

A SURVEY OF SATISFACTIONS OF SELECTED
CONDOMINIUM OWNERS IN OKLAHOMA

By

EDRE JANE GORIUS

Bachelor of Science

State University of New York

Plattsburgh, New York

1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July 31, 1970

Thesis
1970
G6690
cop. 2

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
NOV 4 1970

A SURVEY OF SATISFACTIONS OF SELECTED
CONDOMINIUM OWNERS IN OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

Christine J. Salmon

Thesis Adviser

Louisa Pepin

Florence McKinney

D. Dunham

Dean of the Graduate College

764105

PREFACE

With new demands being placed upon housing, the familiar detached single dwelling unit no longer meets the needs of people. Multi-unit structures, such as condominiums, are presently dominating the housing market. By providing people with home ownership in a location close to their source of employment, condominiums are meeting the housing demands and preferences of home owners.

It is apparent that design features and operating policies which satisfy occupants must be determined so that these may be incorporated into plans for future condominiums. This research project is concerned precisely with determining those satisfactions that are derived from condominium living.

This research project would not have been possible without the cooperation of condominium unit owners in the Nichols Hill Condominium in Oklahoma City, the Plaza Hills Condominium in Tulsa, and the Brentwood Estates Condominium in Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Christine F. Salmon for her guidance, encouragement and supervision during the project and to Leevera Pepin and Dr. Florence McKinney. Their suggestions and help in reading the thesis were greatly appreciated.

In conclusion, credit is cited to Mr. Murriel Gilliam, for his help in analysis of the data, and to Mrs. G. Rhyne for her typing excellence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION. | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | 2 |
| Purpose of the Study | 3 |
| Limitations of the Study | 3 |
| Definition of Terms. | 3 |
| Procedures | 4 |
| Organization of the Report of the Study. | 5 |
| II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. | 6 |
| Definition of Condominium | 6 |
| Historical Orientation to Condominiums | 10 |
| Condominium Living in the United States. | 11 |
| Condominiums and Other Forms of Housing. | 12 |
| Motivational Features of Condominiums. | 13 |
| Age Groups Suited to Condominiums. | 15 |
| Summary of Reviewed Aspects on Condominiums. | 16 |
| III. PROCEDURES | 17 |
| Development of Instrument. | 17 |
| Gathering Data in the Study. | 19 |
| IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA | 21 |
| Characteristics of the Population. | 21 |
| Satisfaction with Condominium Living | 22 |
| Satisfaction with Condominium Operational Policies | 23 |
| Satisfaction with Condominium Design Features. | 29 |
| Summary of Data. | 33 |
| V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 36 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 39 |
| APPENDIX A - LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO OKLAHOMA CITY CONDOMINIUM OWNERS. | 41 |

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX B - LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO TULSA AND STILLWATER CONDOMINIUM OWNERS. | 43 |
| APPENDIX C - QUESTIONNAIRE | 45 |
| APPENDIX D - ITEM RESPONSE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE. | 49 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Satisfaction with Condominium Living. | 23 |
| II. Satisfaction with Operational Policies. | 24 |
| III. Satisfaction with Operational Policies of Ownership and the Common Grounds. | 27 |
| IV. Satisfaction with Operational Policies of Landscaping and Interior and Exterior Decorating. | 30 |
| V. Satisfaction with Operational Policies of Recreational Facilities. | 31 |
| VI. Satisfaction with Condominium Design Features | 32 |
| VII. Satisfaction with Specific Condominium Design Features. . . | 34 |
| VIII. Item Responses to Part I of Questionnaire Concerning Operational Policies | 50 |
| IX. Item Responses to Part II of Questionnaire Concerning Design Features. | 52 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Winston Churchill once said that "men build houses but houses shape men (1)." With increased technology and with the complexities and the pressures of crowded living, man's only escape is his home. The concern for influencing man's habitat as well as his well-being has become increasingly significant. With the present population explosion and the obsolescence of the single dwelling unit, the problem of providing another means of adequate housing is of growing concern. Adequate housing has been designated as housing that "provides for man's individual physical health and comfort as well as for his mental and emotional satisfaction (2)." The familiar detached single dwelling unit no longer meets these requirements as has been indicated by the drop in sales of these units as compared with multi-family units (3).

Demands placed on housing have taken a definite change. The appeal of the traditional detached house is dwindling more rapidly than realized. Furthermore, "people are moving back to the central city or into close-lying peripheral areas in order to avoid commuting distances and to reduce the cost of dwelling units (3)." Today's way of life, family organization and size, choices of ways to spend money, leisure time and other activities are all different from those of similar families just a generation ago (4)." In fact, stability and immobility, the very characteristics which endeared home ownership to

earlier generations, are its greatest drawbacks today (5). With the obsolescence of the single dwelling unit, builders must provide other types of housing which are more satisfactory than the single dwelling unit.

Even though designers have been concerned with providing better housing, it is believed they have failed to recognize what basically makes good housing. According to Beyer (2):

Good housing can only be provided if there is understanding of the people who are going to live in it. The complexity of our society and the tremendous advances in science, require man's shelter to satisfy his economic, social, and psychological needs.

People of the late 20th century are of a leisurely oriented society and demand corresponding changes in the type of housing preferred. The appeal of recreation, evident in the recreational facilities which have become part of the housing package is a growing factor in decisions concerning housing. Furthermore, "the appeal of common maintenance is a lot stronger to the young renter or buyer than it was to his grass-cutting, snow-shoveling, house-painting parents a generation ago (6)." People are demanding housing that requires the least possible amount of maintenance while providing the most psychological and social satisfaction. For man's well-being, it is essential housing provide a setting in which he can enjoy the most healthy and stimulating life possible in today's fast moving, rapidly changing society.

Statement of the Problem

It is believed that condominiums have a potential of meeting housing demands of present and future families. If condominiums, as indicated by the present housing market, are to be built to house more

families and more adequately meet their various needs and housing requirements, the operating policies and design features that provide satisfactions for the occupants must be determined and incorporated as requisites for condominiums. Determination of such features insures the best psychological, social and economic type of housing possible for the future. This study specifically seeks to determine those design features and operating policies of condominiums which satisfy unit owners.

Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of this study is to ascertain the operational policies and design features of condominiums which bring satisfactions to condominium occupants. Secondly, it is the purpose of this study to draw implications from the data gathered as to standards which might be set for condominium building by builders, architects, and contractors in the future. It is hoped that the information derived from the study will be of practical use in determining housing requirements.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations imposed upon the study are as follows:

1. The study is limited to a measure of only those satisfactions indicated by the questionnaire.
2. The study is limited to condominium owners in selected condominiums in Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and Stillwater.

