International Journal of Scientific Research and Engineering Development-– Volume 9 Issue 6, Nov – Dec 2026
Available at www.ijsred.com

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Apartment Living Culture and Changing Life Style Patterns Among Urban Middle-Class Families

Gowtham M[1], Dr. M Sangeetha[2] M.com, M.phil, Ph.D
[1]Department of commerce, VLB Janakiammal College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India
[2]Assistant professor, Department of Commerce ,VLB Janakiammal College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

----------**********----------

ABSTRACT

Apartment living has become an important part of urban life, influenced by housing needs, security, modern facilities and convenient locations. This study examines reported lifestyle patterns, family relationships and social interactions among urban middle-class families living in apartments. A descriptive approach summarises questionnaire-based information on respondents' backgrounds, family time, neighbour interaction, community participation, daily routines, food habits and leisure activities. The findings indicate that modern facilities are a common reason for choosing apartments, while residents report mixed experiences in family communication and lifestyle change. Perceived safety and community participation are also considered. The results are descriptive and should be interpreted cautiously because respondent-level raw data were not supplied.

Because respondent-level raw data were not supplied, category counts were proportionally normalised from the provided summary to total 50 for each question; they should be verified against the original response sheet before formal submission.

Keywords: *Apartment living, urban middle-class families, lifestyle patterns, family relationships, neighbour interaction, community participation, urban housing.*

----------**********----------

I. INTRODUCTION

Urbanisation has influenced housing choices and the organisation of everyday family life. Apartments are often selected for their facilities, security and convenient locations, but shared residential settings can also shape privacy, family routines, neighbour relationships and leisure activities. For middle-class families, apartment living may bring practical benefits while changing how household members communicate, spend time together and use common spaces. This study examines these reported experiences through questionnaire-summary data, considering both the advantages and challenges associated with apartment living.

II. BACKGROUND OFTHE STUDY

Apartment living reflects changes in urban housing preferences and the growing importance of shared residential environments. The choice of an apartment might be influenced by facilities, security, affordability and location. Once residents move into an apartment, their daily experiences may be shaped by the layout of the home, access to common areas, neighbour interaction and the rules or activities of the residential community. The family is a key setting in which lifestyle patterns are formed. Everyday routines include meals, work, education, leisure, recreation and communication.

STATEMENT OFTHE PROBLEM

Although apartment living could provide modern facilities and a sense of security, its influence on family life and lifestyle patterns might differ across households. Some residents might benefit from community activities and convenient facilities, while others might experience changes in family communication, limited quality time, or difficulties in maintaining neighbour relationships. Daily routines, food habits and leisure preferences may also change after moving into an apartment. Therefore, the problem addressed by this study is to understand how apartment living culture is associated with social relationships and changing lifestyle patterns among urban middle-class families, based on the responses provided in the questionnaire

.

1.1 NEED OFTHE STUDY

The study is needed to understand residents' experiences of apartment living beyond the physical structure of housing. It considers whether residents perceive apartments as safe, how frequently they

 ©IJSRED: All Rights are Reserved

spend quality time with
family, how they interact with neighbours and participate in community activities, and how daily routines, food habits and leisure activities have changed. The findings might help residents' associations, housing planners and community organisers understand the aspects of apartment life that residents appreciate and the issues that may require attention. The study can also support discussion about balancing convenience, privacy, family interaction and community participation.

1.2 SCOPE OFTHE STUDY

The study focuses on apartment living culture and changing lifestyle patterns among urban middle-class families. Its scope includes the socio-demographic and household profile of respondents, reasons for choosing apartment living, duration of residence, perceptions of family time and communication, neighbour interaction, perceived safety for children and elderly people, participation in community activities, changes in daily routines and food habits, leisure-time preferences, outdoor recreation, perceived effects on daily lifestyle and family relationships. The analysis is limited to the questionnaire datas upplied. The source document does not identify a specific city or sampling method; therefore, no particular urban location or sampling procedure is assumed.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OFTHE STUDY

1. To study the lifestyle patterns of urban middle-class families living in apartments.
2. To examine the impact of apartment living on family relationships and social interactions.
3. To analyse changes in daily habits, leisure activities, and household practices due to apartment living.
4. To understand how urban middle-class families adapt to the changing apartment living culture.

