

SATISFACTION WITH RENTED LIVING SPACE AMONG
MARRIED STUDENTS AT OKLAHOMA STATE
UNIVERSITY

By

KATHLEEN VIRGINIA GREEN GARDNER

Bachelor of Arts

University of Florida

Gainesville, Florida

1976

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
May, 1980

Thesis
1980
G227s
cop. 2



SATISFACTION WITH RENTED LIVING SPACE AMONG
MARRIED STUDENTS AT OKLAHOMA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Thesis Approved:

Margaret Weber

Thesis Adviser

H. Kay Stewart

Edwin B. Hoop

Norman N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

1057832

PREFACE

This study is concerned with the assessment of satisfaction with one's immediate living environment. Married students who are living in rental apartments, both on campus in married student housing facilities and those living in private rental apartments in the community, make up this research. The primary objective of this study is to determine what variables were considered important to the married student when first choosing an apartment to rent while attending Oklahoma State University. Once moved and settled in the apartment, the student reflects the present satisfaction levels with the apartment facilities.

The researcher wishes to express her appreciation to her major adviser, Dr. Margaret Weber, for her guidance and to the other committee members, Mr. Ed Hoag and Dr. Kay Stewart, for their assistance. A final note of thanks is expressed to my husband, Charles, for his patience and sacrifices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Objectives.	4
Hypotheses.	5
Assumptions	6
Limitations	6
Definitions	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Effects of the Living Environment	10
Spatial Inadequacy	10
Living Environment Satisfaction.	11
Concepts of Home	13
Coping Mechanisms and Behavioral Adapta- tions.	15
User Needs Input	17
University Housing.	19
University Married Student Housing	21
Conclusion.	23
III. RESEARCH DESIGN.	25
Type of Research.	25
Population and Sample	26
Method of Data Collection	28
Instrumentation	28
Data Analysis	30
Summary	30
IV. DATA ANALYSIS.	31
Introduction.	31
Analysis.	31
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	53
Introduction.	53
Conclusions	54
Recommendations	59
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	61

	Page
APPENDIXES.	66
APPENDIX A - LETTER REQUESTING MARRIED STUDENT EN- ROLLMENT.	67
APPENDIX B - TELEPHONE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT FOR THE PILOT STUDY	69
APPENDIX C - TELEPHONE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT - "PER- CEIVED SATISFACTION ASSESSMENT"	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Chi-Square Values for Socio-Demographic Factors by Housing Type.	33
II. Chi-Square Value for Length of Tenure by Housing Type.	34
III. Chi-Square Value for Plans to Move by Housing Type. . .	35
IV. Chi-Square Values for Importance of Specific Variables When Choosing an Apartment by Housing Type.	37
V. Chi-Square Values for Importance of Neighbors, Neighborhood, a Furnished Apartment, and Location When Choosing an Apartment by Housing Type	39
VI. Chi-Square Value for the First Reason for Apartment Selection by Housing Type	42
VII. Chi-Square Value for the Reasons of Study Location Preference by Housing Type.	44
VIII. Chi-Square Values for Perception of Specific Variables Related to the Apartment by Housing Type.	46
IX. Chi-Square Value for the Major Like of the Apartment by Housing Type	48
X. Chi-Square Value for the Major Dislike of the Apartment by Housing Type	49
XI. Chi-Square Value for the Preference of M.S.H. Apartments or Off Campus Community Apartments by Housing Type. .	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the course of dealing with man and the built environment, the interaction between the two has been, at one time or another, researched and analyzed. One area of growing concern involves the impact that the housing industry has had and is having on people as there is an increase in the awareness of the density and crowding phenomenon.

Past studies show that spatial limitations have produced physiological (Bixenstine, 1955) and socio-psychological stress (Altman, 1975; Perin, 1970), influencing and altering behavior patterns (Sherrod, 1974; Beyer, 1965; and Reimer and Demerath, 1952). Stokols (1976, 1972) discusses the experience of crowding and its development over time as being determined by the combination of environmental and personal factors. Feelings of spatial restriction are related to the presence of other persons and their relationships to each other.

The study of the effect that housing has on human behavior is a relatively recent area being pursued and has shown there is a relationship between housing and the family value system (Montgomery, 1969). Further insight by Cooper (1976, p. 157) reflects the importance of the role the living environment plays in the lives of the inhabitants. She perceives the house as being the "symbol-of-self" because it is so deeply engrained in the American ethos, although unconsciously for many.

Another researcher (Shearer, 1977) looks at the varying levels of privacy in the meaning of home and acknowledges that its very diversity suggests the need for further study. When exploring the meaning of home, one must look at the factors involved when considering the concept of home and acknowledges that its very diversity suggests the need for further study. When exploring the meaning of home, one must look at the factors involved when considering the concept of home and the different meanings it elicits in people. One's living space can be regarded as "home" to some, while being thought of as "shelter" by others.

In Hayward's (1977, pp. 11-12) discourse, nine dimensions emerge from his research dealing with the psychological concepts of home. Among these are included the physical structure in which one resides, a social network of relationships, and a concept of home being tied in with self identity. He focuses his research on the concepts of housing through the user's point of view and concludes that "home is such a personal idea that it virtually defies definition."

According to Bennett (1977), personalizing one's private spaces is desirable as it increases the sense of identification. A designer should allow for individual tastes and make provisions for them within the plans of the working and living environments.

Pruitt (1978) indicates that family satisfaction with its own standard of living is the greatest influence on the overall satisfaction with quality of life. Riemer (1947, p. 158) emphasizes the importance of assessing "housing conditions with regard to their influence upon the cohesion of family life."

Lee (1966, p. 2) states that the conditions of university housing influences students' academic and social lives. Other researchers take a closer look at specific types of dwellings, such as married student housing facilities (Melson, Inman, and Kemp, 1978). They conclude that the longer a family lives in married student housing the more the family members experience dissatisfaction and stress from environmental factors. It is believed that density and feelings of being crowded contribute to the resultant feelings of stress.

Presently, there is a consultant engaged in a "feasibility study" regarding the married student housing facilities at Oklahoma State University. The study is looking at the cost of replacing the older apartments on campus or the impact of having the community of Stillwater absorb additional married students if more married student apartments are not built. The results of this decision will have some impact on the residents and their satisfaction regarding their housing, university involvement, and quality of life.

