Research on Community Satisfaction of Residents in Shanghai Large Residential Communities

Xuehui Duan

(College of Sociology and Political Science, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, China)

Abstract: The construction of large residential communities is important strategic step to accelerate urbanization in China. To focus on residents' community satisfaction in large residential communities is of great significance for urban grass-roots social governance and future urbanization development in China. Based on 2014 Shanghai large residential community residents' survey data, the article employs multinomial logistic regression Model to explore the important influential factors of community satisfaction of residents in large residential communities. The results reveal that for residents in large residential communities who believe the more convenient daily life in new communities, the level of strong community satisfaction is higher, the level of weak community satisfaction is lower; for residents in large residential communities who have longer job-housing distances and residence time, the level of community satisfaction is lower; for residents in large residential communities who live in the resettling housing, the level of community satisfaction is lower; The promotion of the age and education does not give rise to significant improvement of community satisfaction; for residents in large residential communities who have higher income and housing property, the level of community satisfaction is higher.

Key words: Community Satisfaction; Large Residential Communities

Data:

According to the regional divisions, and taking survey research simplicity and feasibility and representative patterns of community governance into account, the article employs judgment sampling method to choose the Pujiang, Guvillage, Jiangqiao, Sanling and Sijing five communities to conduct surveys, where 300 questionnaires had conducted in Guvillage community, others communities were made 200 questionnaires. Total sampling size is 1100, but the actual sampling size is 1108. In each large residential community, according to the housing type (affordable housing, resettling housing, etc.) and household number (preferred communities living more residents), the article uses judgment sampling method to choose four residents' committees, the total committees number is 19. In each residential community, according to the residents' household directory registration in communities, the article uses mechanical sampling method to select 50 households to make investigation and employs the birthday method to choose the smallest permanent residents of 18 years old as the respondents of investigation.

The basic information of the sample is seen in table 1. In addition to the basic information described in table 1, the sample average age is 51.35 years (standard deviation is 0.47 year), the average annual income is 38043.66 RMB (standard deviation is 1581 RMB).

Table 1 Sample Basic Variables Described Analysis

Variable	Frequency（%）	Variable	Frequency（%）
gender（N=1100）		Residence time（N=1107）	
male	489（44.45）	Less than 1 year	82（7.41）
female	611（55.55）	1 year	298（26.92）
marriage（N=1105）		2 years	278（25.11）
Non-spouse	174（15.75）	3 years	136（12.29）
spouse	931（84.25）	More than 3 years	313（28.27）
education(N=1108)		Housing Types（N=1084）	
Less than junior school	102（9.21）	affordable	352（32.47）
Junior school	387（34.93）	renting	20（1.85）
Senior school	394（35.56）	resettling	657（60.61）
College Degree or above	225（20.31）	Ordinary Merchandise	55（5.07）
household registration（N=1107）		Housing suite（N=918）	
Non-Shanghai	243（21.95）	1	628（68.41）
Shanghai	864（78.05）	More than 1	290（31.59）
Household registration（N=863）		Housing space（N=1108）	
Not in new community	559（64.77）	Less than 70 square meters	304（27.44）
In new community	304（35.23）	70-79 square meters	482（43.50）
Job-housing distance（N=347）		More than 80 square meters	322（29.06）
Less than 5 km	82（23.63）	Occupation status（N=342）	
6-10 km	46（13.26）	administrator	7（2.05）
11-20 km	54（15.56）	Professional and technical	63（18.42）
More than 20 km	111（31.99）	clerks	59（17.25）
Not fixed	54（15.56）	business services	90（26.32）
Housing property（N=1102）		small proprietor	20（5.85）
no	207（18.78）	freelancers	67（19.59）
yes	895（81.22）	workers	30（8.77）
		peasants	6（1.75）

Dependent variable: community satisfaction. The article uses two questions to measure the community satisfaction. “In general, do you satisfied with large residential community management conditions?" and “In general, do you satisfied with the service conditions of large residential community? The options are divided into: very satisfied, satisfied, not satisfied, very unsatisfied, can’t say clear.

For research purpose, the article puts indicators of community satisfaction of residents in large residential communities into recoding processing: if respondents are not satisfied with any large residential community management or service conditions,

the generated new variable is “dissatisfaction”, the new value is "1". If those respondents are satisfied with large residential community management or service, the generated new variable is “weak satisfaction”, the new value is "2". If those are completely satisfied with large residential community management and service, the new generated variable is “strong satisfaction”, the new value is "3".