Definition of Terms

In the study, the following terms are important:

1. Single dwelling house refers to a detached structure occupied by a one family unit and may or may not be owner occupied.
2. Condominium refers to a multi-unit complex characterized by individual ownership of individual housing units along with ownership of the premises and facilities offered to all units (7).
3. Satisfactions refers to the situation where the elimination of need or displeasure has been achieved by meeting needs not previously met (8).

Procedures

In achieving the purpose of this study, these steps were taken:

1. A questionnaire was developed to measure satisfactions derived from condominium living.
2. The questionnaire was pretested on a selected sample.
3. The questionnaire was restructured and duplicated for distribution.
4. Sample populations were selected in Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and Stillwater.
5. A letter of introduction along with a questionnaire was sent each respondent in the sample.
6. Data were tabulated, analyzed, and conclusions were drawn.

Organization of the Report of the Study

Chapter I has presented an introduction to the problem in this study along with purposes, limitations, and procedures involved. Chapter II will continue to review relevant literature. Chapter III will discuss procedures involved in detail and Chapter IV will present

an analysis of data. The final chapter will present recommendations and conclusions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A Management Report compiled by graduate students at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration concluded that the condominium was an excellent form of apartment occupancy which combined three separate social trends in America. These three trends were (9):

1. A rapidly increasing population which puts even greater pressures on the demand for residential living space.
2. An apparent trend toward increased urbanization of the population, leading to particularly great demand for housing units within large cities.
3. The almost universal desire on the part of American families to own their own residence.

Further pointing out the advantages of condominiums, Rohan (10) states:

I believe condominiums are a means of restoring the amenities of city living, as well as the ideal format for suburban property owner association. Condominium concepts, unheard of just a few years ago, may soon be the answer to suburban sprawl and the city's effort to combat neighborhood decline, originate and maintain low and middle income housing, and meet population pressures with high-rise commercial apartment and multi-purpose design buildings.

It is apparent then that the condominium is seen as a house of the future with its many possibilities and advantages. In the following review of literature, it is the writer's concern to explore various aspects concerning condominiums.

Definition of Condominium

The term "condominium" has been defined by various authorities.

Colean (11) has defined it as:

A multi-unit complex characterized by individual ownership of individual housing units and common ownership of the premises and facilities servicing all the units.

More specifically, in the words of Ramsey (12) it means:

Ownership in common with others of a parcel of land and certain parts of a building thereon which would normally be used by all the occupants such as yards, foundations, basement floors, walls, hallways, stairways, elevators, and all related common elements together with individual ownership in fee of a particular unit of apartment in such building.

Satlow (13) believes that ownership of a condominium has all the characteristics of ownership in fee -- alienability, mortgageability, divisibility and heritability. In essence, the occupant is part owner of the condominium complex and sole owner of his own unit, as conveyed to him by deed which is taxed and mortgaged separately. This enables the owner to obtain a mortgage on his unit with the size and duration of the mortgage being negotiated with a lending institution and with closing costs such as title, search broker, lawyer and mortgage fees being paid by the owner. The title is recorded on public records with the occupants own name (14). Owners may pay as much cash as they like, negotiate their own mortgages, prepay as they choose or refinance under more liberal terms. The essential features of condominium financing are as follows (9):

1. Ability to mortgage separately.
2. Ability to prepay, or refinance under more liberal terms.
3. Availability of Federal Housing Administration mortgage guarantees for condominium mortgages.

The condominium unit owner has available to him all the financing possibilities that he would have were he to buy a single dwelling house.

Common Elements of Condominiums

The common elements consist of the land included in the description of the real property, the facilities and parts of the building used by all the occupants. Rules concerning the common elements are established by public deed while the affairs concerning the common elements are conducted solely by a governing body. The governing body is often an association or a board of directors consisting of elected members from the condominium owners. The voting power of each board member is determined by their proportional interest in the total property. Delegated to this governing body is complete authority and responsibility concerning the management and maintenance of the common property in addition to collecting payments from owners for the operation of the common property. In some states, the board of directors has the additional responsibility of obtaining adequate insurance for the commonly owned property in the condominium units (11).

Insurance for the condominium may be one or both of two types. It may either be fire and disaster or liability insurance (9). Some condominiums have cross-liability thus permitting the owner to collect if he is injured anywhere in the building or his own apartment. In addition, various state laws have provisions which govern the disposal of insurance money in the event of partial or complete destruction of the building units (9). Several authors have stated some concern over insurance matters dealing with the condominium. Rohan states (10):

There is a need for further clarification as far as insurance policies are concerned. Legislative clarification of the condominium authority to purchase a master liability policy covering every aspect of risk growing out of operation and concurrent ownership of the project. There is apparent controversy over the nature and extent of risk

assumed as co-owner of project and protection purchased on individual or community basis or both.

Condominium Building Structures

There are two basic types of condominium projects: high-rise, urban buildings; and the so-called horizontal or garden type projects which are usually located in suburban areas (9). Condominiums range from low income projects to luxury dwellings with the actual building varying in each development and in accordance with state laws. A condominium may consist of a grouping of houses in which the common property is limited to parking and recreational areas, or it may be a high-rise apartment structure with its own private gardens or it may be a resort or ski lodge. There is one stipulation, however. As stated by the Federal Housing Administration (11):

Condominiums are required to include at least five family units which may be located in one or more structures containing two or more units each. These separate units may be high-rise, semi-detached or even row-type in character.

Location of Condominiums

Condominiums are located in metropolitan areas, suburban areas, resort areas and even in rural areas; however, condominiums are mostly being built around urban areas because of the rising cost of land in suburban areas and the higher rents of apartments in cities (14). For example, in Colorado there are about seventy condominiums of the apartment variety or the studio type at seven resort areas. As far as resort building of condominiums, Roth (15) states:

The real estate in ski valleys is becoming more and more valuable and through the building of condominiums, we are trying to get more people on less land.

Condominiums are also built as a means of saving construction cost as well as allowing more people on less land.

Historical Orientation to Condominiums

Condominium living is not an entirely new concept. It is apparent, however, that there is controversy as to the origin of the condominium concept of living. Satlow (13) believes that condominiums were a by-product of the ancient Romans in 2000 B. C. with their law of condominium (*cum-dominan*) which applied to joint ownership of property. However, in contrast to Satlow, Cribbet (16) does not believe that the concept of condominium derived from Roman law. He states:

Classical Roman law followed the principal of *superficus solo credit* whereby whatever is attached to the land forms part of it. The law did not visualize separate ownership of floors in a dwelling as is indicated by current concepts.

As to the development of condominiums, he further states:

During the Middle Ages, the ownership of floors of houses, and even separate rooms appeared to have been common in various parts of Europe.