1.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study adopts a descriptive research design to summarise respondents' reported experiences and perceptions ofapartment living and lifestyle change.

Source of DataThe analysis is based on questionnaire data supplied in the document titled "analysis and interpretation." The articleretains the reported frequencies, percentages and interpretation themes from that source. Sample Size

For consistent presentation, the analysis tables have been normalised to a sample size of 50 respondents. The origina lsummary contained category totals that varied by question. Because individual-level raw responses were not supplied, the counts have been proportionally adjusted from the provided summary and should be verified against the original questionnaire or response sheet.

Data Collection Instrument

A structured questionnaire was used to gather information on respondent characteristics, apartment residence, family and neighbour relationships, community participation and lifestyle patterns.

Tools forAnalysis

interactions.apartment living. culture. The supplied analysis uses frequency counts and percentages. Findings are described using tables and narrativeinterpretation. The study does not claim causal relationships or statistical significance.

Limitations of the Study

The study is based on the questionnaire summary provided and does not include raw responses for independentre-analysis .The specific city, sampling technique and data-collection period are not mentioned in the source document. The original summary contained item-level totals that varied. In this edited version, each question in the three data-analysis tables totals 50 responses; counts were proportionally adjusted from the supplied summary because raw

respondent-level data were unavailable. The results describe respondents' reported perceptions and should not be generalised to all urban middle-class families without further evidence.

III. REVIEW OFLITERATURE

Research on residential environments has considered the relationship between housing design, privacy, social interaction and wellbeing. Apartment living is not only a housing arrangement; it also creates a shared social setting in which residents negotiate access to common spaces, everyday contact with neighbours and boundaries between private and communal life.

2.1 REVIEW OFPREVIOUS STUDIES

Altman (1975) examined the relationship between the built environment and social behaviour, including how people manage privacy and interaction. This perspective is relevant to apartment living because residents share corridors, lifts, entrances and recreational spaces while also seeking privacy within their homes. The balance between shared and private

 ©IJSRED: All Rights are Reserved

space could shape the quality and frequency of social contact. Gifford (2007), in research on environmental psychology, discussed how physical settings influence human behaviour and social experience.

Residential design, crowding, access to facilities and the arrangement of common spaces could influence how people use their environment and interact with others. This provides a useful conceptual background for studying apartment residents' perceptions of safety, neighbour interaction and community activities. Newman (1972) explored the relationship between residential design and community safety through the concept of defensible space. His work suggests that the arrangement and management of residential areas could influence residents' sense of ownership, surveillance and security. This is relevant to the present study because safety for children and elderly family members was included in the questionnaire. Research on urban housing and family life also recognises that changes in the residential environment could affect everyday routines and patterns of social interaction. Shared facilities might encourage recreation and community participation, while changes in privacy, time use and household organisation could create different experiences acros families. The present questionnaire contributes descriptive evidence about how respondents report these dimensions in their own apartment-living context.

2.2 RESEARCH GAP

The literature provides conceptual explanations for the relationship between residential environments, privacy, safety andsocial behaviour. The present study adds questionnaire-based evidence covering several connected dimensions at once:reasons for choosing apartments, family time, family communication, neighbour interaction, community participation,daily routines, food habits, leisure choices and family relationships. It focuses on the reported experiences of therespondents represented in the supplied dataset. Because the geographical area and sampling method are not specified, thefindings should be treated as descriptive of this sample rather than representative of all urban middle-class families.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The following three tables are formatted consistently. For this edited version, the category counts in each question havebeen proportionally adjusted from the supplied summary so that each question totals 50 respondents, and percentages arerecalculated as (frequency ÷ 50) × 100. These are normalised summary figures, not a re-count of raw questionnaires;verify them against the original response sheet before formal submission.

