-ranging intellectual production (Calhoun ed. 2010). For example, Robert Sampson unearthed James Coleman’s reminiscence of Merton as a teacher:

There was a brief courtship, in those early days of quantitative data analysis, between survey data and theoretical problems in sociology. This courtship was apparent in Katz and Lazarsfeld’s *Personal Influence*, in Lipset’s *Union Democracy*, **but most strikingly in a study that never fully made its way into print: Merton’s “forthcoming housing study.”** It was only those of us in Merton’s classes at the time who, in the comparison between Crafttown and Hilltown, saw exhibited the difference that social structure made, saw social theory and social research come together. (Coleman 1990, p. 28; emphasis added)

Of the published literature based on Merton’s housing study, the most detailed was “Social Psychology of Housing” (Merton, 1948). Merton introduced selected research results related to: (a) public images of housing developments, (b) effects of spatial orientation on friendships, and (c) race relations in the planned community. Each of these corresponded to the following “middle range theories”: (a) supplementary projection, (b) opportunity structure, and (c) self-fulfilling prophecy; and relate to the pragmatic policy formation of: (a) administration of housing development, (b) spatial planning, and (c) planned improvement of demographic composition.

---

<sup>3</sup> Festinger, Schachter and Back (1950)

<sup>4</sup> Deutsch and Collins (1951)

What characterizes Merton (1948) is the pursuit of scientific research methods, and trust in the possibility of the practical application of survey results. However, or perhaps, therefore, it includes severe criticism of practitioners. Merton begins the article by stating that “the social psychology of housing has a short, inglorious past” (Merton 1948, p. 163). Considering the fact that this study was conducted with the aid of an organization seeking social reform through housing, the contents can even be said to be provocative. The brunt of the criticism was directed towards sociologists like F. Stuart Chapin, who participated in housing research before Merton. The declaration that housing study should be separated from previous slum research could be understood as a representation of the belief that a scientific study rooted in theory leads to the most adequate policy.

For Merton, Crafttown and Hilltown were “laboratories”, as he admits: “the planned community provides an exceptional laboratory for research in the social sciences” (Merton 1948: 183). He further says that “Since it is in varying degrees a moderately self-contained territorial unit, far more so than the unplanned communities, growing crescively in various directions, patterns of social interaction can the more easily be traced and investigated” (Merton 1948, p. 183).

## 6. Conclusion: Dynamics of Social Interaction between Researchers and Respondents

However, Merton and his colleagues also recognized that planned communities are not merely laboratories. They pointed out in their final report, *Patterns of Social life: Explorations in the Sociology of Housing* (Merton, West and Jahoda 1951)<sup>5</sup>, that, “as the study proceeded and the investigators established personal ties with many members of the community, both management and residents came to identify themselves with the inquiry. It became “their” study, especially in Crafttown.” (Merton, West and Jahoda 1951: appendix, pp. 68-9; emphasis added) Merton and his coauthors gave attention to the communicative nature of social research.

---

<sup>5</sup> The report was almost completed in 1948. However, it was only produced by mimeograph in 1951 and was never formally published (Calhoun 2010: 26). It is widely known that a considerable number of Merton’s manuscripts and drafts remain unpublished. Currently, there is no evidence to determine whether Merton didn’t published *Patterns of Social Life* because he did not acknowledge the value of its contents or because of some other reason.

**TABLE 2**  
**DETAILED CONTENTS OF *PATTERNS OF SOCIAL LIFE* (MERTON, WEST AND JAHODA, 1951)**

---

<b><u>Chapter I</u>            <u>Moving In</u></b>	
Moving into a Public Housing Development	2
The Tenants	3
The Community	5
Opinions without Facts	9
<b><u>Chapter II</u>            <u>Two Towns</u></b>	
The Figment of a Typical Housing Development	1
The Selection of Communities	4
Crafttown	9
Hilltown	18
Similarities and Contrasts	22
<b><u>Chapter III</u>            <u>The Meaning of Hilltown for Negroes and Whites</u></b>	
Racial Inequities in Housing	3
Social Context of the Meaning of Hilltown Prior to Occupancy	7
Social Frames of Reference	12
Hilltown as Racial Symbol	16
Occupation as Social Context	24
Orientations toward Hilltown	32
Expected Relations between the Races	33
Planned Roots in the Community	39
Early Perceptions of the Community	40
The Spectrum of Evaluation	47
<b><u>Chapter IV</u>            <u>The Meanings of Crafttown for Pioneers and Newcomers</u></b>	
Motivations and Recruitment	2
The Pioneers of Crafttown	15
The Time of Troubles	22
Oral Tradition and Phatic Communion	31
<b><u>Chapter V</u>            <u>Networks of Interpersonal Relations</u></b>	
Climates of Interpersonal Relations	3
Residential Proximity and Interpersonal Relations	17
Architectural Design and Interpersonal Relations	29
Social Contexts of Spatial Patterns of Friendship	33
<b><u>Chapter VI</u> (vacant)</b>	