Dober (1968) states that in volume, housing represents the largest single capital investment among the various types of buildings on campus. Since such a large and long term investment is undertaken, it is important for these dwelling units to accommodate as many married student needs as possible. There is also a need to take a look at rental apartments both on and off campus, in relation to perceived adequacy in the living environments regarding space needs, both physically and psychologically.

It is generally agreed that there is a myriad of meanings of what the house represents to the people living in them and this study

helps gain insight into the housing facilities for university married students, both on and off campus. It is important to study the rented living environments of the married students on and off campus, determine the perceived satisfaction levels toward their housing, and to assess differences, if any, in perceived satisfaction levels between the on campus (university-owned and maintained) and off campus (private community) rental apartments. This research is a valuable tool for socio-psychological evaluations, as the feasibility study presently being conducted is taking basically an economic point of view. There is a need for socio-psychological input into the building replacement process with not only quantity being considered when providing housing for a specific population, but also an attempt made to satisfy the psychological needs of that group of people.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to assess the satisfaction levels of married students attending Oklahoma State University who are living in university married student housing apartments (on campus) or in privately-owned rental apartments in the community (off campus) of Stillwater, Oklahoma. The following objectives are cited for the study:

1. To determine if differences exist in selected socio-demographic factors of sex of respondent, family size, student classification, tenure, and expected tenure in residence, between the married students residing in university-owned apartments and privately-owned community rental apartments.

2. To determine if differences exist between the reasons for choosing university-owned apartments (on campus) or privately-owned community rental apartments (off campus) among the married students residing in married student housing and those residing in privately-owned community rental apartments;
3. To analyze differences in housing satisfaction between the married students residing in university-owned rental apartments and those residing in privately-owned community rental apartments; and
4. To make recommendations for further research in the area of married students' needs in relation to housing adequacy.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses are formulated for the study:

- H₁: There will be no significant difference in selected socio-demographic factors of sex of respondent, family size, student classification, tenure and expected tenure in residence, between married students residing in university-owned apartments and privately-owned community rental apartments;
- H₂: There will be no significant difference in the reasons for choosing university-owned apartments (on campus) or privately-owned community rental apartments (off campus) between the married students residing in married student housing and those residing in privately-owned community apartments, and

H₃: There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of housing satisfaction between married students who live in the university-owned and privately-owned community rental apartments.

Assumptions

The scope of research is conducted with the following assumptions considered:

1. Each respondent will respond to questions as accurately as he or she can;
2. The respondents are cognizant of their living environment and able to perceive adequacy of their housing facility;
3. The married students living in both university housing and community housing in the summer are representative of the married students attending Oklahoma State University.

Limitations

The following limitations also affect the outcome of the research. They include:

1. The study is limited to Oklahoma State University married students.
2. Those students surveyed represent a specific time, summer semester, 1979.
3. Those responding represent married students who have a listed telephone number.
4. The study excludes all students claiming International status.

5. All of the married student housing apartments had four rooms, excluding the bathroom, were furnished, and had utilities included in the rent payment.

Definitions

The following terms are defined as they are used in this study.

They include:

1. Adaptation, as defined by Morris and Winter (1978) is
 . . . a relatively permanent structural change in response to stress. Included are changes in norms or changes in the means used to meet the norms that appear when the stress of housing dissatisfaction is great (p. 16).
2. Community Housing, for purposes of this study, are those privately-owned rental apartments off campus and part of an apartment complex, which excludes duplexes and houses.
3. Family, as defined by Morris and Winter (1978, p. 61), is
 ". . . two or more persons living in the same household who are related by blood, marriage, or adoption . . . performing the function of nurturant socialization. . . ."
4. Housing Quality (Morris and Winter, 1978, p. 80) refers to
 ". . . characteristics of dwelling units that contribute to desirability through the subjective reactions of families to those characteristics. . . ."
5. Housing Satisfaction is
 . . . a state of the level of contentment with current housing conditions. Low levels of satisfaction are experienced as stress. The term may refer to the entire continuum of satisfaction from very dissatisfied to very satisfied (Morris and Winter, 1978, p. 80).

6. International Student: Those students claiming international status on the Student Information List provided by the Oklahoma State University Registrar's office.
7. Married Student Housing, defined as the housing facilities provided by Oklahoma State University for married students while they are attending Oklahoma State University. Criteria for eligibility for occupancy, according to the Married Student Housing Handbook (1978-79) by Oklahoma State University, are as follows:

Married students will be given preference for Married Student Housing when enrolled in at least 12 undergraduate credit hours, or 9 graduate credit hours or 6 graduate credit hours if employed by the University 50 percent of the time or more in graduate level work during regular semesters and upon continued attendance at the University.

The apartments are to be occupied by the REGISTERED LESSEE and LESSEE'S spouse and . . . legally adopted children only (p. 3).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

While providing housing for specific populations and dealing with related problems, one confronts personal space needs, interpersonal relationships, and perceived satisfaction levels. The dwelling unit in which the married student chooses to live while attending the university affects his or her ability to function as a student, spouse, employee, and possibly, parent. Housing choices also affect feelings of involvement in the life of the university and the surrounding community. Years are spent attending a university while in the process of pursuing formal education. If the living space is not adequate (either physical or psychological), the student's sense of satisfaction may be a result of perceived experiences in housing.

This chapter looks at some of the research related to the married student and his or her relationship to the university community in terms of the living space. The concept of what home is and the role it plays in one's life and consequent perceived satisfaction is included in the chapter. Rental apartments, including those which are university-owned and those privately-owned in the community are reviewed. Culture also plays a role when researching the process of perception with regard to satisfaction toward one's housing. Adaptation and coping techniques are also considered as these mechanisms play an integral part of the relationship between the built environment and the resultant behavior via one's level of perception.

Effects of the Living Environment

Spatial Inadequacy

There are many variables involved when considering what constitutes a family's feeling of solidarity or belonging. One area of concern relates to the perceived adequacy of space in one's living environment. Stokols (1972) states that perceived satisfaction in one's environment is influenced, in part, by a sense of spatial inadequacy.

According to Stokols (1972, pp. 75-76), recognizing spatial inadequacy arouses feelings of psychological and physiological stress. This perceived crowding develops over time and is determined through a combination of environmental and personal factors. Psychological stress is perceived when one realizes that the space demand exceeds the available supply. This results in feelings of infringement or lack of privacy. Chapin (1951) finds that

psychological response to an excessive number of persons per room, expressed as complaints because of . . . irritations . . . and frustrations . . . due to lack of personal privacy is the most direct aspect of crowding (p. 12).