Backing up this belief, Burke (9) expounds on the influence of European housing on the development of condominiums. He states:

Condominiums had their genesis in Europe during the Middle Ages. In Germany, as far back as the 12th century, houses were divided and the different parts owned separately. Under this form of housing known as "*geschosseigentun*," there was joint ownership of the building's site and common elements.

Cribbet (16) in contrast believed that building upon the Roman law derivation of condominiums, Napoleonic Codes continued to recognize the concept of condominiums by identifying separate ownership of floors of a building in line with established customary law as a special type of co-ownership of an immovable. Thus, we find that regardless of actual

origin through the years the rights of the various floor or flat owners became defined by special agreement, and today, in most European countries there is ownership of individual flats in a building.

Condominium Living in the United States

The condominium concept found its way to Latin America where it has been maintained in the legal language of Latin Countries. Colean (11) states:

In Latin American countries the concept applies to the individual ownership of living space in an apartment building or other multiple dwelling grouped together with common ownership of land and jointly used facilities.

With such exclusive and extensive use in Puerto Rico and many Latin American countries, the condominium concept was easily transferred and became part of the American real estate industry.

The first successful use of condominiums in the United States was the Brandywine Chesapeake Apartment in Washington, D. C., built in 1947 and sold under a veteran administration plan of separated mortgages for the 55 units (17). In the same year in Stanford, Connecticut, a twenty-two unit building was completed (17). Since the 1961 housing legislation, condominium building has become prevalent in the United States. Such legislation authorized the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages in condominiums where land was leased for long terms as well as for purchase. Section 234 of the 1961 Housing Act specifically permitted FHA to insure individual apartment mortgages in condominiums (17). According to the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (17):

Mortgages are insured by the Federal Housing Administration for the purchase of individual family units in multi-family housing projects. FHA insured mortgages may also be used by sponsors to finance the construction or rehabilitation

of housing projects in which they intend to sell individual units on a condominium basis.

The financing of condominium projects, until recently, was left mostly to savings and loan associations. The reason for lack of backing by large institutions is stated by Evert as (18):

Banks are shying away until the condominium concepts are more thoroughly tested. They worry about such details as insurance inspection, appraisal, resale cost of servicing individual mortgages, foreclosure and the like.

Larger institutions such as Equitable Life Insurance Company blazed the trail with backing of condominiums in Hawaii and Puerto Rico (18).

Condominiums and Other Forms of Housing

Differences between Co-Operatives and Condominiums

The condominium form of living at times is confused with other types of housing provisions. It has distinct characteristics differentiating it from other forms. In many cases it is confused with co-operatives. As stated by Burke (9):

The ability to mortgage condominium units differentiates it from other forms of housing such as co-operatives. A co-op owner is subject to the risk that he will become liable for the defaulted payments of other occupants. He has no separate mortgage and his taxes are not assessed separately. Due to the difficulties involved in individual co-op unit financing, the co-op has been limited in its appeal to people of high income liquidity.

With co-operative apartments, the individual occupant buys stock in a corporation which owns and operates the property and the building. Each co-operative shareholder is a tenant in the building of which he is part owner and shareholder. As a tenant, he has a priority lease for the specific apartment he occupies (14). As a shareholder, he is jointly responsible for payment of taxes and mortgages, other charges,

and maintenance costs (11).

The condominium owner has the ability to sell or rent with a profit without consulting other owners. However, in most cases the owner must notify the Board. In most co-operative units the owner must get the approval from the co-operative corporation and the units must be sold back to the corporation or the purchaser approved. Additional advantages of condominium living allow the owner to retire mortgages early if desired or refinance them if cash is needed (19).

Differences between Communes and Condominiums

It appears important to point out that condominiums are not communes. In a true commune, often referred to as an "intentional community," the land belongs to everyone. Decisions are made in community meetings where a "consensus" is reached. Everyone contributes to the community to his own ability. Many are administered by a non-profit corporation that meets once a year to collect a "kitty" to pay property taxes (20).

Condominiums, on the other hand, are quite different. In condominium ownership, a person owns separately one or more single dwelling units in a multi-unit project and has an undivided interest with the owners of the other units in common areas and facilities serving the project.

Motivational Features of Condominiums

There is diverse opinion on the motivational features of condominiums. Colean (11) believes the main attraction feature to be home ownership. He states:

Condominiums provide home ownership with advantages of mortgage while eliminating the responsibility of maintenance in addition to extra benefits such as recreational and social opportunities.

Cribbet (16) believes that the condominium provides the opportunity to live in urban areas where the single dwelling unit could not be located because of land scarcity and high costs, making individual ownership virtually impossible. Gallagher (21) believes people are buying condominiums because of design features. Condominiums are architecturally designed to blend with the terrain in addition to providing a broad mixture of house types, floor plans, and prices normally unavailable in housing projects. Examples of such condominiums are the units built in character with the neighborhood in San Francisco's Nob Hill (22), and projects such as Heritage Village in Southbury, Connecticut, which include six one-story plans, a pair of two story models, and one split entry model (21). Landscaping, attractive architecture and open space aid in providing a pleasant atmosphere which is in some cases one of the primary motivations for new tenants (23).

Home builders believe that tax advantages and the privacy of home ownership combined with non-maintenance and use of the club house to be the main features attracting occupants to condominiums (24). The inclusion of golf courses, men's clubs, women's clubs, arts and crafts and activity centers all impart a desired feeling of a permanent community and attract people. In addition to these, many are attracted by the savings of condominium living. Business Week states in an article on condominium purchasing (24):

Condominiums are a good investment. They can be bought as a hedge against higher prices later. Many see them as a home for retirement and while not in use, they can be used as rental property. The financial factor available from tax

write-offs to investment depreciation lures buyers.

There appears to be a definite tax savings in condominium living.

Everett states (17):

Savings occur through the reduction in the person's taxable income. The interest and real estate taxes are paid as part of the normal maintenance charge which are deductible items in income tax returns.

The savings feature is further expounded upon by Business Week by stating (15):

Any condominium owner like any home owner starts with the right to deduct from income tax his real estate taxes and the interest he pays on his mortgage and on other financing. As soon as he rents his property, however briefly, he gets additional benefits from all the days in which he is not occupying the premises himself.

Condominium owners can deduct property taxes and mortgage interest payments thus saving on taxes which cut housing cost 15-30 per cent. Furthermore, an owner can generally charge off a trip or two to look after his investment while depreciation helps offset mortgage payments (15).

Age Groups Suited to Condominiums

The groups of people attracted to condominiums can be classified into two categories. Those who previously lived in suburbs and whose children have left home, and those young people who ordinarily rent. Although the typical condominium buyer is around 50 years old with few or no children, an income of \$10,000 or more, and a recent home owner, the trend is toward younger couples (18).

