SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS INFLUENCING THE GATED COMMUNITY APARTMENTS IN COIMBATORE DISTRICT, TAMIL NADU-AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Dr. S. Velanganni
Assistant Professor, PG and Research Department of Cooperation, SRMV College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore.

Abstract
Gated Community (GC) is being accepted worldwide. In India, the cosmopolitan cities of New Delhi, Mumbai, Ahmadabad, Bangalore and Chennai –district headquarters are also getting the entry of Gated Communities. In Tamil Nadu, Coimbatore is one among the corporations, identified by Union Government for developing as Smart City, where such Gated Communities are mushrooming. Research is being carried out by the author, exploring the various demographic and socio-economic variables influencing the customer, to select a Gated Community house and also their experiences there in. Review of Literature confirms that the Gated Community is not just a pool of Apartments and Villas, but it is a Life Style. Data collection was made from 525 GC respondents and the details of demographic and socio- economic variables was analysed. Appropriate tools were used for the analysis and inferences were drawn, basing on the results.

Keywords: Gated Community Socio-Economic Status, Influencing Factors And Life Style.

1.1 Introduction

Gated Community is a modern form of formal residential community or housing estate where the entrances for pedestrians, bi-cycles, automobiles, servants and servicing people are strictly controlled using closed perimeters of walls and fences. This includes small residential street and shared amenities which are enjoyed by residents. Gated community are usually guarded by private security guards and they are often home to high value properties & are set up as retirement villages. Many gated communities are secured enough to resemble forts. Out of them some are exclusively planned and designed as senior citizen paradise. Commonly, gated community includes the following amenities: Swimming pool, Tennis courts, Club houses, Play grounds/Children's park, Gymnasium and Mini Theatre. Gated Communities were existing in India in the form of Army, Navy and Air Force quarters, Teachers colony, Bank employees quarters, Police Quarters, Oil company employees houses, which were modified as full-fledged Gated Communities, with modern amenities. It was originated in U.S and spread over Latin America, Europe, East Asia and South Africa. Now Gated community has widened its wings in many developing countries. In India, the Aamby Valleyy and Lavasa City in Maharashtra where many gated communities are being developed with occupying 100 km squares of area. Now days gated communities are being built at Chennai, Hyderabad, Bangalore by a lot of real estate developers.

1.2 Review of Literature

The phenomenon of fencing the urban space has to be considered as a' global phenomenon (Gasior-Niemice et al 2007). The complex process are explained by global and local factors. These factors are closely connected with political, economical, and cultural transformations, which take place at different pace on both local and global scale. Real estate business survives on the dreams of its customers. Customers have fate expectations about their future homes on its designs, comforts, features, safety measures, privacy, in order to fill-up their specific Life style Karvinska (2008) explains that the feelings of safety (like order, self confidence and satisfaction).However, there is no connection between an objective level of safety and its subjective perception which has been corroborated by research conducted both in Poland and in USA (Gadecki 2009) .

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Coimbatore is a district head quarter, which has a historical back ground and uniqueness in culture, Industry, mix of the people, etc, unlike metropolitan cities like New Delhi, Mumbai, Bangalore, Calcutta and Chennai. Over two decades, there was a mixed trend in the growth of the various industries, including Housing Industry. Traditionally, people prefer to buy or take a lease/rental in individual houses. But for the last few years, the City is visibly crowded with Apartments and of-late Gated Communities and its advertisements are widely seen in Newspapers, Televisions, and also in various websites. On studying the various dimensions of Gated Communities, the researcher had series of questions to be explored to know the development of Gated Communities in Coimbatore in near future. These questions are listed and they are projected towards a question whether there is a significant association between demographic factors such as age, gender, educational status , and marital status , Family Size, Type of family, Community, Religion, Occupation and income and Gated community living

1.4 Objective of the Study

* To analyse the demographic and socio-economic variables of respondents and their influence on Gated Communities in Coimbatore.

- To analyse the social involvement of Gated Community residents in various social Organizations.
- To analyse the possession of house hold appliances, by the GC residents and their relation with the life style.