Research findings (Rossi, 1955, p. 79) show that when considering mobility in families, it is not the objective amount of space that causes the families to want to move but the "subjective evaluation of that space as fulfilling or not fulfilling household requirements." Riemer and Demerath (1952, p. 231) discuss the effects within the family regarding housing conditions and speculate that crowding in the home induces the family to spend less hours in the home.

Beyer (1965, pp. 280-281) indicates that a family must adapt to the design plan of an apartment. The degree of livability that a design will provide depends upon how well the architectural features of the living space meet the needs of those who carry on activities within it.

Some theories indicate (Proshansky, Ittelson, and Rivlin, 1970) that space influences behavior.

Seen from the viewpoint of the participant in the environmental process, the surroundings typically are 'neutral'; they enter into awareness only when they deviate from some adaptation level. Although the participant remains largely unaware of his surroundings in the environmental process, these surroundings continue to exert considerable influence on his behavior (pp. 36-37).

Perin (1970, p. 129) states that "the lack of sufficient space is actively destructive to strivings for self-fulfillment." Dean (1953, p. 129) concludes that inadequate dwellings work for most families but many household operations and the inadequate facilitation for them seems to be below the tenant's threshold of awareness.

It is found that varying levels of spatial adequacy and spatial inadequacy influence the inhabitants of the space. These influences are expressed as feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the living environment.

Living Environment Satisfaction

The degree of livability is reflected in the perceived feelings of overall satisfaction with one's living environment. Harris (1976, p. 12) finds that the quality of housing affects overall housing satisfaction; but, it is only a small component of overall satisfaction in housing.

Further research (Onibokun, 1974, pp. 189-190) indicates that satisfaction of human beings is not absolute and that "habitability" refers to the type of tenant-dwelling-environment-management interaction system. This system results in a type of dwelling which is considered by "the tenant component" of the system as a relatively acceptable environment in light of what tenants consider to be their housing needs and expectations. Thus, the "housing unit" is considered as an important subsystem of a housing habitability system. In this sense, "habitability would always be considered as a relative concept" (Onibokun, 1974, p. 198).

Habitability reflects different combinations of separate components of perceived satisfaction. Ahlbrandt and Brophy (1976, p. 523) find that tenant satisfaction is related to neighbors, the neighborhood, cleanliness, and the physical unit, but management is the most important determinant. In part, management consists of strictness, empathy, maintenance, and responsiveness.

Other research (Becker, 1974, p. 187) indicates the neighborhood plays an important part in one's satisfaction. The reaction of the surrounding community and its friendliness toward the residents is found to be important to the residents. It affects the resident's perceptions, thus influencing overall feelings of satisfaction of living within the housing development (Becker, 1974, p. 187).

Morris, Crull, and Winter (1976, p. 317) find that neighborhood satisfaction is the strongest influence on housing satisfaction. Other findings (Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers, 1976, p. 249) indicate that from those residents not satisfied with their communities, half are also not satisfied with their housing.

Another study (Weber, Managan, and Windsor, 1978) conducted in Stillwater, Oklahoma, reveals that the largest single concern in rental housing is related to maintenance. Weber et al. (1978, pp. 24-25) show that the tenants in rental housing do not feel there is adequate storage, enough accoustical insulation, or outside enclosed play space for children. Weber et al. (1978, p. 30) also indicate that satisfaction is determined by location, design, and rent.

Pruitt (1978, p. 237) indicates that neighborhood satisfaction is important and that a family's satisfaction with its standard of living is the greatest influence on their overall satisfaction with quality of life. One study (Rainey, Nickols, and Stewart, 1977) finds that:

. . . satisfaction with the dwelling and satisfaction with the neighborhood are related to satisfaction with quality of life . . . the greatest influence on satisfaction with life comes from the attitudinal response to the housing environment . . . rather than directly from the objective measures of the . . . dwelling unit (p. 14).

Concepts of Home

Studies have been conducted which reveal many approaches to housing satisfaction. Research indicates that when perceiving the housing phenomenon, one attaches many symbolic values to the concept. Davis and Roizen (1971, p. 37) discuss the symbolic value of a building and include the aesthetic-cultural context, which is the way the building symbolizes a user's perception of oneself. This perception also changes with time as the desirability to the users may change, resulting in a change in satisfaction. "Whether or not the building is perceived as appropriate to time and place may be important to user satisfaction" (Davis and Roizen, 1971, p. 37).

When dealing with the symbolic value of house, new concepts of home emerge with more psychological input. This is expressed in the findings by Weber et al. (1978, p. 29) that most of the rental housing tenants surveyed feel "at home anywhere if they had their belongings around them."

One researcher (Rakoff, 1977, p. 94) concludes that the home is a protector against the world's chaos. Research has been done on the psychological concepts of home (Hayward, 1977), and nine dimensions have emerged. These are:

- Home as a relationship with others . . . home as a sense of belonging, love and togetherness, 'where someone cares for me' . . .
- Home as social network . . . including relationships among friends, neighbors, the community . . . acquaintances in the neighborhood . . .
- Home as self-identity . . . serves as a symbol of how they want to be seen by others . . . a center of one's world, a reflection of one's ideas and values, and an important influence on being comfortable and happy with oneself.
- Home as a place of privacy and refuge . . . chance to be alone . . . not be bothered . . . a place of rest . . . and be safe and secure.
- Home as continuity . . . one's relationship to an environment over time . . . can return to . . .
- Home as a personalized place . . . home as a concept which emerges from an active process of creating and controlling an environment.
- Home as a base of activity acknowledges more of a functional and behavioral orientation to home . . . where one's day 'starts' and 'ends' . . .
- Home as childhood home . . . where people grew up . . .
- Home as physical structure . . . impersonal view of a housing environment . . . space in and around the dwelling (p. 12).

Overall satisfaction is a result of how one adapts oneself to the environment. Adaptation is a process of coping which affects one's perception of the primary living environment. To assess satisfaction

levels it is necessary, therefore, to consider the phenomenon of coping techniques and adaptive behavior.

Coping Mechanisms and Behavioral Adaptations

When dealing with housing satisfaction and its assessment, there must be an ability to perceive the environment and to determine whether one's housing fulfills one's needs. One adjusts to the present living conditions by engaging in certain behavior if the housing environment is perceived as being less than ideal. Becker (1977b, p. 211) discusses coping via the "coping mechanism." He suggests modifying the physical environment directly to arrive at a more acceptable image of home; changing one's own idea of the residence or oneself; or changing one's own behavior pattern.