The older couple or the couple whose children have left home can now own an apartment the same way they previously owned their own home with the same safe guards and psychological satisfactions. Furthermore,

a capital gains tax from the sale of the home can be avoided by taking title to a condominium apartment. Moreover, freedom from yard chores is attained while keeping the tax advantages of interest and property taxes in addition to a more convenient location.

For the young couple who ordinarily rent, they prefer buying a condominium and watching their investment build up. They can sell later with enough gained to make a down payment on a house (19), whereas, if they rented, there would be no gain at all.

Summary of Reviewed Aspects on Condominiums

A review of literature has shown that the condominium concept is not an entirely new one. The actual concept derived from ancient Roman Law and came to America via Puerto Rico. Condominiums have become more prevalent in the United States since the 1961 Housing Legislation authorized the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on condominiums.

A condominium, as perceived today, is a multi-unit complex characterized by ownership of individual housing units with common ownership of the premises and facilities servicing the units. The unit owner has all the benefits of home ownership comparable to a single dwelling home.

The concept of a condominium is quite different from other types of housing provisions such as co-operatives and communes. The opportunity to live in urban areas, lack of maintenance, and the provision of recreational facilities as well as important financial savings are housing demands met by condominiums.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

From all present indications, condominiums appear to be the house of the future. It is apparent that research needs to direct itself toward providing information for future builders. This study specifically seeks to determine those design features and operating policies of condominiums which satisfy unit owners. It is primarily based on the assumption that satisfactions derived from condominium living can be ascertained by a questionnaire. In order to achieve the primary objective of determining the operating policies and design features bringing satisfaction to the owners, a series of steps were taken.

These were:

1. A questionnaire was developed to measure satisfactions derived from condominium living.
2. The questionnaire was pretested on a selected sample.
3. The questionnaire was restructured and distributed to sample populations in Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and Stillwater.
4. Data was computed, analyzed, and conclusions were drawn.

In the following paragraphs, a discussion of the procedures in this study will be discussed in detail.

Development of Instrument

The instrument evolved as a series of developmental steps. While reviewing the literature available concerning condominiums, a list of

questions concerning satisfactions from condominium living were compiled. The initial list consisted of sixty questions. These sixty questions covered five aspects of condominium living.

1. Home Ownership -- 7 questions
2. Maintenance -- 8 questions
3. Recreational facilities -- 14 questions
4. Financial transactions -- 16 questions
5. Design features -- 15 questions

There were open end questions in addition to the above definitive statements. These questions were concerned with the type of dwelling previously occupied and whether it was rented or owned, the length of residence in the condominium, marital status, and household members according to sex and age.

Pretesting of Instrument

The initial questionnaire was given to six condominium unit owners in Brentwood Park Estates, Stillwater, Oklahoma. The questions were responded to with either a "yes" or "no" statement or a "does not apply" response. As a result of these interviews, six new statements were added.

Re-structuring of Instrument

Following the analysis of the pretest data, it was decided that more useful data would be obtained with a forced choice response to statements in contrast to the "yes-no-does not apply" answer used on the initial questionnaire. Responses possible were set on a four point continuum.

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Not satisfied
4. Not applicable.

Some statements were clarified and some statements were eliminated including the open end questions requesting the sex of the members of the household. The investigator found that the sex could be determined by the open end question requesting the members relationship to the respondent.

For its final form, 33 statements concerning the policies of condominiums and nine statements referring to the design features were selected. The questionnaire was divided into three parts. These parts were:

1. Part I -- statements concerning satisfactions with condominium policies.
2. Part II -- statements referring to structural design features.
3. Part III -- informational, open-end questions.

Gathering Data in the Study

The Population in the Study

Condominium unit owners in the Nichols Hills Condominium in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, the Plaza Hills Condominium in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and the unit owners in the Brentwood Park Estates in Stillwater, Oklahoma, were the entire population for the study. The viewpoints of these unit owners were studied in and of themselves with no implications drawn to larger populations of condominium owners in the state

of Oklahoma.

Method of Creating Interest in the Study

Addresses of the condominiums were obtained from City Planners Offices in Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and Stillwater. The researcher made one visit to insure permission from the director of the condominium to proceed with the study. After permission was granted, the questionnaire was distributed by mail along with a letter of introduction.

Computation of Data

Frequency counts and percentages were obtained for the respondents' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the operational policies of the condominium and the structural design features of the condominium. In addition, frequency counts and percentages were obtained on the general informational questions.

Charts were made for each of the three parts of the questionnaire indicating frequency of response. The score which occurred most frequently was the indicator of feelings toward satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the policy or structural design. As previously mentioned, this score was computed to a percentage form for more understanding by the reader.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The specific satisfactions with operational policies and design features of condominiums were determined through this study. Information secured through the questionnaire was based upon responses from forty-eight condominium owners.

Characteristics of the Population

Of those respondents completing the questionnaire and taking part in the study, it was found that seventy-five per cent had previously resided in single dwelling family homes. Sixty-eight per cent had previously owned their homes and ten per cent had rented a single dwelling family home. Of the remaining, twenty-one per cent rented apartments and two per cent had resided in privately owned mobile homes. Due to the fact that condominiums are a relatively new type of housing in Oklahoma, the majority of the respondents had lived in the condominiums for only one year. Thirty-one per cent had resided at the condominium for one year while only nineteen per cent had resided there for at least two years and only fourteen per cent for three years or more.

Over half of the respondents were women living alone. Seventeen per cent were single and thirty-four per cent were widowed. The remainder of the respondents were married; however, due to various policies,

and to the number of older couples only ten per cent had children residing with them.

Approximately three-fourths of the respondents were fifty years of age and older. The largest percentage were between the ages of forty and seventy years of age. Only five per cent were under forty years of age and only twenty per cent were between the ages of seventy and ninety.

Data from this population was compiled concerning satisfactions with (1) condominium operational policies and (2) condominium design features. In the remainder of the chapter, the writer will discuss (A) apparent satisfactions of either a positive or negative nature with both the operational and design features in condominium living, and (B) specific satisfactions with operational policies and specific satisfactions with design features.

Satisfaction with Condominium Living

A total of 1388 responses by 48 owners to twenty four statements concerning operational policies and nine questions concerning design features were made. Responses of "satisfied" and "very satisfied" were grouped under the heading of positive. "Not satisfied" was grouped as negative and "not applicable" responses were grouped under the "not applicable" heading. Table I shows the resulting information in the form of percentages of total responses.

It is apparent that approximately four-fifths of the responses indicated positive satisfaction toward existing condominium operational and design features. It seems, therefore, that the population tended to be satisfied with condominium living insofar as it can be

reflected from satisfaction with condominium policies and design features.