1.5 Hypothesis
Hypothesis 1: There was no significant difference between demographic factors such as age, gender, educational status, and marital status, Family Size, Type of family, Community, Religion, Occupation and income, with Gated community living.
Hypothesis 2: H0: There was no significant difference between Gated community and house hold appliance of the respondents.
Hypothesis 3: There was no significant difference between Gated community and Tenure of membership of the respondents in Social Organizations.

1.6 Methodology
A close watch over the developments in housing and real estate Industry at macro level and efforts taken by the Union and State governments, to address the needs of people. ' Gated Community ' was identified as the area of study, which is analytical and empirical. Secondary details were collected from various newspapers, journals, libraries, Internet websites, leaflets collected from 'Housing Exhibitions'. For the purpose of Pilot study, 35 questionnaires were got filled from Coimbatore Gated Communities at Vadavalli and Saravanampatti with 525 feed backs were collected from the respondents from all the above areas, by using of Convenient Sampling method. On studying the geography of Coimbatore, clusters of Gated Communities are up-coming in North, North –West, North-East, South-East and South-West, of the City. The townships covered under these areas include, R. S Puram, Thudiyalur, Saravanampatti, Vadavalli, Thondamuthur, Ramanathapuram, and KovaiPudur. The respondents from the Gated Communities from these areas will represent the entire city of Coimbatore. Hence this Purposive Sampling procedure, was adopted.

1.7 Data Analysis
There are ten variables identified , which are associated with the Life style of Gated Community. The variables are Age, Gender, Educational status, Marital status, Family Size, Type of family, Community, Religion, Occupation and income. It was analysed whether these variables have any significant association with the type of house they have acquired , namely 1 Bed room-Hall-Kitchen (1BHK), 2 Bed room-Hall-Kitchen (2BHK), 3 Bed room-Hall-Kitchen (3BHK), and an Independent House in a Gated Community. Details of the analysis, Inferences and the summary of the tables are , given below:

1.8 To analysis the gender of the respondents has any influence on the type of houses chosen in Gated community.

Table 1: Gender of the Respondents

GC Gender	No. of. Respondents				Total
	1BHK	**2BHK**	**3BHK**	**Villa**	
Male	13(3.9)	146(43.5)	85(25.3)	92(27.3)	336(64.0)
Female	4(2.1)	75(39.7)	49(25.9)	61(32.3)	189(36.0)
Total	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.6)	153(29.1)	525(100)
Mean	1.2353	1.3394	1.3657	1.3987	1.3600
Std. Deviation	0.43724	0.4745	0.4834	0.4912	0.4804

Figures in brackets are percentage to column total
**Chi-square value between Gender and Gated Community of the respondents is 2.569 which is not significant at 0.001level*

The above table reveals that 'gender' and Gated Community 'house type' are analyzed. Out of 525 respondents, majority of them are men 336 (64%) and rest of women189 (36%) of which 221 respondents (42.1%) are occupied under 2BHK category houses, followed by 134 (25.6%) in 3BHK, 153 (29.1%)in Villa and only 17 (3.2%) are in 1BHK community of the respondents.. The chi-square value analysis indicated that there is no significant association between type of house and Gender level of the respondents since the calculated value 2.569 is not significant at 0.001 levels. So, it is inferred that the gender of the respondents does not influence the type of house in a GC.

1.9 To analysis the age of the respondents has any influence on the type of house in Gated Community

Research Paper
Impact Factor: 4. 695
Peer Reviewed & Indexed Journal

IJMSRR
E- ISSN - 2349-6746
ISSN -2349-6738

Table 2: Age of the Respondents

GC Age	No. of. Respondents				Total
	1BHK	2BHK	3BHK	Villa	
up to 30 years	1(2)	22(43)	12(24)	16(31)	51(9.7)
31-55years	9(4)	111(45)	60(24)	67(27)	247(47.0)
56 - 70 years	5(3)	66(40)	42(26)	51(31)	164(31.2)
above 71 years	2(3)	22(35)	20(32)	19(30)	63(12.0)
Total	17(3)	221(42)	134(26)	153(29)	525(100)
Mean	2.4706	2./3982	2.5224	2.477	2.4532
Std. Deviation	0.7998	0.8004	0.8569	0.8435	0.82679