Table 2 Described Analysis of Community Satisfaction

Indicator	Very satisfied	satisfied	Not satisfied	Very unsatisfied	Can’t say clear	N
Community	14	647	360	75	11	1107
management	1.26	58.45	32.52	6.78	0.99	100
Community	13	655	343	72	22	1105
services	1.18	59.28	31.04	6.52	1.99	100

Table 3 Recoded Described Analysis of Community Satisfaction (N=1081)

Level of satisfaction	Frequency（%）
dissatisfaction	362（33.49）
Weak satisfaction	115（10.64）
Strong satisfaction	604（55.87）

Independent variables: life convenience. The article uses “do you agree with daily life convenience in new community?” to measure the life convenience. The options are divided into: inconvenience and convenience.

Job-housing separation refers to job and housing spatial separation caused by institutional constraints and market failures (Siqi Zheng, et al, 2009). The question in the questionnaire is about "how far is your main job unit from your residential community?" The options are divided into: less than 1km, 2-5km, 6-10 km, 11-20 km, more than 20 kilometers and unfixed distances.

Residence time: The article divides residence time into five categories: "less than 1 year", "1 year", "2 years", "3 years", "more than 3 years".

Housing types: The article divides housing types into four categories: "affordable housing", "renting housing", "resettling housing", "ordinary commercial housing".

Control variables: the article takes gender, age, the square of age, income, the square of income, education level and housing property as control variables and put these variables into the regression Model to examine the influencing factors of community satisfaction of residents in large residential communities.

***Research hypothesis*:**

Hypothesis one:

The more convenient is daily life in new communities, the higher level is community satisfaction of residents in large residential communities.

Hypothesis two:

The longer distance is job-housing separation, the lower level is community satisfaction of residents in large residential communities.

Hypothesis three:

Residents who live in different housing types have different level of community satisfaction.

Hypothesis four:

The longer is residence time in new communities, the higher level is community satisfaction of residents in large residential communities.

Table 4 Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis of Community Satisfaction

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
variable	Weak odds ratio (SE)	Strong odds ratio (SE)	Weak odds ratio (SE)	Strong odds ratio (SE)	Weak odds ratio (SE)	Strong odds ratio (SE)	Weak odds ratio (SE)	Strong odds ratio （SE）
Male [1]	2.680	1.136	2.455	1.257	2.265	1.024	2.803	0.954
	（1.863）	（0.487）	(1.760)	(0.555)	(1.630)	(0.470)	(2.122)	(0.456)
Age	0.607**	0.682**	0.568**	0.712**	0.565**	0.722*	0.555**	0.710*
	（0.136）	（0.114）	(0.132)	（0.121）	(0.138)	(0.129)	(0.137)	(0.133)
Age square	1.005**	1.004**	1.006**	1.004*	1.006**	1.004*	1.006**	1.004*
	（0.003）	（0.002）	（0.003）	（0.002）	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Income	3.047	3.371	4.459	3.308	18.449	219.002**	31.216	255.892*
	（19.818）	（17.753）	(28.273)	(17.807)	(123.447)	(1.356e+06)	(216.212)	(1.651e+06)
Income square	0.687	0.678	0.672	0.682	0.631	0.564**	0.621	0.560*
	（0.212）	（0.168）	(0.200)	(0.173)	（0.199）	（0.165）	(0.202)	(0.171)
Education [2]								
Junior school	0.088	0.565	0.056	0.539	0.034*	0.182	0.031*	0.111
	（0.152）	（0.860）	(0.101)	（0.849）	（0.067）	(0.319)	(0.061)	（0.199）
High school	0.019**	0.847	0.009**	0.991	0.006**	0.356	0.004**	0.224
	(0.034)	（1.289）	（0.017）	（1.565）	(0.011)	(0.628)	（0.008）	（0.402）
College and above	0.033*	0.517	0.020**	0.526	0.012**	0.171	0.007**	0.078
	（0.061）	（0.818）	（0.040）	(0.858)	(0.025)	(0.312)	（0.016）	（0.148）
Housing property [3]	0.694	4.570	0.566	4.801	0.687	8.491*	0.739	27.61**
	（0.922）	（4.476）	（0.799）	（4.694）	(0.962)	(10.66)	（1.127）	(39.91)
Life convenience [4]	0.333*	2.533**	0.237**	2.804***	0.231**	2.700**	0.172**	2.992**
	（0.216）	(0.960)	(0.166)	(1.119)	(0.163)	(1.125)	(0.131)	（1.337）
Job-housing distance [5]								
6-20 km			4.705	0.352*	4.720	0.355*	5.238	0.285*
			(5.201)	(0.213)	(4.500)	(0.222)	（6.127）	（0.189）
More than 20km			1.477	0.558	1.405	0.465	1.142	0.360
			(1.165)	（0.321）	（1.583）	（0.284）	(1.329)	(0.231)