When discussing environmental perceptions, the "true" evaluation, according to Daun (1978, p. 339), is a result of psychological rationalization. Interviewees tend to be defensive in regard to their housing and adjust themselves accordingly. This results in a more positive attitude. Morris and Winter (1978, p. 155) conclude that most feelings of satisfaction are reported relatively accurate except possibly, the extreme of dissatisfaction.

Yockey (1976, p. 8) finds that those who feel apathetic may have less sensitivity to deficits. When expressing this in terms of satisfaction in housing, there would be less tendency to feel and/or express dissatisfaction. Yockey (1976, p. 8) suggests this indifference is an adaptation to low income status and not as a result of different housing norms.

Turin (1973, p. 53) explains that "the process of coping is selection from several perceived and available regions which will result in the particular behavior or action. It is not the behavior or the action itself." In other words, a process of the awareness for the need to adapt to one's housing is noted rather than the actual behavior that results.

According to Proshansky, Ittelson, and Rivlin (1976, p. 180), "Acceptance is a form of adaptation to negative situations in which the individual's willingness to act to change the situation is neutralized." Perception of satisfaction with housing is related to the values involved.

Montgomery (1957, pp. 11-12) concludes from his study of families that there are values present but they are not sufficiently articulated or translated. This is reflected in living in a dwelling that is perceived as less than ideal because one can not find reflected housing values in an appropriate price range. Findings conclude that "the major cause of a reduction in housing satisfaction is the combined influence of the normative housing deficits and a reduction in neighborhood satisfaction" (Morris and Winter, 1978, p. 189).

Becker (1977b, p. 189) states that if one has a full range of available coping mechanisms and the present housing situation is different from the ideal, one will be satisfied with one's housing. Others who have limited coping mechanisms at hand will more often experience dissatisfaction if the present housing is not the ideal housing image. Again, this dissonance or dissatisfaction could be a result of the current housing being perceived as long term rather than short term (p. 182).

Morris and Winter (1978, p. 152) find there is a tendency for more lower income than middle income families to be satisfied with housing that has more deficits because the lack of money lowers expectations. This reduces the effect of income-caused deficits on perceived satisfaction.

Theoretically, the "most probable cause of reported satisfaction is a measure of the extent to which unfilled needs exist" (Morris and Winter, 1978, p. 153). These needs are "defined in terms of cultural norms. . . ." The researchers suggest that "reported satisfaction is expected to be low when an important need is not met" (p. 153).

Resultant perceptions of the housing facility is a part of the final product. This product, according to Riker (1956, p. 214), is the "students who have been helped to grow and to learn by living in an environment favorable to growth and learning." Saegert (1976, p. 222) has claimed in her studies that the issue is "to attempt to selectively limit the amount and types of stress the user . . . must experience." In order to build for a particular population, then, it is necessary to get input from those people who will be using that space.

User Needs Input

Becker (1977a, p. 100) states that a basic assumption on which environmental psychology rests supports the fact that buildings designed with user input are more satisfactory for their occupants than those built without it. For user participation processes to satisfy the human need to create and control one's surroundings, user

control of decisions is considered. He also finds that there is a significant correlation between the amount of student input in the original design of a facility and the satisfaction of currently enrolled students.

Davis and Roizen (1971) find that students arrive at the university with a wide variety of housing needs, and having a range of housing types on campus will result in satisfying more students than any one type would be able to, no matter how ideal.

The combination of architecture and behavioral science allows architectural forms to respond to behavior . . . the architect is able to control environmental factors which affect human behavior and . . . can more accurately satisfy user needs (p. 38).

Another research study (Perin, 1970, p. 134) states, "The social organization of the users is as much a fact as the physical organization of spaces and places." Obata (1962, pp. 58-59) indicates that the spaces between the buildings should be as important as the space within the buildings. To be successful, the building must not only provide for the basic needs but emotionally satisfy the people who use it.

Researchers give suggestions on how to gather input from those living in the dwelling units so as to attempt to improve living satisfaction. According to Riker (1956, p. 32), an assessment of the housing situation should be made which includes the examination of present and future space needs and potential outcome of the proposed housing for the institution as a whole. Good planning is based on organization, attention to detail, and cooperative team effort. Sims (1978, p. 490) suggests one should gather users in homogeneous groupings with similar environmental needs. These typical groupings may be based on characteristics such as the stage in life cycle or social class.

Shearer (1977, p. 7) expresses the need to recognize the characteristics of the environment which encourage conversation or influence the relationship between people and to let these serve as the bases for design decisions. Studying the characteristics of the environment or engaging user studies can be a valuable tool by which new facilities are built. According to Lee (1966, p. 57) housing in the past has been designed and built on the basis of what the builders think the housing dwellers may require.

There are problems, however, as Kurtz (1971, p. 41) mentions. He believes in evaluating a building from the user standpoint but concludes that the prospective residents are not participants in planning, construction, or administrative decisions. The transient nature of tenantry and its changing character may make it impossible or even undesirable from a planning standpoint. He also states that the exclusion has its consequences; the "passive resistance" from those who merely accept or reject their environment (p. 48). What seems to prevent creative alternatives is the transient nature of academics and passivity as a result of non-involvement in planning and administration.

Not until tenants decide to demand as much responsibility (not merely privilege) for their housing as students do for their education, will they start to become the clients for whom apartment blocks are built (Kurtz, 1971, p. 48).

With this interaction between the inhabitants and housing being reviewed, another kind of interaction is considered. This interaction occurs between the student and university housing.

University Housing

Hewes (1963, p. 78) states that housing is an important part of

the total institutional program because it affects the student's attitudes, behavior, and receptivity to academic life. Housing also affects the level of the student's identification with the college community.

It has only been in the last four decades that scientists have become aware of the role of housing. Even less research has been done regarding the housing facilities of the university environment and the married student population (Melson, Inman, and Kemp, 1978, p. 176).

Researchers are beginning to study the effects concerning the interaction between housing and the inhabitants. While researching man's immediate or primary living environment, it has been found that this environment influences man's feeling of security, group cohesiveness, and sense of place (Montgomery, 1969, p. 53). Researchers have often been unaware of the relationship between design and the consequences felt in the family's resultant perception of whether their values are being fulfilled or not. Fulfilling both the physical and psychological needs will ultimately contribute to the family's sense of belonging or place in the environment and will add a feeling of solidarity to the family (Montgomery, 1969, p. 55).

Davis and Roizen (1971) indicate if a basic threshold of user needs is met, individual architectural features are not the determinants of overall satisfaction.