*Figures in brackets are percentage to column total

*Chi-square value between Age and Gated Community of the respondents is 3.564 which is not significant at 0.001level

With regard to age category of the respondents, out of 525 respondents, 51 are below 30years age group (9.7%), 247 are under31-55 years age group (47%), 164 are under 56-70age group (31.2 %), and 63 are above 71years age group (12%). The chi-square value analysis indicated that there is no significant association between type of house and age level of the respondents since the calculated value 3.564 is not significant at 0.001 levels. So, it is inferred that the age of the respondents does not influence the type of house in a GC.

1.10 To analyse the educational qualification of the respondents has any influence on the type of house in Gated Community.

Table 3: Educational qualification of the Respondents

GC Edu. Qualification	No. of. Respondents				Total
	1BHK	2BHK	3BHK	Villa	
Primary level	0	13(38.2)	12(35.3)	9(26.5)	34(6.5)
Secondary level	0	7(36.8)	8(42.1)	4(21.1)	19(3.6)
Higher secondary level	4(3.4)	49(40.8)	31(25.8)	36(30.0)	120(22.9)
Graduate	5(2.9)	78(46.2)	42(24.9)	44(26.0)	169(32.2)
Post graduate	4(3.6)	47(42.7)	23(20.9)	36(32.7)	110(20.9)
Ph.D	0(0.0)	7(58.3)	3(25.0)	2(16.7)	12(2.3)
Professional	4(43.6)	20(19.8)	15(14.9)	22(21.8)	61(11.6)
Total	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)
Mean	4.7059	4.0860	3.9328	4.2288	4.1086
St. Deviation	1.4901	1.4260	1.5978	1.5538	1.51507

*Figures in brackets are percentage to column total

*Chi-square value between level of education and Gated Community of the respondents is 14.769 which is not significant at 0.001level

The above table shows that majority of the respondents 169 are Graduates (32.2%) 34 are with Primary level of education (6.5%), 19 are with Secondary level (3.6 %), 120 are Higher Secondary level (22.9%), 110 are with Postgraduates (21 %), 12 are Doctorates (2.3%) and 61 are with Professional qualifications**.** The chi-square value analysis indicated that there is no significant association between type of house and educational qualification of the respondents since the calculated value 14.769 is not significant at 0.001 levels. So, it is inferred that the education level of the respondents does not influence the type of house in a GC.

1.11 To analyse the social community of the respondents has any influence the type of house in Gated Community

Table 7: Community of the Respondents

GC Community	No. of. Respondents				Total
	1BHK	2BHK	3BHK	Villa	
OC	4(3.4)	50(42.4)	29(24.6)	35(29.7)	118(22.5)
BC	12(3.8)	131(40.9)	83(25.9)	94(29.4)	320(60.9)
MBC	0(0.0)	20(37)	16(29.6)	18(33.3)	54(10.3)

Research Paper
Impact Factor: 4. 695
Peer Reviewed & Indexed Journal

IJMSRR
E- ISSN - 2349-6746
ISSN -2349-6738

SC/ ST	1(3.0)	20(60.6)	6(18.2)	6(18.2)	33(6.3)
Total	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)
Mean	1.8824	2.0452	1/9925	1.9673	2.0038
Std. Deviation	0.69663	0.8244	0.72024	0.7109	0.76167

Figures in brackets are percentage to column total

**Chi-square value between level of Community and Gated Community of the respondents is 7.958 which is*
not significant at 0.001level

Out of 525 respondents, there are 118 respondents belong to OC communities (22.5%) 320 belong to BC (60.9%), 54 belong to MBC (10.3%), and 33 belong to SC/SC (6.3%). The chi-square value analysis indicated that there is no significant association between type of house and Community of the Respondents, since the calculated value7.958 is not significant at 0.001 levels. So, it is inferred that the Community of the Respondents does not influence the type of house in a GC