SECTION I: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Table 1. Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Age	Below 25 years	17	34.0
	26–35 years	12	24.0
	36–40 years	14	28.0
	Above 45 years	7	14.0
Gender	Female	23	46.0
	Male	17	34.0
	Prefer not to say	10	20.0
Marital Status	Unmarried	22	44.0
	Married	22	44.0
	Other	6	12.0
Family Size	1–2 members	12	24.0
	3–4 members	20	40.0
	5–6 members	11	22.0
	More than 6 members	7	14.0
Monthly Family Income	Below ₹25,000	10	20.0
	₹25,000–₹50,000	19	38.0
	₹50,000–₹75,000	15	30.0

 ©IJSRED: All Rights are Reserved

	Above ₹75,000	6	12.0
Duration of Apartment Residence	Less than 1 year	17	34.0
	1–5 years	15	30.0
	6–10 years	13	26.0
	More than 10 years	5	10.0
Reason for Choosing Apartment Living	Modern facilities	19	38.0
	Security	13	26.0
	Affordable cost	13	26.0
	Convenient location	5	10.0

Interpretation

The socio-demographic profile indicates that the largest age group is below 25 years (34.0%), followed by respondentsaged 36–40 years (28.0%). Females account for 46.0% of the sample, males 34.0%, and 20.0% preferred not to disclosegender. Households with 3–4 members form the largest family-size group (40.0%). The largest monthly family incomegroup is I25,000–I50,000 (38.0%). Modern facilities are the most commonly reported reason for choosing apartmentliving (38.0%), followed by security and affordable cost (26.0% each).Data note: the age bands supplied do not show a category for ages 41–45. The category labels should be checked againstthe original questionnaire.

SECTION II:APARTMENTLIVING CULTUREAND SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

Variable	Category	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Sufficient Family Time	Neutral	21	42.0
	Strongly agree	12	24.0
	Agree	10	20.0
	Disagree	7	14.0
Quality Time with Family	Daily	6	12.0
	Weekly	12	24.0
	Occasionally	21	42.0
	Rarely	11	22.0

Variable	Category	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Interaction with Neighbours (Q1)	Daily	15	30.0
	Weekly	19	38.0
	Occasionally	10	20.0
	Rarely	6	12.0
Safety for Children and Elderly	Agree	19	38.0
	Strongly agree	15	30.0
	Neutral	10	20.0
	Disagree	6	12.0
Family Communication	Positively affected	18	36.0
	Negatively affected	20	40.0
	No effect	9	18.0
	Not sure	3	6.0
Interaction with Neighbours (Q2)	Daily	10	20.0
	Occasionally	23	46.0

 ©IJSRED: All Rights are Reserved

	Rarely	9	18.0
	Never	8	16.0
Participation in Community Activities	Always	17	34.0
	Often	18	36.0
	Sometimes	11	22.0
	Never	4	8.0

Interpretation

The results show varied experiences of family time and social relationships. The largest group (42.0%) expressed a neutralopinion about whether apartment living provides sufficient family time. In terms of quality time with family, 42.0%reported that this happens occasionally, while 22.0% reported it rarely. Neighbour interaction varies acrossthe two questionnaire items: weekly interaction was the most common response in the first item (38.0%), while occasionalinteraction was the most common response in the second item (46.0%).Perceived safety was relatively positive: 38.0% agreed and 30.0% strongly agreed that apartments provide safety forchildren and elderly people, giving a combined 68.0%. However, 40.0% reported a negative effect on familycommunication, compared with 36.0% who reported a positive effect. Community participation was relatively common,with 70.0% participating often or always. Overall, the findings suggest that apartment communities may provideperceived safety and opportunities for social engagement, while family communication remains an area for attention.

SECTION III: CHANGING LIFESTYLE PATTERNS

Table 3. Changing Lifestyle PatternsAmong Respondents

	Very little	**14**	**28.0**
	To a great extent	12	24.0
	Not at all	3	6.0
Changes in Food Habits	Yes, significantly	18	36.0
	Yes, to some extent	17	34.0

	Very little	**14**	**28.0**
	No change	8	16.0
	Very significantly	7	14.0
Leisure-Time Activities	Mobile phones/social media	23	46.0
	Reading books	12	24.0
	Watching television	11	22.0
	Mobile phones/recreational facilities*	4	8.0
Outdoor Recreational Activities	Daily	13	26.0
	Weekly	19	38.0
	Occasionally	12	24.0
	Rarely	6	12.0
Effect on Daily Lifestyle	Slightly improved	17	34.0
	Greatly improved	15	30.0
	Made it more difficult	13	26.0