It seems . . . that student feelings . . . come from his general image of the building; from his overall ideas about its character, mood, ethos. Specific features are to gripe about. The overall design and 'feel' is to like or dislike. Gripes about specific features are quite independent of overall satisfaction (p. 35).

Research (Lumpkin, 1969) shows that students have a complex relationship with their housing environment. It is the perceived adequacy or inadequacy which influences emotional stability and satisfaction with the university environment as well as the student's ability to perform academically (Lumpkin, 1969, p. 3). The student population is affected by the living environment and when looking at facilities for the student, the married student population must be considered.

University Married Student Housing

Despite widespread existence of planned and subsidized housing for married students, little research has been done on the married student population (Melson, Inman, and Kemp, 1978, p. 176). Oppelt (1965) states that the

. . . married . . . student has become a permanent and significant element on college campuses. Unfortunately, accurate information concerning the characteristics and behavior of this group is scarce (p. 228).

Married student housing is an ever-increasing common feature of universities in the United States and not very much is known concerning the association between housing characteristics and familial relations (Melson et al. 1978, p. 176). Perceived satisfaction toward one's living environment is expressed as a result of many variables. Melson et al. (1978) find that length of time in present housing is associated with increased dissatisfaction and perceived stress. They also suggest, however, that the students with children feel more and more burdened with their multiple role demands of spouse, parent, and student, no matter where they are residing.

Complaints regarding the housing unit, among married junior college students in northeastern Oklahoma, include inadequacy of space (Mann, 1972, p. 49). Other research (Chamblis, 1961, pp. 413-414) indicates that married students residing off campus envy those married students living on campus and feel they are being denied the advantages of those on campus. The off campus dwellers also feel exploited by the property owners. On the other hand, the university apartment dwellers have complaints regarding maintenance, fire hazards, sanitation, traffic, laundry facilities, and play areas. Some married students also indicate a willingness to accept any kind of housing if the rent is cheap (Chamblis, 1961, pp. 413-414).

Hutter (1969, p. 14) concludes that families in university apartments have their needs fulfilled by facilities close to home. Hutter (1969, pp. 9, 14) also finds that the common trait of student status among those residing in married student housing reinforces commitment as a student. At the same time, one residing in the student housing community feels more pressure to study and compete academically, even against neighbors.

Some characteristics show that married student families residing in university housing have fewer children per family than student families with children living in other housing facilities (Fink and Cooke, 1973, p. 42). Most couples, according to Moore, Forrest, and Hinkle (1972, p. 46), do not participate in or create permanent social organizations, and over half of all the spouses questioned say their best friends live outside of their married student housing facility. Dressel (1965, p. 922) and Rogers (1958, pp. 195-197) indicate that

married students participate at a minimal level in the program activities on campus. However, Rogers (1958, p. 198) concludes that less participation is not necessarily undesirable as married students may have an adequate social life of a different kind.

Moore et al. (1972) also reveal that the majority of married students residing in university-owned housing move there and stay there because of convenience (close to campus), and it is inexpensive (reasonable rent). Among their complaints are inadequate furnishings, poor design, and construction problems.

Apparently, the respondents did not move into university-owned housing with a primary aim of meeting their social needs, nor did they perceive social change in their community as a goal after arriving there (p. 42).

Conclusion

Chapter II reviewed the relationship between housing and perceived satisfaction with that housing. While attending the university it is considered important for the institution to provide adequate housing facilities in order to facilitate or enhance the student's adaptation to university life and academic performance.

When dealing with housing satisfaction one must assess whether or not the dwelling unit fulfills one's needs. Coping mechanisms or behavioral adaptations in varying degrees are engaged as a result. Applying a full range of coping mechanisms to perceived deficits in one's housing will result in more satisfaction than if one does not have access to as many coping mechanisms. Perceived spatial inadequacy shows that stress occurs both physiologically and

psychologically. Varying levels of spatial adequacy, consequently, influence feelings of satisfaction with one's living environment.

When planning new housing facilities such as married student housing it is considered important that an evaluation of the needs of the users of that space be done. Research finds that it is not the objective measures, i.e., architectural features, that determine overall satisfaction, but the attitudinal responses to the housing environment. These attitudinal responses change over time.

Dober (1968, p. 119) states that in volume, housing represents the largest single capital investment among the various types of buildings on campus. Not only has the issue of quantity and quality been discussed but whether or not the institutions have an obligation to provide housing as part of their academic purpose. The major trends in institutions that furnish housing involve an expansion of the institutional role of providing for the varying types of campus population through a diversity in the housing accommodations.

Oklahoma State University is presently engaged in a "feasibility study" with regard to a capital investment involving the replacement of a section of housing built after World War II that is being used as part of the married student housing facility. The study is economic in nature and is analyzing the impact of replacement of the housing facilities or accommodating married students in privately-owned rental apartments in the community.

Studying the impact of housing not only calls for an economic viewpoint, but a social-psychological perspective as well. There is a need for research to be done in this latter area, as the housing facilities may plan an important role in the life of the students.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The review of literature in Chapter II reflected the importance of studying the complex interaction between the housing facility and human behavior. The importance of assessing perceived satisfaction among married students regarding their rented living spaces in university-owned and privately-owned apartments was emphasized.

The purpose of this chapter will be to take a more in-depth look at the population that will be assessed. The type of research, sample selection, method of data collection, instrument development, and subsequent analysis will be explained.

Type of Research

The type of research chosen by the researcher for this study was the comparative descriptive study. There were two groups of married students that were to be assessed regarding socio-demographic factors of sex of respondent, family size, classification in school, tenure, and expected tenure in residence in their chosen living space. These groups resided in either university-owned married student housing rental apartments or in privately-owned rental apartments in the community of Stillwater. The difference between these two groups in the levels of satisfaction with one's living spaces was to be assessed and compared. The

comparative study was thought to be the most appropriate method to use in assessing perceived satisfaction.

Population and Sample

The sample for this research study was comprised of the married students that were enrolled at Oklahoma State University in the spring semester of 1979 and residing in Stillwater. The sample included the married students living in rented living spaces in university-owned and maintained married student housing apartments and those living in privately-owned apartments in the community of Stillwater.