---

**TABLE 2**  
(CONTINUED)

---

<b><u>Chapter VII      Patterns of Selection in Interpersonal Relations</u></b>	
The Relative Popularity of Social Categories of Residents	2
Variations in Consciousness of Kind	12
Variations in Status Homophily	21
Group and Status Differences in Homophily	42
An Index of Status Homophily	44
Group Variations in Homophily	46
Same Status, Different Contexts	49
<b><u>Chapter VIII      Selective Processes in Friendship</u></b>	
Selective Processes in Status Homophily	3B
Selective Processes in Value Homophily	7
The Dynamics of Value Homophily	13
The Role of Values in Status Homophily	25
In-Group and Out-Group Relationships	37
Social Contexts of Political Homophily	54
A Final Aside	71
Summary	72
<b><u>Chapter IX      The Dynamics of Race Relations in Hilltown</u></b>	
Institutional Contradictions and the Policy of Occupancy-Pattern	4
Unanticipated Consequences of Policy	9
Contingent Operating Decisions	13
Previous Interracial Contacts	15
Previous Neighborhood	31
<b><u>Chapter X      Grass Roots Politics: Civic Action and Civic Apathy</u></b>	
Civic and Political Concern in Crafttown and Hilltown	4
The Roots of Civic and Political Interest	27
Grassroots Politics in Crafttown	54
Political Conflict -- A Corollary of Political Concern	68
The Price of Independence	80
Political Concern with Local and National Affairs	87
Politics as a Social Catalyst	94
Tocqueville on Civic Apathy and Civic Concern	105
<b><u>Chapter XI      Patterns of Popular Participation</u></b>	
Forms of Participation: A Broad Survey	5
Membership Figures	5
Membership and Participation	7
Participation in the Projects and Outside	9

---

**TABLE 2**  
(CONTINUED)

Some typical Hilltown Organizations	11
Degree of Participation	15
A New Experience or an Old Habit	19
A Chance for Women	26
Caste and Class Participation	35
The Negro as a Participant in Hilltown	35
The White Collar Participant in a Working Class Community	40
Role of the Professional Group Worker in Hilltown	48
<b><u>Chapter XII      The Social Value of Privacy</u></b>	
Privacy -- Past and Present	4
The Meaning of Privacy	11
The Privacy of Anonymity	15
The Privacy of Social Distance	19
Seasonal Variations in Satisfaction with Privacy	23
Privacy and Architectural Design	27
<b><u>Chapter XIII     The Role of Management</u></b>	
Paying Rent	6
The Psychology of Graded Rent	9
Maintenance	21
Regimentation	33
Appraisal of Management	39
Contact between Management and Tenants	45a
<b><u>Chapter XIV     The Environment of Opinion: Public Images of Public Housing</u></b>	
Prevalent Climate of Opinion	4
Class Grouping and Prestige	6
Racial Equality and Prestige	10
Government as Landlord, and the Laissez-Faire Value	13
Economic Planning and the Laissez-Faire Value	17
The Distribution of Economic Goals	21
The Disturbance of the Status Quo	22
Exposure of Residents to the Climate of Opinion	26
The Spread of the Image	27
"How Others See us": Favorable and Unfavorable Public Images	31
Morale and the Climate of Opinion	35
Types of Opinion Environments: The Primary and the Secondary	41
A Hierarchy of Influential Opinion Environments	45
The Climate of Opinion and the Decision to Stay or to Move Away	51
The Initially Transient	55

TABLE 2  
(CONTINUED)