 ©IJSRED: All Rights are Reserved

	No change	5	10.0
Effect on Family Relationships	No change	14	28.0
	Improved relationship	13	26.0
	Reduced family interaction	12	24.0
	Increased family conflicts	11	

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS: AGE AND QUALITY TIME WITH FAMILY

Variables Used

Variable	Categories	Total
Age	Below 25; 26–35; 36–40; Above 45 years	50
How often do your family members spend quality time together?	Daily; Weekly; Occasionally; Rarely	50

Formula

□² = □ □ (O E)² / E, where O = observed frequency and E = expected frequency. Expected frequency for each cell is calculated as E = (Row Total × Column Total) / Grand Total.

Illustrative Observed Frequency Table

The source document provides separate totals for age and quality-time frequency, but not respondent-level cross-tabulated data. The inner cell counts below are illustrative only; they preserve the supplied row and column totals and must be replaced with actual cross-tabulated counts before formal submission.

Age Group	Daily	Weekly	Occasionally	Rarely	Row Total
Below 25 years	2	4	8	3	17
26–35 years	1	3	5	3	12
36–40 years	2	3	6	3	14

Age Group	Daily	Weekly	Occasionally	Rarely	Row Total
Above 45 years	1	2	2	2	7
Column Total	6	12	21	11	50

EXPECTED FREQUENCYAND CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION

Expected frequencies are calculated from the age-group totals and the quality-time response totals given in the questionnaire summary.

Age Group	Daily	Weekly	Occasionally	Rarely
Below 25	2.04	4.08	7.14	3.74
26–35	1.44	2.88	5.04	2.64
36–40	1.68	3.36	5.88	3.08
Above 45	0.84	1.68	2.94	1.54

 ©IJSRED: All Rights are Reserved

Using the illustrative observed table, the calculated chi-square statistic is $\chi^2 = 1.075$, with 9 degrees of freedom and $p = 0.999$. At the 5% significance level, this illustrative result is not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

Interpretation

Based on the illustrative counts only, there is no statistically significant evidence of an association between respondents' age group and how often family members spend quality time together. This conclusion must not be treated as a finding from the actual respondents because the cross-tabulated raw data were not supplied. The observed frequencies above are hypothetical examples; use the original respondent-level data to obtain a valid chi-square result. Also, several expected cell frequencies are below 5, so the assumptions for the conventional chi-square approximation may be weak; consider combining categories only if substantively justified or using an appropriate exact test.

MAJOR FINDINGS

- Respondents below 25 years form the largest age group (34.0%).
- Households with 3–4 members are the most common family-size category (40.0%).
- Modern facilities are the most frequently reported reason for choosing apartment living (38.0%).
- About 68.0% agree or strongly agree that apartments provide safety for children and elderly family members.
- Occasional quality time with family is the most common response (42.0%).
- Family communication is reported as negatively affected by 40.0% of respondents and positively affected by 36.0%.
- About 70.0% participate in community activities often or always.
- Many respondents report changes in daily routines and food habits; mobile phones/social media are the most common leisure activity (46.0%).
- Daily lifestyle is reported as slightly or greatly improved by 64.0%, while 26.0% say apartment living has made life more difficult.

ANOVAANALYSIS: FAMILY TIME AND APARTMENT NEIGHBOUR INTERACTION

This section examines whether the mean family-time response differs according to how often respondents interact with their apartment neighbours.

Variables Used

Variable	Categories / coding	Total
Family time (dependent variable)	Sufficient family time response coded as: Strongly agree = 4; Agree = 3; Neutral = 2; Disagree = 1	50
How often do you interact with your apartment neighbours? (grouping variable)	Daily; Weekly; Occasionally; Rarely	50

ANOVA Formula

F = MS between groups / MS within groups, where MS = sum of squares (SS) divided by its degrees of freedom (df).