The researcher submitted a letter requesting a record of all married student enrollment (Appendix A) and acquired a list of all married students enrolled at Oklahoma State University in the spring semester of 1979 from the Registrar's Office (Enrollment Statistics: Enrollment by Class, Sex, and Marital Status, p. 3). The population included a total of 3,947 married students. The researcher then requested of the Registrar's Office a print-out of the Student Information List for the reported telephone numbers of the enrolled married students in the spring semester of 1979. Any like telephone numbers were considered as one unit to minimize potentially similar input. Also eliminated were those married students who were graduating in May, 1979, International students (because of their varied backgrounds and perceptions regarding housing satisfaction), those leaving campus for the summer, and those students who were temporarily attending Oklahoma State University for only summer course work. The remaining

list of 1,589 telephone numbers was used to contact the married students in the summer semester of 1979.

The researcher pretested with eight respondents to determine the validity of the questionnaire. To obtain the eight interviews for the pilot study, it was necessary to call 51 telephone numbers via random selection. The researcher originally planned to get 15 interviews. Two more telephone numbers were added to the list to account for rejections. The sample of 1,589 telephone numbers was then divided by 17. This result indicated every 94th telephone number would be called. To obtain the eight actual contacts it was necessary to go three deep on each 94th telephone number. In other words, the 94th, 95th, 96th, 188th, 189th, 190th, etc. telephone numbers were called to obtain eight successful interviews. The pilot study is included in Appendix B. From the remaining 1,538 telephone numbers it was determined by committee members that a five percent sample would be sufficient, i.e., 77 interviews. At the pilot study rate of rejections of 51 telephone calls for eight interviews, it was necessary to design the random sample of potentially calling 491 telephone numbers. This was the equivalent of every third number on the list after beginning with the first one on the list. Each number was called three times at varying times of days, if an answer was not obtained the first or second call. No respondent refused to participate in the interview. Those respondents in the rejection category included those who owned their house or trailer home, were renting a house or duplex, were getting a divorce, not home after three calls, or had a disconnected telephone number.

To be chosen for this research, at least one member of the couple had to be enrolled as a student. Either a female or male married student was interviewed. In the case of both being a married student, the one answering the telephone was questioned.

Method of Data Collection

On the basis of previous methods used in analyzing perceived housing satisfaction, the researcher felt that an interview administered via the telephone was the best method for securing the data for the study. It was believed (Dilman, 1978) the telephone interview was the most financially efficient method for the researcher and would also reduce costs to the respondents, i.e., embarrassment over personal questions (Dilman, 1978, p. 230). It was thought that the respondent would feel less intimidated and answer more honestly because of relative anonymity.

The interview was conducted over the telephone with the married students between the hours of 9 a.m. and 10 p.m. It was believed that the residents would already have an overall opinion regarding their housing and its adequacy and interviewing at different times of the day would not significantly matter. Any meal or meal preparation time was avoided. If the married student was not at home, the telephone number was reserved and called again later, up to two more times.

Instrumentation

The structured interview schedule was designed by the researcher with regard to the housing environment and subsequent perceived

satisfaction with that environment. The interview schedule was structured to obtain measurement of basic socio-demographic characteristics of respondents, the reasons for choosing the present rental apartment, perceived satisfaction with one's interior rented living space, and satisfaction with the overall rental facility. The instrument was referred to as the Perceived Satisfaction Assessment (P.S.A.).

The development of the instrument involved a pilot questionnaire administered via the telephone to eight married students chosen by random selection. The responses were analyzed for clarity and revisions were made where needed.

To collect data for the telephone questionnaire, the researcher asked to speak with the married student. The researcher introduced herself to the party on the telephone and explained that she was a graduate student who was collecting data from married students at Oklahoma State University, who resided in the on campus married student housing apartments and in the off campus community rental apartments. It was then explained to the respondent that he or she was part of a carefully selected sample and that his or her opinions were valuable in obtaining information regarding the satisfaction with their rented living space. Privacy of all answers was assured and it was explained that the grouped and coded data would later be destroyed.

The structured telephone interview was administered which included obtaining brief socio-demographic characteristics, perceptions regarding the interior of the rental apartment, reasons for choosing the rental unit, and questions related to fulfillment of needs or perceived housing adequacy. Each interview was recorded on an answer

sheet with preplanned coding. After the interview was completed, the researcher expressed her appreciation for the respondent's sharing of time and information. The telephone interview was coded and transferred onto a computer program for analysis. The survey instrument is listed in Appendix C.

Data Analysis

The researcher used frequency tables, percentages, and the chi-square test (χ^2) in order to determine differences between the two sample groups related to perceived levels of satisfaction and reasons for the selection of the rental unit.

Summary

Chapter III discussed the comparative descriptive type of research that was done. There were two groups of married students who were interviewed and satisfaction with their rented living space was assessed. The sample selection dealt with those married students enrolled in the spring of 1979 at Oklahoma State University. Interviews were done via the telephone with 77 respondents. Questions dealt with demographic information, choices of apartments, reasons for their apartment selection and resultant satisfaction with those choices. The analysis of the data was done by means of frequencies, percentages, and chi-square (χ^2) tests.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

Chapter IV presents the data analysis for this study. The data were analyzed by means of frequencies, percentages, and chi-square tests. The acceptable alpha level for significance was $p < .05$. Analysis of the basic socio-demographic characteristics showed that there was a much larger proportion of males than females interviewed, and that over 60 percent of the interviewees resided in the university-owned married student housing apartments (m.s.h.). All of the m.s.h. apartments had four rooms excluding the bathroom, were furnished, and had utilities included in the rent payment. Rent payments for the entire sample ranged from \$80.00 to \$325.00, with an average rent payment being \$175.00. The majority of respondents indicated they had no children. The respondent was usually an undergraduate student who lived in a four room apartment, excluding the bathroom. Almost all of the respondents had some of their own furniture in the apartment with them. Over half had lived in their present apartment for a year or more, with about half of the sample planning to move in another year or more.

Analysis

The null form of each hypothesis was analyzed by chi-square. Each

hypothesis will be presented with the analysis following.

H_{o1} : There will be no significant difference in selected socio-demographic factors of sex of respondent, family size, student classification, tenure, and expected tenure in residence, between married students residing in university-owned apartments and privately-owned community rental apartments.

Selected socio-demographic factors considered sex of respondent, family size, student classification, apartment size, length of residence in the apartment, and expected amount of time left before moving from the apartment. From the sample of 77, 49 (63.64 percent) of the respondents lived in m.s.h. apartments and 28 (36.36 percent) lived in community apartments.