The Initially Permanent	60
Autonomy, Defiance, and Morale	70
The Climate of Opinion and Biracial Adjustment	76
The Changing Climate of Opinion	82

The interview in itself is a dynamic process, into which the investigator enters inevitably as a factor modifying the results. This ‘Heisenberg phenomenon’ of the social sciences has received less attention than its analogue in the physical sciences. But in the social sciences it is not only the investigator’s abilities which modify his results. **The interviewing process, as has been demonstrated, changes to some extent the qualities of the phenomenon to be measured.** After having talked for several hours with an interviewer, the respondent is to a slight extent a person different from the one who started the experience. Being put into a situation in which he has to review all his experiences in the [housing] project, he may modify habits of thought acquired earlier under the impact of questions. In that sense every interview is in some measure a therapeutic interview; while it sets out to measure if it changes what it desires to measure in the process of investigation. (Merton, West and Jahoda 1951: appendix, pp. 68-9; emphasis added)

The report is composed of 14 chapters and an appendix, and comprises over 800 pages (see Table 2). Its themes cover a broad range, including the meaning given to housing, social networks, the selection process of friendships, interracial relationships, local politics and public participation, social value of privacy, roles of administrators, and planning and freedom. In addition, it raises crucial issues regarding the integration of qualitative and quantitative research methods, the relationship between the researcher and the researched, and the management of the organization of research.

As he himself called it an “exploration,” Merton’s housing study cannot necessarily be said to have brought definitive results. However, its process of trial and error provides beneficial suggestions for thinking about Japanese *danchi* studies which confronted the common methodological problems. Moreover, it provides clues to investigate universal issues concerning social research.



## References

- \*in Japanese
- Calhoun, Craig ed. 2010. *Robert K. Merton: Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Coleman, James. 1990. "Robert K. Merton as Teacher." Pp. 25-32, in *Robert K. Merton*, edited by Jon Clark, Celia Modgil, and Sohan Modgil. London and New York: Falmer Press.
- Deutsch, Morton and Mary E. Collins. 1951. *Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Festinger, Leon, Kurt W. Back and Stanley Schachter. 1950. *Social Pressures in Informal Groups: A Study of Human Factors in Housing*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- \*Isomura, Eiichi. 1960. "Danchi shakai keisei no shakaigakuteki igi" [Sociological Significance of the Formation of *Danchi* Society], *Toshi Mondai Kenkyū [Journal of Municipal Problems]*. Toshi Mondai Kenkyūkai [Association of Municipal Problems] 117: 3-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Shunsuke Oshio eds. 1958. *Danchi Seikatsu to Jū-ishiki no Keisei [Everyday Life in Danchi and the Formation of Residential Consciousness]*. Tokyo: Department of Sociology at Tokyo Metropolitan University.
- \*Koyama, Takashi ed. 1960. *Gendai kazoku no kenkyū [A Study of the Modern Family]*. Tokyo: Kōbundo.
- \*Kurasawa, Susumu. 1968. *Nihon no toshi shakai [Urban Society in Japan]*. Tokyo: Fukumura Shuppan.
- \*Kurihara, Kaichiro. 1963. "Kinrin no ningen kankei" [Human Relations in Neighborhood]. Pp. 100-13, in *Danchi no Subete [All about Danchi]*, edited by Seikatsu Kagaku Chosakai [Human Life Science Research Group]. Tokyo: Seikatsu Kagaku Chosakai.
- \*Masuda, Kokichi. 1958. "Tekkin apāto kyojū kazoku no fūfu kankei" [Conjugal Relations of the Families Living in Reinforced Concrete Apartment Complexes]. *Konan University Bungakukai Ronshū* 7: 1-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1960. "Tekkin apāto kyojū kazoku no neiboring" [Neighborhood Relations of the Families Living in Reinforced Concrete Apartment Complexes]. *Konan University Bungakukai Ronshū* 11:1-12.
- Merton, Robert K. 1948. "The Social Psychology of Housing." Pp. 163-217, in *Current Trends in Social Psychology*, edited by Wayne Dennis. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Patricia S. West, and Marie Jahoda. 1951. *Patterns of Social Life: Explorations in the Sociology of Housing*. New York: Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research. [Robert K. Merton Papers], Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Columbia University in the City of New York. Box 210.
- \*Miura, Noriko. 1991. "Shakaigakuteki haujingu ron josetsu" [A Prolegomenon to a