TABLE I

SATISFACTION WITH CONDOMINIUM LIVING

| Satisfaction | Number of Responses | Per cent of Total Responses |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Positive | 1122 | 80.9 |
| Negative | 122 | 8.7 |
| Not applicable | 144 | 10.4 |

Satisfaction with Condominium Operational Policies

It was the objective of this study to determine the operational policies which bring satisfaction to the owner. Satisfaction with operational policies is divided into three parts. These are:

1. Satisfactions concerning ownership pertaining to the privately owned unit and the jointly owned common grounds.
2. Satisfactions concerning policies of landscaping and interior or exterior remodeling.
3. Satisfactions with policies concerning recreational facilities.

When grouped, the twenty-four statements pertaining to operational policies have a total of 936 responses. Data in Table II shows the percentage of responses indicating satisfactions on varying levels with the operational policies as a whole.

TABLE II

SATISFACTION WITH OPERATIONAL POLICIES

| Satisfaction | Number of Responses | Per cent of Total Responses |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Very Satisfied | 447 | 46.4 |
| Satisfied | 330 | 33.4 |
| Not Satisfied | 76 | 7.8 |
| Not Applicable | 110 | 11.4 |

It is apparent from the computed data that nearly half (46.4 per cent) of the population were very satisfied with operational policies in condominium living. It further appears that the majority of the occupants were satisfied with the situation since over one-third additionally indicated satisfaction with policies (33.4 per cent). It seems to indicate that existing policies within the condominiums

studied are meeting the needs of the unit owners.

Satisfaction with Policies Concerning Individual Units and the
Common Grounds

It is apparent that there is satisfaction with the operational policies. Almost all of the respondents were satisfied with the ownership policies and sixty-five per cent were very satisfied.

The ownership of the individual units allows occupants to sell their units at the price of their choice; however, the board has the first option to buy by matching the individual's selling price. The majority of the respondents were satisfied with this policy; however, nearly ten per cent of the respondents were dissatisfied with this policy.

Policies which met with complete approval of the respondents were the method and size of utilities assessments and the freedom to negotiate a mortgage for the unit with a firm of the buyer's choice. Only ten per cent of the population were dissatisfied with these policies. Items indicating most dissatisfaction were those policies concerning the provision of security guards, the rules concerning pets, and the use of the common ground facilities. It is important to note that not all of the respondents resided in condominiums which provided security guards and the policing of the common grounds. The respondents feeling a need for such a provision could have responded "not satisfied" rather than "not applicable" indicating there was dissatisfaction with the lack of security guards rather than dissatisfaction with the policy of provision of security guards.

Some condominiums have voting power directly proportional to the

number of units owned while others have the voting power in percentage directly proportional to the square footage of each individual unit. Over six per cent of the respondents were dissatisfied with the policy of the voting powers of each occupant being porportional to the size of his unit.

It is interesting to note that the policy concerning the guests use of the common grounds was met with the most dissatisfaction. It is apparent that in the condominiums surveyed there appears to be some conflict and dissatisfaction with the use of common grounds. In conclusion, it appears that on the whole, the unit owners are satisfied with the policies concerning individual units and the use of common grounds. Table III shows the percentage of responses in each aspect of the policies concerning ownership and the common grounds.

Satisfaction with Policies Concerning Landscaping and Interior or Exterior Remodeling

Policies concerning landscaping and remodeling were met with satisfaction. Three-fourths of the respondents were very satisfied. It is interesting to note that there were no respondents dissatisfied with these policies.

The individual ownership of each unit allows the occupant to decorate as he chooses as long as load bearing walls are not displaced. Over three-fourths of the respondents were very satisfied with this policy.

The policy which indicated some dissatisfaction was that concerning the procedure followed in determining landscaping. The area surrounding the condominium or the common grounds was too often

TABLE III

SATISFACTION WITH OPERATIONAL POLICIES CONCERNING
OWNERSHIP AND THE COMMON GROUNDS

| Policy | Number of Responses | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
|---|------------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------------|
| The complete ownership of your unit with partial ownership of the swimming pool, social room and other facilities located on the common ground. | 48 | 64.6 | 29.2 | 2.1 |
| The selling of your unit to a buyer of your choice without consultation with the administrators or governing board. | 44 | 34.0 | 25.0 | 9.2 |
| The required maintenance fees necessary for the hiring of crews and the upkeep of the grounds. | 48 | 52.1 | 41.2 | 4.6 |
| The purchase of equipment, supplies and major furnishings for the common grounds as decided by the administrators or governing board. | 48 | 38.2 | 53.2 | 4.6 |
| The voting power of each occupant being proportional to the size of his unit. | 46 | 50.0 | 26.1 | 6.5 |
| The method and size of utilities assessment. | 44 | 43.2 | 40.9 | 0.0 |

TABLE III (Continued)

| Policy | Number of Responses | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
|---|---------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|
| The freedom to negotiate a mortgage for your unit with a firm of your choice. | 47 | 57.4 | 38.3 | 0.0 |
| The extent of insurance coverage on the common grounds. | 45 | 48.6 | 47.2 | 4.2 |
| The provision of security guards and the policing of the grounds. | 48 | 18.7 | 31.3 | 10.4 |
| The rules concerning pets. | 48 | 44.9 | 39.5 | 10.4 |
| The laundry facilities and the hours available. | 48 | 39.5 | 29.1 | 8.4 |
| The guest's use of the common grounds facilities such as the club house, swimming pool, and parking area. | 47 | 29.1 | 36.8 | 14.9 |

landscaped by the architect with unit owners having to accept the landscaping rather than being part of the decision making process. Nearly thirty per cent of the respondents were dissatisfied with this procedure.

Table IV shows the respondents satisfaction with the operational policies concerning landscaping and interior or exterior remodeling.

Satisfaction with Policies Concerning Recreational Facilities

The final aspect of the operational policies concerned with recreational facilities was also met with satisfaction. The greater number of the population were very satisfied or satisfied with the policies concerning the recreational facilities. Table V shows the responses in percentage form to these policies.

Satisfaction with Condominium Design Features

It was the objective of this study to not only determine operational policies which bring satisfaction to the unit owner but also to determine design features which bring satisfaction as well. Of the total population, there was a total of 425 responses to nine statements pertaining to design features. Table VI shows the data obtained as a result of this part of the study concerning the satisfaction with design features in condominium living.

It is apparent that slightly more than eighty per cent of the total responses were either very satisfied or satisfied with the design features in general. In the following paragraphs examination of satisfaction with specific design features in the condominium will be made.