Illustrative One-Way ANOVA Table

Neighbour interaction frequency	n	Mean family-time score
Daily	15	2.80
Weekly	19	2.47
Occasionally	10	2.30

 ©IJSRED: All Rights are Reserved

Rarely	6	2.50

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	p-value
Between groups	1.683	3	0.561	0.530	0.664
Within groups	48.737	46	1.059	—	—
Total	50.420	49	—	—	—

Interpretation

In this illustrative calculation, F = 0.530 and p = 0.664. Since p is greater than 0.05, the result is not statistically significant. The example does not provide evidence that the mean family-time score differs across the four neighbour-interaction groups.

Important data note: The original PDF provides separate totals for family-time responses and neighbour-interaction frequency, but does not provide each respondent's paired answers. Therefore, the group means and ANOVA statistics above are illustrative, not actual findings. The example uses a hypothetical cross-tabulation that preserves the supplied totals. Replace it with respondent-level data before submitting the project. Because the family-time response is ordinal, ANOVA on numeric codes is only an approximate classroom demonstration; a suitable ordinal/non-parametric method may be preferable for formal analysis.

neighbour interaction and family communication, with 40.0% reporting a negative effect on family communication compared with 36.0% reporting a positive effect. Lifestyle patterns also showed considerable change. Many respondents reported changes in daily routines and food habits, and mobile phones and social media were the most common leisure-time choices. While 64.0% reported some improvement in daily lifestyle, 26.0% said apartment living had made life more difficult. Family relationships similarly showed both positive and negative outcomes.

These findings suggest that the quality of apartment living depends not only on physical facilities but also on how families manage daily routines and how residential communities support safety, interaction and inclusion. The counts and percentages in this version have been proportionally normalised from the supplied summary because raw respondent-level data were not available; they should be checked against the original response sheet before formal submission.

VI. SUGGESTIONS

- Encourage regular family time through shared meals, screen-free periods and planned activities.
- Promote positive neighbour relationships through inclusive resident events while respecting privacy.
- Maintain safe shared spaces, with particular attention to children and older residents.
- Support meaningful community participation through cultural programmes, reading groups, exercise sessions and family events.
- Balance digital leisure with reading, outdoor recreation and face-to-face interaction.
- Encourage healthy food routines and accessible recreational facilities.
- Address communication challenges through open discussion, shared responsibilities and agreed routines.
- Conduct periodic resident feedback surveys to identify areas for improvement.

VII. CONCLUSION

The study examined apartment living culture and changing lifestyle patterns among urban middle-class families using the supplied questionnaire summary, presented consistently for 50 respondents. Modern facilities were the leading reported reason for choosing apartment living, and 68.0% of respondents expressed a positive view of apartment safety for children and elderly family members. Community participation was relatively common, with 70.0% participating often or always. At the same time, respondents reported mixed experiences of family time, neighbour interaction and family communication, with 40.0% reporting a negative effect on family communication compared with 36.0% reporting a positive effect.

Lifestyle patterns also showed considerable change. Many respondents reported changes in daily routines and food habits, and mobile phones and social media were the most common leisure-time choices. While 64.0% reported some improvement in daily lifestyle, 26.0% said apartment living had made life more

 ©IJSRED: All Rights are Reserved

difficult. Family relationships similarly showed both positive and negative outcomes. These findings suggest that the quality of apartment living depends not only on physical facilities but also on how families manage daily routines and how residential communities support safety, interaction and inclusion. The counts and percentages in this version have been proportionally normalised from the supplied summary because raw respondent-level data were not available; they should be checked against the original response sheet before formal submission.

REFERENCES

Altman, I. (1975). The Environment and Social Behavior: Privacy, Personal Space, Territory, and Crowding.

Brooks/Cole. Gifford, R. (2007). The consequences of living in high-rise buildings. Architectural Science Review, 50(1), 2–17.

Newman, O. (1972). Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design. Macmillan.

Questionnaire data supplied by the researcher. (n.d.). Apartment Living Culture and Changing Lifestyle Patterns Among

Urban Middle-Class Families: Analysis and Interpretation [Unpublished data].

 ©IJSRED: All Rights are Reserved