Housing type [6]								
renting					26.16	1.244e+07	116.9	5.403e+07
					（64.746）	(1.593e+10)	(335.395)	(8.021e+10)
resettling					0.804	0.467*	0.694	0.401*
					（0.585）	（0.208）	(0.574)	(0.220)
Ordinary Merchandise					1.979	4.125	1.663	4.571
					（3.309）	（4.989）	(2.814)	(5.609)
Residence time [7]								
1 year							0.198	0.096**
							（0.321）	（0.111）
2 years							0.377	0.067**
							（0.596）	（0.079）
3 years							0.713	0.053**
							（1.187）	（0.066）
More than 3 years							0.328	0.087**
							（0.530）	(0.102)
Constant	0	0	0	0	0	0*	0	0*
	(0)	(0)	(0)	（0）	（0）	（0）	(0)	(0)
N	165		165		165		165	
Pseudo R^2	0.1228		0.1588		0.1951		0.2329	

Two tailed test statistical significance: p* < 0.05, p**<0.01, p***<0.001

1 gender, with female as reference

2 education, with less than junior school as reference

3 housing property, with no housing property as reference

4 life convenience, with life inconvenience as reference

5 job-housing separation, with less than 5 km as reference

6 housing type, with affordable housing as reference

7 residence time, with less than 1year as reference

Conclusion and discussion:

First, the results suggest that level of community satisfaction of Shanghai residents in large residential communities is medium level. Community service's satisfaction is better than community management's satisfaction. The research results indicate that the infrastructure constructions in Shanghai large residential communities have made great achievements and community management is also gradually increased. However, community service and community management still have failed to meet the residents' increasing social demands.

Second, the community daily life convenience has very obvious effects on community satisfaction. The lag of public facilities may be the important cause for the lower level of community satisfaction of residents in large residential communities. Because of the lag of public infrastructure construction in large communities and living in suburbs, lots of residents in large residential communities immigrating from the city center area, where public infrastructure is better, will inevitably produce huge

psychological contrast and feeling of "countryman". And the "town-managed community paradigm" has been unable to effectively deal with great challenge of increasing population migration into large residential communities. The urban development pattern of disconnection between industry and residence has led to a large number of residents not to work nearby and large residential communities only have the residential function. Statistics results show that 64.77% of respondents have not registered permanent residence in new communities.

Third, job-housing separation has significant influence on community satisfaction. The longer distance is job-housing separation, the lower level is community satisfaction. The phenomenon of serious job-housing separation in China actually reflects the relationship between the macroscopic structural factors of urban residential suburbanization, housing policy and urban residents' reaction of job-housing spatial separation (Liu, et.al, 2011). Social involuntary migration does not necessarily lead to reassignment into the better communities (Goetz, 2010). The development of economical affordable housing could lead to new social isolation (Wang & Murie, 2000; Stephens, 2010). The results about job-housing separation is negatively related to the community satisfaction indicates that community satisfaction of residents in large residential communities to some extent, has strong tendency of instrumental rationality, namely community satisfaction generated by resources or interests satisfaction.

Fourth, as for economic factor, housing has significant influence on community satisfaction. Under the current market economy system, as a symbol of personal economic strength, housing directly embodies the residents' social and economic status, obviously affects the residents' subjective cognition and life experience. The facts that the lower community satisfaction of residents in resettling housing may be related to compensation and other problems left over by history. Some residents considered his own interests impaired and developed the strong feeling of deprivation and the lack of community identity and community satisfaction. Housing construction quality problem may be important cause for lower level of community satisfaction in large residential communities. With the increasing in residence time, housing construction quality problem will be further exposed. Bad quality housing may lead to decreasing of community satisfaction. The research conclusion sufficiently suggested that under the condition of the diversification of social interest groups and the "fragmentation" of social interest relations and social value identification, the allocation and meets of resources which is closely linked with the residents' daily life is core elements of measuring the higher or lower level of community satisfaction.

Finally, it should be pointed out that, due to data limitations, the article does not put more variables possibly affecting community satisfaction into the regression model, which to some extent affect the model validity. The article also find some important problem deserving of further studies: the two variables of possessing Shanghai local household registration and household registration in the new community have not significant impacts on community satisfaction, which it means whether the influences of household registration institution in China on community satisfaction has weakened as China's housing institution reform? The results also indicate that for

resident in large residential communities, education degree is negatively related with community satisfaction but income is positively related with community satisfaction. However the social economic status variables, closely related with education and income, has not significant impacts on the community satisfaction, which it means whether the influences of the social economic status variables on community satisfaction are also weakening? All these questions need more empirical researches to verify the results in the future.

Corresponding Author:
Xuehui Duan, Shanghai University,
College of Sociology and Political Science,
99 Shangda Road, Shanghai, China 200444
E-mail: chrisduansh@163.com