1.12 To analyse the Religion of the respondents has influence the type of house in Gated Community.

Table 8: Religions of the Respondents

GC Religions	No. of. Respondents				Total
	1BHK	**2BHK**	**3BHK**	**Villa**	
Hindu	16(3.4)	203(42.6)	112(23.5)	145(30.5)	476(90.7)
Islam	1(2.6)	16(42.1))	13(34.2)	8(21.1)	38(7.2)
Christian	0(0.0)	2(18.2)	9(81.8)	0(0.0)	11(2.1)
Total	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)
Mean	1.0588	1.0905	1.2313	1.0523	1.1143
Std.Deviation	0.24254	0.31759	0.56080	0.22334	0.37869

Figures in brackets are percentage to column total

**Chi-square value between level of Religions and Gated Community of the respondents is 21.817which is*
not significant at 0.001level

Out of 525 respondents, 476 are Hindus (90.7%),38 are Islamizes (7.2%), 11 are Christians (2.1%) .The chi-square value analysis indicated that there is no significant association between type of house and religion of the respondents since the calculated value21.817 is not significant at 0.001 levels. So, it is inferred that the Community of the Respondents does not influence the type of house in a GC

1.13 To analyse the occupation of the respondents has influence the type of house in Gated Community

Table 10: Occupation of the Respondents

GC Occupation	No. of. Respondents				Total
	1BHK	**2BHK**	**3BHK**	**Villa**	
Advocate	2(4.3)	20(43.5)	11(23.9)	13(28.3)	46(8.8)
Consultant	1(5.6)	11(61.1)	1(5.6)	5(27.8)	18(3.4)
doctor	1(2.9)	16(47.1)	4(11.8)	13(38.2)	34(6.5)
Engineers	3(2.9)	48(46.6)	26(25.2)	26(25.5)	103(19.6)
Farmers	0(0.0)	1(11.1)	6(66.47)	2(22.2)	9(1.7)
Industrialist	1(2.6)	17(43.6)	9(23.1)	12(30.8)	39(7.4)
manager	0(0.0)	16(39.0)	10(24.4)	15(36.6)	41(7.8)
teacher	3(3.3)	41(45.1)	20(22.0)	27(29.7)	91(17.3)
Business and others	3(6.4)	16(34.0)	16(34.0)	12(25.5)	47(8.9)
house wife	1(3.8)	8(30.8)	12(46.2)	5(19.2)	26(4.9)
Retired and relaxing	2(2.8)	27(38.0)	19(26.8)	23(32.4)	71(13.5)
Total	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)
Mean	6.3529	6.1086	6.8358	6.4052	6.3886
Std.Deviation	3.4449	3.1169	3.0588	3.1297	3.1211

Figures in brackets are percentage to column total

**Chi-square value between level of occupation and Gated Community of the respondents is 31.577 which*
is not significant at 0.001level

Research Paper
Impact Factor: 4. 695
Peer Reviewed & Indexed Journal

IJMSRR
E- ISSN - 2349-6746
ISSN -2349-6738

The table No.10.Out of 525 respondents, 46are advocates (8.8%), 18 are Consultants (3.4%), 34 are doctors (6.5%), 103 are Engineers(19.6%), 9 are farmers (1.7%), 39 are Industrialists (7.4%), 41 are Managers(7.8%), 91 are Teachers(17.3%),47 are Business and other Services(8.9%), 26 are House wives (4.9%), 71 are Retired and relaxing respondents(13.5%). The chi-square value analysis indicated that there is no significant association between type of house and Occupation   of the respondents since the calculated value31.577 is not significant at 0.001 levels. So, it is inferred that the occupation of the Respondents does not influence the type of house in a GC.

1.14 To analyse the income level of respondents has any influence on the type of house in a Gated Community
Ho: There was no significant difference between Gated community and income level of the respondents.
H1: There was a significant difference between Gated community and income   level of the respondents.