Thirty-six (73.5 percent) males responded from m.s.h. and 21 (75 percent) males responded from the community (Table I). This study consisted of a larger percent of males responding than females. A χ^2 value of .02 was not found to be significant at the .05 level when considering the difference between the residents of m.s.h. and community housing regarding sex of respondent.

Findings indicated there were 30 (61.2 percent) m.s.h. residents and 19 (67.9 percent) community residents who had no children. Those who stated they had one child or more included 19 (38.8 percent) m.s.h. and 9 (32.1 percent) community residents. A χ^2 value of .35 showed no significant difference for number of children between the respondents in m.s.h. and community housing at the .05 level.

Findings indicated about two-thirds of each housing group were undergraduates enrolled in the university. There were 31 (63.3 percent) m.s.h. and 16 (57.1 percent) community respondents who were undergraduates with 18 (36.7 percent) m.s.h. and 12 (42.9 percent)

community respondents who were classified as graduate or special students. A χ^2 value of .78 showed no significant difference in the student classification between the respondents in m.s.h. and those in community housing.

TABLE I
CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC
FACTORS BY HOUSING TYPE

Variable	n	%	n	%	χ^2
<u>Sex</u>					
		Male		Female	
M.S.H.	36	(73.5)	13	(26.5)	.02
Community	21	(75.0)	7	(25.0)	
<u>No. of Children</u>		None		1+	
M.S.H.	30	(61.2)	19	(38.8)	.35
Community	19	(67.9)	9	(32.1)	
<u>Student Class.</u>		U.G.		Grad.	
M.S.H.	31	(63.3)	18	(36.7)	.78
Community	16	(57.1)	12	(42.9)	
<u>Own Furniture?</u>		Yes		No	
M.S.H.	41	(83.7)	8	(16.3)	.17
Community	26	(92.9)	2	(7.1)	

It was indicated that 41 (83.7 percent) of the m.s.h. residents and 26 (92.9 percent) of the community residents had some of their own furniture in the apartment with them. Only eight (16.3 percent) m.s.h. residents and two (7.1 percent) community residents stated they did

not have any of their own furniture in the apartment with them. The difference between the m.s.h. and community housing groups in their responses to owning furniture was not significant at the .05 level.

The last two factors involved in H_{07} were related to the length of time the renter had lived in the apartment (Table II) and how much longer he/she planned to live there (Table III). There were 35 (71.4 percent) m.s.h. and 12 (42.9 percent) community residents who had lived in their present apartment for at least one year (Table II). Fourteen (28.6 percent) m.s.h. and 16 (57.1 percent) community residents stated they had lived in their present apartment for less than one year. The difference between the m.s.h. and community housing groups in apartment tenure was significant at .05 with a χ^2 value of 6.11.

TABLE II
CHI-SQUARE VALUE FOR LENGTH OF TENURE
BY HOUSING TYPE

Housing Type	Length of Tenure				χ^2
	<1 year		≥1 year		
	n	%	n	%	
M.S.H.	14	(28.6)	35	(71.4)	6.11*
Community	16	(57.1)	12	(42.9)	

*Significant at .05 level.

TABLE III
 CHI-SQUARE VALUE FOR PLANS TO MOVE
 BY HOUSING TYPE

Housing Type	Plans to Move				χ^2
	<1 year		≥1 year		
	n	%	n	%	
M.S.H.	20	(40.8)	29	(59.2)	3.92*
Community	18	(64.3)	10	(35.7)	

*Significant at .05 level.

Table III shows there were 29 (59.2 percent) m.s.h. and 10 (35.7 percent) community residents who planned to move out of their present apartment in a year or more. Those who planned to move in less than one year included 20 (40.8 percent) m.s.h. and 18 (64.3 percent) community respondents. The difference between the m.s.h. and community housing groups in planning to move was found to be significant at the .05 level, with a χ^2 value of 3.92.

The previous discussion included basic socio-demographic factors regarding the sample of m.s.h. residents and community residents. There were no significant differences between the groups in terms of sex of respondent, family size, student classification, and if the respondents had any of their own furniture in the apartment (Table I). However, there were significant differences ($p < .05$) between groups related to how long the respondents had lived in their present apartment and how much longer they planned on living there. A larger

proportion of m.s.h. residents than community residents had lived in their apartment for a year or more and were planning to live there another year or more. These significant differences should be viewed as trends, since the small sample of community residents may have influenced the validity of the statistical test. From the findings cited above, the first null hypothesis was partially rejected.

The second null hypothesis was designed to determine reasons and analyze importance of selected variables in apartment selection.

Ho₂: There will be no significant difference in the reasons for choosing university-owned apartments (on campus) or privately-owned community rental apartments (off campus) between the married students residing in married student housing and those residing in privately-owned community apartments.

Certain variables were involved when choosing an apartment.

Those variables pertaining to the apartment in this study included cost, rules, size, recreational facilities, social environment, and maintenance. Other variables considered were neighbors, neighborhood, a furnished apartment, and location. Information regarding major reasons of apartment selection was gathered by asking an open-ended question. A rating scale from 1 to 5 was utilized to collect some of the data. A rating of 1 was very unimportant, 2 was unimportant, 3 was neutral, 4 was important, and 5 was very important. The categories of the variables were later collapsed for analysis due to the small sample size where a rating of 1, 2, and 3 became the unimportant to neutral category and 4 and 5 became the important category. The researcher felt a neutral response (3) reflected an unimportant status rather than important status in the interviewee's response.

Those factors not found to be significant at the .05 level regarding the rating of certain variables in apartment selection included cost, regulations and rules, size, recreational facilities, social environment, and maintenance (Table IV).

TABLE IV
CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC
VARIABLES WHEN CHOOSING AN APARTMENT
BY HOUSING TYPE

Variable	Unimportant		Important		χ^2
	n	%	n	%	
<u>Cost</u>					
M.S.H.	3	(6.1)	46	(93.0)	.5
Community	3	(10.7)	25	(89.3)	
<u>Regulations & Rules</u>					
M.S.H.	39	(79.6)	10	(20.4)	.71
Community	20	(71.4)	8	(28.6)	
<u>Size</u>					
M.S.H.	27	(55.0)	22	(45.0)	.51
Community	13	(46.4)	15	(53.6)	
<u>Recreational Facilities</u>					
M.S.H.	37	(75.5)	12	(24.5)	1.11
Community	24	(85.7)	4	(14.3)	
<u>Social Environment</u>					
M.S.H.	41	(83.7)	8	(16.3)	.37
Community	22	(78.6)	6	(21.4)	
<u>Maintenance</u>					
M.S.H.	13	(26.5)	36	(73.5)	.71
Community	10	(35.7)	18	(64.3)	

Of the 49 m.s.h. residents, 46 (93 percent) considered cost important when choosing an apartment, while 25 (89.3 percent) community residents responded that cost was important. When considering the regulations and rules of their apartment there were 39 (79.6 percent) responses of unimportant from the m.s.h. group and 20 (71.4 percent) responses of unimportant from the community group. The findings again indicated a non-significant difference between the m.s.h. and community housing groups when rating size of apartment. The sample was divided in about half when rating importance of apartment size. There was a slightly larger percentage of m.s.h. respondents than community respondents that thought apartment size was unimportant.