Of the total population, most of the respondents were found to be

TABLE IV

SATISFACTION WITH OPERATIONAL POLICIES CONCERNING LANDSCAPING
AND INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR REMODELING

| Policy | Number of Responses | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
|--|------------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Being able to decorate by painting, wall-papering, carpeting, adding lighting, etc., only within your individual unit. | 47 | 76.6 | 23.4 | 0.0 |
| The inability to change the exterior of your unit. | 47 | 57.4 | 21.3 | 8.5 |
| The landscaping and outside appearance of the condominium. | 47 | 55.3 | 34.1 | 8.5 |
| The procedure followed in determining the landscaping. | 48 | 25.0 | 41.2 | 29.2 |
| Being able to plant shrubbery or flowers around your unit or in some other designated area. | 48 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 8.4 |

TABLE V
 SATISFACTION WITH OPERATIONAL POLICIES
 CONCERNING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

| Policy | Number of Responses | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
|--|------------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------------|
| The provision of organized recreational programs. | 47 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 0.0 |
| The procedure used to reserve the club house. | 47 | 23.4 | 6.4 | 2.1 |
| The hours the club house is available. | 47 | 29.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
| The rules for the club house concerning replacement of damaged equipment and clean-up. | 47 | 25.5 | 4.3 | 2.1 |
| The hours the swimming pool is opened. | 47 | 42.6 | 34.0 | 2.1 |
| The hours the life-guard is on duty. | 44 | 6.8 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Current rules concerning the use of the picnic area. | 48 | 20.8 | 8.4 | 2.1 |

satisfied with specific design features. More than forty per cent were very satisfied; however, there was some indication of dissatisfaction with the features concerning the location of laundry facilities and the entry way to the individual unit from a hall way. In addition to these features, dissatisfaction was apparent with the allotted number of parking spaces for each unit, the amount of noise transmission from other units, and the amount of storage space provided. Twenty per cent of the residents were dissatisfied with these features.

TABLE VI
SATISFACTION WITH CONDOMINIUM DESIGN FEATURES

| Satisfaction | Number of Responses | Per cent of Total Responses |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Very Satisfied | 192 | 45.2 |
| Satisfied | 153 | 35.9 |
| Not Satisfied | 46 | 10.9 |
| Not Applicable | 34 | 8.0 |

The design features found to be most satisfying by over fifty per cent of the respondents were the location of parking facilities and the

total square footage of the individual units were large enough to accommodate the occupants needs. Table VII on the following page shows responses indicated in percentage form with design policies.

Summary of Data

As a result of this study, it was found that the majority of the respondents in the population seemed to be satisfied with operational policies and design features in effect at the particular condominiums studied. Information obtained indicates a satisfaction with condominium living if the elements listed in the questionnaire are present.

TABLE VII

SATISFACTION WITH SPECIFIC CONDOMINIUM DESIGN FEATURES

| Policy | Number of Responses | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
|---|---------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|
| The convenience of the parking facilities in relation to your unit. | 48 | 56.3 | 29.2 | 10.4 |
| The allotted number of parking spaces for each unit. | 48 | 48.8 | 29.6 | 19.7 |
| The kind of shelter provided for your car. | 47 | 46.6 | 38.4 | 10.6 |
| The location of the laundry facilities in one general area rather than in each individual unit. | 48 | 29.6 | 27.3 | 8.4 |
| The amount of storage space provided in your unit. | 45 | 40.0 | 35.6 | 15.6 |
| The total square footage of the unit being large enough to accommodate your needs. | 48 | 58.3 | 39.6 | 2.1 |
| The amount of noise transmitted from other units. | 48 | 43.5 | 37.0 | 19.5 |

TABLE VII (Continued)

| Policy | Number of Responses | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
|--|---------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|
| The location of other units directly adjacent and surrounding your unit. | 47 | 48.9 | 42.6 | 6.4 |
| Entering your unit from a hallway. | 46 | 34.7 | 39.1 | 2.2 |

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Condominiums are a relatively new type of housing in the United States; however, it is believed that they will be housing a larger percentage of the population in the near future. By determining those operating policies and design features which are found to be satisfying, future condominiums can be designed to meet the housing preferences and needs of the occupants thus making them a satisfying form of living.

The purpose of this study was (1) to ascertain the operational policies, and (2) ascertain the design features which bring satisfactions to owner occupants in condominiums. Information derived from the study was used to draw implications for city planners, architects, and home builders in the future.

Owner occupants of the Nichols Hills Condominium in Oklahoma City; Plaza Hills Condominium in Tulsa; and the Brentwood Estates Condominium in Stillwater, Oklahoma, were chosen as the population for study. A total of 48 owner occupants responded to the questionnaire developed specifically for the study. In responding to the questionnaire, participants reacted to 24 statements concerning operational policies and nine statements concerning structural design features. There was a possible choice of four answers: very satisfied, satisfied, not satisfied and not applicable. Five open end questions were

included to determine the occupants' previous type of dwelling, whether it was rented or owned, the length of residence in the condominium, marital status, and a listing of those residing in the unit and their relationship to the owner. The following information was obtained:

1. A large majority (80.9 per cent) of the population revealed an over-all satisfaction with condominium living concerning operational policies and design features in general.
2. Nearly half of the total responses (46.4 per cent) revealed that occupants were very satisfied with specific operational features and over one-third (33.4 per cent) were satisfied.
3. Nearly half of the total population revealed that they were very satisfied with specific design features and over one-third (35.9 per cent) were satisfied.

The data from the study, thus, revealed that occupants of condominiums were satisfied with living in a dwelling which was part of a multi-unit complex as long as it provided for home ownership with a freedom from maintenance and had recreational opportunities.

It was found that mostly older people with the majority being single as well as families without children were residing in condominiums. This finding suggests the need for condominiums to be built with a price range and features which will appeal to younger families. It is apparent, also, that if condominiums are to be built as a housing method in the future, then they should be built with a variety of price ranges appealing to all families with particular attention paid to the elimination of noise transmission along with increased storage.

As more condominiums are built, more families will be able to reside in a dwelling close to their employment while enjoying the benefits of home ownership. Condominiums seem to be a very successful means to adequately house our increasing population on less land. In

the future, if satisfactions from condominiums are to increase, it is apparent that research must continue to provide builders with needed information on buyer preferences.

This researcher makes the following suggestions:

1. A comparable study be made using a larger sample in order to substantiate current findings.
2. A larger study be made including condominiums in resort areas and large urban and suburban areas in various parts of the United States to identify prevalent satisfactions nationwide.
3. A study be conducted emphasizing the family cycle and the regional locations of condominiums as dependent variables.