Table 12: Income of the respondents

GC Income level	No. of. Respondents				Total
	1BHK	**2BHK**	**3BHK**	**Villa**	
Rs.10,000 - 20,000	3(3.6)	45(54.2)	17(20.5)	18(21.7)	83(15.8)
Rs.20,001 - 35,000	4(2.1)	85(44.0)	44(22.8)	60(31.1)	193(36.8)
Rs.35,001 -50,000	5(5.3)	41(43.6)	27(28.7)	21(22.3)	94(17.9)
Rs.50,001 -1,00,000	4(3.8)	35(33.0)	28(26.4)	39(36.8)	106(20.2)
Rs.1,00,001 above	1(2.0)	15(30.6)	18(36.7)	15(30.6)	49(9.3)
Total	17(3.2)	221 42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)
Mean	3.2358	3.3529	3.5746	3.5946	3.4305
Std. Deviation	0.90342	0.94501	0.91254	1.0054	0.95581

*Figures in brackets are percentage to column total
*Chi-square value between income and Gated Community of the respondents is 18.848 which is not
significant at 0.001level

ANOVA					
Income					
	Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Between Groups	4.769	3	1.590	1.748	.056
Within Groups	473.943	521	.910		
Total	478.712	524			

The above table shows the significant difference between Gated Community respondents and Income level. The one way ANOVA indicated positive significant difference between GC and income of the respondent ie., the significant value is 0.056 at 0.005 level.

1.15 To analyse the ownership of appliance of respondents has any influence on the type of house in Gated community
Ho: There was no significant difference between Gated community and house hold appliance of the respondents.
H1: There was a significant difference between Gated community and house hold appliance of the respondents.

Table 13: House Hold appliance of the respondents (Multiple response)

GC Sources of Income	No. of. Respondents				Total (No=525)	Mean	Rank
	1BHK	**2BHK**	**3BHK**	**Villa**			
Sewing machine	1(2.1)	27(56.3)	7(14.6)	13(27.1)	48(100)	2.6667	3.56
CD player	8(3.8)	90(42.7)	52(24.6)	61(28.9)	211(100)	2.7867	4.76
LED Television	12(3.8)	124(38.8)	81(25.3)	103(32.2)	320(100)	2.8594	6.06
Refrigerator	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)	2.8057	8.35
Washing machine	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)	2.8057	9.35
Home theater	14(3.4)	181(43.4)	106(25.4)	116(27.8)	417(100)	2.7770	8.83
Micro oven	10(2.5)	175(44.5)	95(24.2)	113(28.8)	393(100)	2..7913	9.12
Cooking range	13(2.7)	213(44.7)	115(24.1)	136(28.5)	477(100)	2.7841	11.03
Cooking gas	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)	2.8057	12.80
Wet Grinder/ mixes	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)	2.8057	13.80

Research Paper
Impact Factor: 4. 695
Peer Reviewed & Indexed Journal

IJMSRR
E- ISSN - 2349-6746
ISSN -2349-6738

Dish washer	11(2.4)	192(42.4)	113(24.9)	137(30.2)	453(100)	2.8300	13.16
Gazers	6(5.7)	41(38.7)	32(30.2)	27(25.5)	106(100)	2.8260	3.93
Iron box	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)	2.8057	3.86
Computer desk model	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)	2.6625	4.01
Mobile phone	17(3.2)	221(42.1)	134(25.5)	153(29.1)	525(100)	2.8057	15.66
Laptops	8(4.5)	69 (38.8)	46(25.8)	55(30.9)	178(100)	2.8315	7.73`

Figures in brackets are percentage to column total

From the table-13, it is observed that the appliances are possessed and used in the Rank order – 10 and above. Mobile Phones (15.66), Dish Washer (13.8), Wet Grinder/ mixes(13.8) Dish washer(13.16), Cooking Gas (12.8),   Cooking Range (11.03), Remaining Appliances are ranked below 10, such as, Washing machine(9.35), Micro Oven (9.12) . CD player Home theater (8.83), Refrigerator(8.35), Lap Top (7.73), LED Television (6.06), CD Player (4.76 Computer desk model (4.01),),and Iron Box (3.56)

1.16 To Analyse the tenure of membership of respondents in Social Organizations   has any influence on the type of house in a Gated Community

Ho: There was no significant difference between Gated community and   Tenure of membership of the respondents in Social Organizations.