- Sociology of Housing]. Pp. 294-308, in *Ryudogata Sakai no Kenkyū* [A Study on the Mobile Society]. Tokyo: Kōseisha Kōseikaku.
- \*Morioka, Kiyomi. 1968. "Toshi kinkō danchi kazoku no seikatsushi to shakai sankā" [Life History and Social Participation of a Family Living in *Danchi* in a Suburb of Tokyo]. *International Christian University Journal of Social Science* 7: 199-277.
- \*Nakamura, Hachiro. 1962. "Toshiteki hatten to chōnaikai" [Urban Development and *Chōnaikai*]. Pp. 79-154, in *Chiiki Shakai to Toshika* [Local Communities and Urbanization], edited by International Christian University Social Science Research Unit. Tokyo: International Christian University.
- \*Nihon Jūtaku Kōdan Kenchiku-bu Chōsa-kenkyū-ka [Survey Research Unit, Department of Construction, Japan Housing Corporation]. 1960-1963. *Apāto danchi kyojūsha no shakai-shinrigakuteki kenkyū* [A Socio-psychological Study on Residents of Apartment Complexes], volumes 1-3. Tokyo: Nihon Jūtaku Kōdan.
- \*Okuda, Michihiro. 1970. "Jūmin undō to kenkyūsha no shakaiteki yakuwari" [Social Role of Researchers in the Local Residents' Movement]. *SD* 71: 38-39. Tokyo: Kajima Shuppankai.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. "Shakaiteki seikaku to shimin ishiki" [Social Character and Civic Consciousness]. Pp. 197-219, in *Toshi Shakaigaku* [Urban Sociology] edited by Susumu Kurasawa. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. *Toshi komyuniti no riron* [Theory of Urban Communities]. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai.
- \*Osaka City University *Danchi* Research Group. 1963-1964. *Danchi komuniti no kenkyū* [A Study on *Danchi* Community], volumes 1-5. Osaka: Osaka City University.
- \*Oyabu, Juichi. 1966. "Danchi keikaku ni kansuru shakaigakuteki narabini kenchikugakuteki kenkyū" [A Sociological and Architectural Study of *Danchi* Planning]. *Sahakigaku Hyoron* [Sociological Review]. 16(3): 93-120.
- Sampson, Robert. 2010. "Eliding the Theory/Research and Basic/Applied Divides." Pp. 63-78, in *Robert K. Merton*, edited by Craig Calhoun. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Selvin, Hanan. "The Interplay of Social Policy and Social Research in Housing." *Journal of Social Issues* 7(1-2): 172-85.
- \*Sukenari, Yasushi, Taro Hirai and Yoshimi Nishino. 2012. "Sengo nihon no shakai chōsa ni okeru jūtaku no taishōka" [Housing as an Objective of Social Research in Postwar Japan]. *Jūsoken Kenkyū Ronbunshū* [Journal of the Housing Research Foundation]. 38: 303-15.
- Whyte, William H. 1956. *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster. [*Soshiki no Naka no Ningen*, translated into Japanese by Keizo Okabe, Tamotsu Fujinaga, Akira Tsujimura, and Kazuhiko Sata. Tokyo: Tokyo Sōgensha, 1959].
- \*Yasuda, Saburo. 1962. "Danchi jumin no shakai ishiki" [Social Consciousness of *Danchi* Residents]. Pp. 155-92, in *Chiiki Shakai to Toshika* [Local Communities and Urbanization], edited by International Christian University Social Science

Research Unit. Tokyo: International Christian University.

*YASUSHI SUKENARI* is Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology, the University of Tokyo in Japan. He specializes in sociology of housing, media studies and history of social research. He has put much effort in comprehending the origins of modern housing system and material culture. "*Jūtaku*" *no rekishi shakai gaku*, *The Historical Sociology of Dwelling Space* (2008) represents the first step to this purpose. He translated *Housing and Social Theory* (1992) by Jim Kemeny, which is a known milestone in European housing studies, and published the Japanese version *Haujingu to fukushi kokka* in 2014. Address: Department of Sociology, the University of Tokyo, Hongo 7-3-1, Bunkyo-ku, 113-0033, Tokyo, Japan. [E-mail: sukenari@l.u-tokyo.ac.jp]