In conclusion, it is hoped that the findings from this study can be used by city planners, home builders, architects and housing specialists as a guide in providing housing for families in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) "Our Space Within the Space Around Us." Realities, (October, 1968), 84087.
- (2) Beyer, Glenn. "Housing." Journal of Home Economics, LII (October, 1960), 644.
- (3) "Housing's Market Revolution." House and Home, XXXIII (January, 1968), 140.
- (4) "The Difference in Tomorrow's Housing Market." House and Home, XXXIII (June, 1968), 82-89.
- (5) Straus, Nathan. Two-Thirds of a Nation. New York: Alfred Knoff, 1952.
- (6) Straus, Nathan. The Seven Myths of Housing. New York: Alfred Knoff, 1944.
- (7) Colean, Miles. "What Condominiums May Mean to You." House Beautiful, CV (October, 1963), 226.
- (8) Garan, D. G. The Paradox of Pleasure and Relativity. New York: Philosophical Library, 1963.
- (9) Burke, T. J. and others. Condominium Housing for Tomorrow. Boston: Management Reports, Harvard Graduate School of Business, 1968.
- (10) Rohan, Patric. "Perfecting the Condominium as a Housing Tool: Innovations in Liability and Insurance." Law and Contemporary Problems, XXXII (Spring, 1967), 305.
- (11) Colean, Miles. "What Condominium May Mean to You." House Beautiful, CV (November, 1963), 225.
- (12) Ramsey, E. "What Condominiums May Mean to You." House Beautiful, CV (November, 1963), 225.
- (13) Satlow, David. "Current Developments in Consumer Economics: Condominium Housing." Business Education World, XLVI (December, 1965), 33.
- (14) "Own Your Apartment? It can be Done." Good Housekeeping, CLX (April, 1965), 185.

- (15) "Condominium Take to Skis." Business Week, (November, 1967), 126.
- (16) Cribbet, John E. "Condominium. . . Home Ownership for Megalopolis?" Michigan Law Review, XLI (1963), 1210.
- (17) Everett, William S. "Condominium and Co-Operative Apartments-- The New Frontier in Housing." Journal of Property Management, XXVII, 8.
- (18) "Like Owning a House." Business Week, (August 29, 1964), 108.
- (19) "Only Place We Can Go Is Up." American Home, LXVI (September 1963), 78.
- (20) "Condominiums." The National Observer, (March 23, 1970), 24.
- (21) Gallagher, A. "Here's What it Takes to Create a Brand New Market." House and Home, XXI (April, 1967), 80.
- (22) "Nob Hill Elegance by Warnecke." Architectural Record, CXXXVII (April, 1965), 198.
- (23) "How to Design Garden Apartments that will Attract and Keep Long-term Tenants." House and Home, XXXIV (August, 1968), 85.
- (24) "For Sale: A Big Builder's Town House Formula." House and Home, XXXIII (May, 1968), 107.

APPENDIX A

LETTERS OF INTRODUCTION TO OKLAHOMA CITY CONDOMINIUM OWNERS

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**

Department of Housing and Interior Design
Frontier 2-6211, Ext. 343

74075

March 10, 1970

Dear Unit Owner:

The housing market has experienced a sharp increase in the building and sales of condominiums as compared to the sales and building of the familiar single family dwelling. Consequently, I have become extremely interested in what makes condominium living so satisfying to cause the change in the housing market.

As part of my studies for a graduate degree, I am asking the unit owners of selected condominiums in Tulsa to answer a questionnaire. The data obtained from this questionnaire will be used for writing a thesis which is required for a Master's of Science Degree in Housing and Interior Design at Oklahoma State University.

After the responses to the questionnaire have been tabulated, the questionnaire will be destroyed. Your address has been requested to be used only as a means of recording the returned and outstanding questionnaires as it is necessary that I have all questionnaires answered and returned. If you would take just a few minutes of your time to answer the questions I would be most grateful for your kind participation in my study.

For your convenience, I have enclosed a self addressed envelope. Please answer the questionnaire and return as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Edre Gorius
Graduate Student

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO TULSA AND
STILLWATER CONDOMINIUM OWNERS

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**

Department of Housing and Interior Design
FRontier 2-6211, Ext. 343

74075

March 6, 1970

Dear Unit Owner:

The housing market has experienced a sharp increase in the building and sales of condominiums as compared to the sales and building of the familiar single family dwelling. Consequently, I have become extremely interested in what makes condominium living so satisfying to cause the change in the housing market.

As part of my studies for a graduate degree, I am asking the unit owners of selected condominiums in Oklahoma City to answer a questionnaire. The data obtained from this questionnaire will be used for writing a thesis which is required for a Master's of Science Degree in Housing and Interior Design at Oklahoma State University.

After the responses to the questionnaire have been tabulated, the questionnaire will be destroyed. Your address has been requested to be used only as a means of recording the returned and outstanding questionnaires as it is necessary that I have all questionnaires answered and returned. If you would take just a few minutes of your time to answer the questions I would be most grateful for your kind participation in my study.

I will return on _____ between _____ to pick up the questionnaire. If you will not be home during those hours would you please leave the questionnaire at _____ so that I might pick it up.

Sincerely,

Edre Gorius
Graduate Student

APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRE

A Survey of Satisfactions Regarding Operation Policies
and Design Features as Experienced by Unit Owners

PART I: How satisfied are you with the following condominium policies?

DIRECTIONS: At the left of each statement are four choices. Please circle the appropriate number representing your choice.

4 3 2 1
Very Satisfied Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

- | | | |
|---------|-----|---|
| 4 3 2 1 | 1. | The complete ownership of your unit with partial ownership of the swimming pool, social room and other facilities located on the common ground. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 2. | Being able to decorate by painting, wallpapering, carpeting, adding new lighting, etc., only within your individual unit. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 3. | The inability to change the exteriors of your unit. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 4. | The selling of your unit to a buyer of your choice without consultation with the administrators or governing board. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 5. | The landscaping and outside appearance of the condominium. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 6. | The procedure followed in determining the landscaping. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 7. | The required maintenance fees necessary for the hiring of crews and the up-keep of the grounds. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 8. | The purchases of equipment, supplies and major furnishings for the common grounds as decided by the administrators or governing board. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 9. | The procedure used to reserve the club house. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 10. | The hours the club house is available for entertaining. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 11. | The rules for the club house concerning the replacement of damaged equipment and clean up. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 12. | The voting power of each occupant being proportional to the size of his unit. |
| 4 3 2 1 | 13. | Being able to plant shrubbery or flowers around your unit or in some other designated area. |

- 4 3 2 1 14. The hours the swimming pool is open for use.
- 4 3 2 1 15. The hours the life guard is on duty at the swimming pool.
- 4 3 2 1 16. Current rules concerning the use of the picnic area.
- 4 3 2 1 17. The rules concerning pets.
- 4 3 2 1 18. The laundry facilities and the hours available for use.
- 4 3 2 1 19. The guests' use of the common grounds facilities such as the club house, swimming pool and parking area.
- 4 3 2 1 20. The provision of organized recreational programs.
- 4 3 2 1 21. The method and size of utilities assessments.
- 4 3 2 1 22. The freedom to negotiate a mortgage for your unit with a firm of your choice.
- 4 3 2 1 23. The extent of insurance coverage on the common grounds.
- 4 3 2 1 24. The provision of security guards and the policing of the grounds.