H1: There was a significant difference between Gated community and the tenure of membership of the respondents in Social Organizations.

Table 15: Tenure of Membership with Social Organization of the respondents(Multiple response)

GC Sources of Income	No. of. Respondents				Total (No=525)
	between 3 to 6 years	between 6 to 9 years	between 9 to 12 years	12 years and above	
Lions club	68(44.2)	24(15.6)	12(7.8)	50(32.5)	154(100)
Rotary club	185(45.8)	94(23.3)	22(5.4)	103(25.5)	404(100)
Professional Organization	107(41.5)	64(24.8)	14(5.4)	73(28.3)	258(100)
Community Organization	228(62.3)	106(29.0)	10(2.7)	22(6.0)	366(100)
Spiritual Organization	74(39.8)	26(14)	8(4.3)	78(41.9)	186(100)
Farmers Organization	79(48.5)	37(22.7)	8(4.9)	39(23.9)	163(100)
Political party	135(42.9)	81(25.7)	14(4.4)	85(27.0)	315(100)
Women forum	43(37.1)	24(20.7)	9(7.8)	40(34.5)	116(100)
Sports club	76(41.5)	36(19.7)	9(4.9)	62(33.9)	183 (100)
Music/ dance club	120(44.4)	55(20.4)	15(5.6)	80(29.6)	270(100)

Figures in brackets are percentage to column total

Table 16: Tenure of membership with Social Organization

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Lions club	Between Groups	1.552	3	.517	2.512	.058
	Within Groups	107.275	521	.206		
	Total	108.827	524			
Rotary club	Between Groups	5.186	3	1.729	2.452	.063
	Within Groups	367.264	521	.705		
	Total	372.450	524			
Professional organization	Between Groups	8.808	3	2.936	1.305	.072
	Within Groups	1172.095	521	2.250		
	Total	1180.903	524			
Community organization	Between Groups	1142.276	3	380.759	314.255	.000
	Within Groups	631.256	521	1.212		

Research Paper
Impact Factor: 4. 695
Peer Reviewed & Indexed Journal

IJMSRR
E- ISSN - 2349-6746
ISSN -2349-6738

	Total	1773.531	524			
Spiritual organization	Between Groups	167.059	3	55.686	10.232	.000
	Within Groups	2835.512	521	5.442		
	Total	3002.571	524			
Farmers organization	Between Groups	18.543	3	6.181	.800	.494
	Within Groups	4027.583	521	7.730		
	Total	4046.126	524			
Political party	Between Groups	89.779	3	29.926	2.638	.049
	Within Groups	5909.460	521	11.343		
	Total	5999.238	524			
Women's forum	Between Groups	64.338	3	21.446	1.954	.020
	Within Groups	5719.311	521	10.978		
	Total	5783.650	524			
Sports club	Between Groups	82.690	3	27.563	1.500	.214
	Within Groups	9573.436	521	18.375		
	Total	9656.126	524			
Music / dance club	Between Groups	20.868	3	6.956	.277	.042
	Within Groups	13093.418	521	25.131		
	Total	13114.286	524			

From the above table, it is inferred that in One way ANOVA, the total variable is classified into two components 'between groups', representing variation of the other group means around the overall mean and 'within the group' representing variation of the each individual scores, around their respective group means significant indicators the significant level of the 'F Test. Small significant value (0.05) indicate group difference from the above, it is inferred that significant level is observed to be less than 0.005 percent level. Hence the Null Hypothesis is rejected in the case of Lion's club, Rotary Club, Professional, Community forum, Women's forum, Spiritual, Music and dance club and political Organization and Alternate Hypothesis is accepted. In the case of Farmers Organization, and sports club, the difference is more. Therefore this study concluded that there is a significant difference observed between Social participation with Tenure.

1.17 Participation in Social Organisation
Table 17: Frequency of active participation of the respondents, in Social Organizations(Multiple response)

GC Sources of Income	No. of. Respondents				Total (No=525)
	Very often	Often	Rarely	Never	
lions club	46(29.9)	75(48.7)	25(16.2)	8(5.2)	154(100)
Rotary club	115(28.5)	(48.0)	74(18.3)	21(5.2)	404(100)
Professional organisation	74(28.7)	117(45.3)	48(18.6)	19(7.4)	258(100)
Community organisation	93(25.4)	183(50.0)	71(19.4)	19(5.2)	366(100)
Spiritual organisation	67(36.0)	77(41.4)	29(15.6)	13(7.0)	186(100)
Farmers organisation	50(30.5)	75(45.7)	26 (15.9)	12(7.4)	163(100)
Political party	92(29.2)	147(46.7)	63(20.0)	13(4.1)	315(100)
women forum	28(24.1)	54(46.6)	25(21.6)	9(7.8)	116(100)
sports club	54(29.5)	83(45.4)	33(18.0)	13(7.1)	183(100)
music/ dance club	83(30.7)	123(45.6)	50(18.5)	14(5.2)	270(100)

*Figures in brackets are percentage to column total

Frequency of participation in the social organization
H0: There is no significant difference between the active participation of the respondent in the social Organization and their Gated Community living.
H1: There is significant difference between the active participation of the respondent in the social Organization and their Gated Community living.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
		ANOVA Table - 18				
Lions club	Between Groups	.090	3	.030	.143	.934
	Within Groups	108.737	521	.209		
	Total	108.827	524			
Rotary club	Between Groups	3.215	3	1.072	1.512	.210
	Within Groups	369.234	521	.709		
	Total	372.450	524			
professional organisation	Between Groups	6.381	3	2.127	.944	.019
	Within Groups	1174.522	521	2.254		
	Total	1180.903	524			
community organisation	Between Groups	43.506	3	14.502	4.367	.005
	Within Groups	1730.025	521	3.321		
	Total	1773.531	524			
spiritual organisation	Between Groups	44.873	3	14.958	2.635	.049
	Within Groups	2957.698	521	5.677		
	Total	3002.571	524			
farmers organisation	Between Groups	8.572	3	2.857	.369	.776
	Within Groups	4037.554	521	7.750		
	Total	4046.126	524			
political party	Between Groups	121.151	3	40.384	3.579	.014
	Within Groups	5878.087	521	11.282		
	Total	5999.238	524			
women's forum	Between Groups	42.557	3	14.186	1.287	.078
	Within Groups	5741.092	521	11.019		
	Total	5783.650	524			
sports club	Between Groups	18.927	3	6.309	.341	.796
	Within Groups	9637.198	521	18.498		
	Total	9656.126	524			
music / dance club	Between Groups	65.879	3	21.960	.877	.053
	Within Groups	13048.407	521	25.045		
	Total	13114.286	524			

From the above table, it is inferred that in One way ANOVA, the total variable is classified into two components 'between groups', representing variation of the other group means around the overall mean and 'within the group' representing variation of the each individual scores, small significant values closure to 0.05. It is inferred that Null Hypothesis is rejected in the case of Professional Organizations (0.019), Community Organizations(0.005), Spiritual Organizations (0.049), Political involvement(0.14), and women's forum (0.078), and alternate Hypothesis is accepted, ie, there is a significant difference between the participation in these Organizations and their living in Gated Community. There is no significant difference between the active participation of the respondent in the social Organization and their Gated Community living in the case of Lion's club(0.934), Rotary Club (0.210), Farmers' Organization(0.776) and sports club.

1.18 Summary of Findings
- **Gender: and Gated Community:** Out of 525 respondents, majority of them are men 336 (64%) and rest are women189 (36%) of which 221 respondents (42.1%)are occupied under 2BHK category houses. So, it is inferred that the gender of the respondents does not influence the type of house in a GC.