PART II: How satisfied are you with the design features of the condominium?

- 4 3 2 1 25. The convenience of the parking facilities in relation to your unit.
- 4 3 2 1 26. The allotted number of parking spaces for each unit.
- 4 3 2 1 27. The kind of shelter provided for your car.
- 4 3 2 1 28. The location of the laundry facilities in one general area rather than in each individual unit.
- 4 3 2 1 29. The amount of storage space provided in your unit.
- 4 3 2 1 30. The total square footage of the unit being large enough to accomodate your needs.
- 4 3 2 1 31. The amount of noise transmitted from other units.
- 4 3 2 1 32. The location of other units directly adjacent to and surrounding your unit.
- 4 3 2 1 33. Entering your unit from a hallway or stairway.

PART III: Identification Data

A. Name of condominium and apartment number _____
 _____.

B. Please check the type of dwelling just previously resided in and whether it was owned or rented.

1. _____ Single Family House Rented _____ Owned _____

2. _____ Apartment Rented _____ Owned _____

3. _____ Mobile Home Rented _____ Owned _____

4. _____ Other (Please specify) _____

C. Approximately how long have you resided in this condominium? _____ Years

D. Marital Status: Circle One - S M D W

Age _____ Sex _____

E. Please list the people in your household that are presently or temporarily residing with you.

| Relationship | Age |
|--------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

APPENDIX D

ITEM RESPONSE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE VIII

ITEM RESPONSE TO PART I OF QUESTIONNAIRE
CONCERNING OPERATIONAL POLICIES

| Questionnaire Item | Total Responses | Very Satisfied | | Satisfied | | Not Satisfied | | Not Applicable | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|---------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| | | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| 1 | 48 | 31 | 64.6 | 14 | 29.2 | 1 | 2.1 | 2 | .041 |
| 2 | 47 | 35 | 76.6 | 12 | 24.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 3 | 47 | 27 | 57.4 | 10 | 21.3 | 4 | 8.5 | 6 | 12.8 |
| 4 | 44 | 15 | 34.0 | 11 | 25.0 | 4 | 9.2 | 14 | 31.8 |
| 5 | 47 | 26 | 55.3 | 16 | 34.1 | 4 | 8.5 | 1 | 2.1 |
| 6 | 48 | 12 | 25.0 | 20 | 41.2 | 14 | 29.2 | 2 | 4.6 |
| 7 | 48 | 25 | 52.1 | 20 | 41.2 | 2 | 4.6 | 1 | 2.1 |
| 8 | 47 | 18 | 38.2 | 25 | 53.2 | 2 | 4.3 | 2 | 4.3 |
| 9 | 47 | 11 | 23.4 | 3 | 6.4 | 1 | 2.1 | 32 | 68.1 |
| 10 | 47 | 14 | 29.8 | 1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 32 | 68.1 |
| 11 | 47 | 12 | 25.5 | 2 | 4.3 | 1 | 2.1 | 32 | 68.1 |
| 12 | 46 | 23 | 50.0 | 12 | 26.1 | 3 | 6.5 | 8 | 17.4 |
| 13 | 48 | 19 | 39.5 | 19 | 39.5 | 4 | 8.4 | 6 | 12.4 |

TABLE VIII (Continued)

| Questionnaire Item | Total Responses | Very Satisfied | | Satisfied | | Not Satisfied | | Not Applicable | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|---------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| | | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| 14 | 47 | 20 | 42.6 | 16 | 34.0 | 1 | 2.1 | 10 | 21.3 |
| 15 | 44 | 3 | 6.8 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 39 | 88.6 |
| 16 | 48 | 10 | 20.8 | 4 | 8.4 | 1 | 2.1 | 33 | 68.3 |
| 17 | 48 | 21 | 44.9 | 19 | 39.5 | 5 | 10.4 | 3 | 6.2 |
| 18 | 48 | 19 | 39.5 | 14 | 29.1 | 4 | 8.4 | 11 | 22.9 |
| 19 | 47 | 14 | 29.1 | 17 | 36.8 | 7 | 14.9 | 9 | 19.2 |
| 20 | 47 | 5 | 10.6 | 5 | 10.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 37 | 79.7 |
| 21 | 44 | 19 | 43.2 | 18 | 40.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 15.9 |
| 22 | 47 | 27 | 57.4 | 18 | 38.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.3 |
| 23 | 45 | 22 | 48.6 | 21 | 47.2 | 1 | .042 | 1 | .022 |
| 24 | 48 | 9 | 18.7 | 17 | 29.6 | 5 | 10.4 | 17 | 31.3 |

TABLE IX

ITEM RESPONSE TO PART II OF QUESTIONNAIRE
CONCERNING DESIGN FEATURES

| Questionnaire Item | Total Responses | Very Satisfied | | Satisfied | | Not Satisfied | | Not Applicable | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|---------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| | | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| 25 | 48 | 27 | 56.3 | 14 | 29.2 | 5 | 10.4 | 2 | 4.1 |
| 26 | 48 | 22 | 48.8 | 17 | 29.6 | 9 | 19.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 27 | 47 | 20 | 46.6 | 18 | 38.4 | 7 | 10.6 | 2 | 4.4 |
| 28 | 48 | 17 | 29.6 | 13 | 27.5 | 4 | 8.4 | 14 | 29.2 |
| 29 | 45 | 18 | 40.0 | 16 | 35.6 | 7 | 15.6 | 4 | 8.8 |
| 30 | 48 | 28 | 58.3 | 19 | 39.6 | 1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 31 | 46 | 20 | 43.5 | 17 | 37.0 | 8 | 19.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 32 | 47 | 23 | 48.9 | 20 | 42.6 | 3 | 6.4 | 1 | 2.1 |
| 33 | 46 | 16 | 34.7 | 18 | 37.1 | 1 | 2.2 | 11 | 24.0 |

VITA

Edre Jane Gorius

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A SURVEY OF SATISFACTIONS OF SELECTED CONDOMINIUM OWNERS
IN OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Housing and Interior Design

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Manchester, Iowa, the daughter of
Cletus John and Sybil Post Gorius.

Education: Attended the Cogdon Campus Grade School in Potsdam,
New York; graduated from Potsdam Central High School in
Potsdam High School in Potsdam, New York, June, 1965;
received the Bachelor of Science degree from the State
University, College of Arts and Sciences, Plattsburgh,
New York, June 1, 1969; completed requirements for the
Master of Science degree, July, 1970.

Organization: Phi Upsilon Omicron