- **Age and Gated Community:** Most of respondents comes under 31-55 years age group (47%). So, it is inferred that the age of the respondents does not influence the type of house in a GC.
- **Education Qualification and Gated Community:** Majority of them are qualified Graduates (32.2
- **Religions and Gated Community of respondents:** Out of 525 respondents, 476 are Hindus (90.7%),38 are Islamizes (7.2%), 11 are Christians (2.1%)
- **Occupation and Gated Community of the Respondents**: out of 525 respondents, 286 are from Cosmopolitan Cities (54.5%) such as Chennai, Bangalore Mumbai, Calcutta and New Delhi, 148 are from Urban (28.2%) .   91 are from Rural (17.3%),
- **Income and Gated Community:** The table shows the significant difference between Gated Community respondents and Income level. The one way ANOVA indicated positive significant difference between GC and income of the respondent i.e., the significant value is 0.056 at 0.005 level Regarding the compositions of the social classes,
- **Community and Gated Respondents:** Out of 525 respondents, there are 118 respondents belong to OC communities (22.5%), 320 belong to BC (60.9%), 54 belong to MBC(10.3%), and 33 belong to SC/SC (6.3%).The chi-square value analysis indicated that there is no significant association between type of house and Community of the Respondents, since the calculated value 7.958 is not significant at 0.001 levels. So, it is inferred that the Community of the Respondents does not influence the type of house in a GC
- **Anova – Demographic and Socio – Economic Variable:** It is observed that there is significant association among Religion ((0.000),, Occupation (0.009), Education(0.041), and   Income level (0.056),   with respect to Gated Community living. Whereas there is no significant association among Gender(0.065), age(0.063), Marital status(0.089), Family size(0.076), Family Type(0.092), Social Community.0691),& domicile (0.959)with respect to type of Gated Community living.
- **Social Participation** like Lion's club, Rotary Club, Professional, Community forum, Women's forum, Spiritual, Music and dance club and political Organization and Alternate Hypothesis is accepted. In the case of Farmers Organization, and sports club. Therefore this study concluded that there is a significant difference observed between Social participation with Tenure. From the above table-18, it is inferred that in One way ANOVA, the total variable is classified into two components 'between groups', representing variation of the other group means around the overall mean and 'within the group' representing variation of the each individual scores, small significant values closure to 0.05. Small significant value (0.05) indicate group difference from the above, it is inferred that significant level is observed to be less than 0.005 percent level.It is inferred that Null Hypothesis is rejected in the case of Professional Organizations (0.019), Community Organizations(0.005), Spiritual Organizations (0.049), Political involvement(0.14), and women's forum (0.078), and alternate Hypothesis is accepted, ie, there is a significant difference between the participation in these Organizations and their living in Gated Community.

1.19 Conclusion
The study reveals the fact that there is no significant association between gender, education, marital status , family size, type of the family , domicile of the respondents, income level of spouse, house hold appliances, etc, with GC life style living. But there is a close significant association between 'the Income   level and Socialization with various forums', with Gated Community living. It can be understood that Gated Community will fit in to all categories of people with above demographic factors of any gender, any education qualification, family size, any domicile of the respondents, any income level of spouse, possessing any type of house hold appliances, etc, but they should have steady stream of income and willingness to mingle with people/society. This blend of residents will makes a successful Gated Community living. Efforts can be made by the resident members for improving these two factors namely, low Income level and low degree of Socialization, so that they can be strongly bonded with the synergy of 'Happy Gated Community'.

References
1. Type of Gated Community- Jill Grant and Lindsey Mittelsteadt (2000)2004).
2. Gated Communities – Physical Construction Or Social destruction tool? Abdel Hamid Hatem Touman (2002).
3. Sustainability of Gated Communities in developing countries – Yasser Mahgoub FatimaKhalfani (2012).
4. Income and Expenditure pattern of the Samichettipalayam Milk producers Cooperative society in Coimbatore District.: A Survey – Dr. S Velankanni (2013).