When responding to the importance of recreational facilities, 37 (75.5 percent) m.s.h. residents felt these facilities were unimportant, while 24 (85.7 percent) community residents responded that the facilities were unimportant. Recreational facilities were unimportant to a large percentage in both groups. There were 41 (83.7 percent) responses of unimportant among the m.s.h. residents and 22 (78.6 percent) among community residents when they considered the social environment in their choice of apartment. Again, there was a larger percentage in both groups who responded that the social environment was unimportant. When rating the importance of maintenance in choosing an apartment, the majority from each group stated that it was important. Thirty-six (73.5 percent) m.s.h. and 18 (64.3 percent) community respondents thought maintenance was important in their apartment choice.

The previous findings cited were not significant at the .05 level. These included cost, regulations and rules, size, recreational

facilities, social environment, and maintenance. The following discussion will reflect those variables which were significant at the .05 level. Those variables included neighbors, neighborhood, a furnished apartment, and location (Table V).

TABLE V
CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR IMPORTANCE OF NEIGHBORS,
NEIGHBORHOOD, A FURNISHED APARTMENT, AND
LOCATION WHEN CHOOSING AN APARTMENT
BY HOUSING TYPE

Variable	Unimportant		Important		χ^2
	n	%	n	%	
<u>Neighbors</u>					
M.S.H.	47	(95.9)	2	(4.1)	11.52*
Community	19	(67.9)	9	(32.1)	
<u>Neighborhood</u>					
M.S.H.	38	(77.55)	11	(22.45)	19.11*
Community	10	(35.7)	18	(64.3)	
<u>Furnished</u>					
M.S.H.	17	(34.7)	32	(65.3)	9.8*
Community	20	(71.4)	8	(28.6)	
<u>Location</u>					
M.S.H.	7	(14.3)	42	(85.7)	5.83*
Community	11	(39.3)	17	(60.7)	

*Significant at .05 level.

When choosing an apartment, the consideration of neighbors was unimportant to a larger percentage of the m.s.h. group with 47 (95.9

percent) who claimed that stance (Table V). There were 19 (67.9 percent) community dwellers who stated neighbors were unimportant, while 9 (32.1 percent) said they were important. Neighbors were considered as an important factor to a larger percentage of the community residents than the m.s.h. residents. The χ^2 value of 11.52 showed a significant difference between the m.s.h. and community housing groups regarding the importance of neighbors.

A significant difference at the .05 level was also found between the m.s.h. and community groups related to the importance of neighborhood in apartment selection (Table V). The χ^2 value was 19.11. Neighborhood was considered unimportant by a larger percentage of the m.s.h. group than the community group. There were 38 (77.55 percent) from the m.s.h. groups who stated neighborhood was unimportant, while 11 (22.45 percent) stated it was important. Among the community dwellers there were 10 (35.7 percent) who claimed neighborhood to be unimportant, while 18 (64.3 percent) felt neighborhood to be important in their choice of apartment.

Among the m.s.h. group there were 17 (34.7 percent) who stated that a furnished apartment was unimportant, while 32 (65.3 percent) m.s.h. dwellers thought a furnished apartment was important. Community responses included 20 (71.4 percent) unimportant and 8 (28.6 percent) important responses. A larger percentage of m.s.h. residents felt a furnished apartment was important, while a larger percentage of community residents felt a furnished apartment was unimportant. The χ^2 value of 9.8 for the difference between the m.s.h. and community housing groups when rating the importance of a furnished apartment

was significant at the .05 level. The m.s.h. apartments all were furnished and 83.7 percent of the m.s.h. residents owned furniture.

When location of apartment was rated, a larger percentage of m.s.h. respondents thought location of apartment was important. There were 42 (85.7 percent) m.s.h. respondents who felt location was important and 17 (60.7 percent) community residents who felt it was important. There were only 7 (14.3 percent) m.s.h. dwellers who stated location was unimportant, while 11 (39.3 percent) community dwellers stated location was unimportant in their choice of apartment. The χ^2 value of 5.83 for the difference between the m.s.h. and community housing groups when rating the importance of location of apartment was significant at the .05 level.

Table IV reflected many non-significant findings at the .05 level. Those included in this category were cost, regulations and rules, size, recreational facilities, social environment, and maintenance. Table V illustrated those findings that were significant at the .05 level. Table V showed the rating of specific variables regarding unimportant or important status according to the interviewee's reply. Those included in this category were neighbors, neighborhood, a furnished apartment, and location of apartment. Validity of χ^2 values may be questionable, due to the small sample size.

The following discussion was designed to show the respondents' reasons for their apartment selection. They responded to an open-end question and gave their first reason for apartment selection (Table VI). The findings showed a significant difference between the m.s.h. and community housing groups.

TABLE VI
CHI-SQUARE VALUE FOR THE FIRST REASON FOR
APARTMENT SELECTION BY HOUSING TYPE

First Reason	n	%
<u>Location</u>		
M.S.H.	24	(49.0)
Community	13	(46.4)
<u>Cost</u>		
M.S.H.	24	(49.0)
Community	8	(28.6)
<u>Other</u>		
M.S.H.	1	(2.0)
Community	7	(25.0)

Note: $\chi^2=10.32$; significant at .05 level.

When the respondents considered their main reason for selecting an apartment, location was first. There were 24 (49 percent) m.s.h. and 13 (46.4 percent) community dwellers who claimed location was the first factor in their choice. There were also 24 (49 percent) m.s.h. and 8 (28.6 percent) community dwellers who claimed cost was their main reason for selecting their apartment. There were 7 (25 percent) community respondents and 1 (2 percent) m.s.h. respondent who identified "other" reasons which included apartment size and maintenance. The χ^2 value of 10.32 for the difference between residents of m.s.h. and community housing in terms of reasons for choosing the apartment was found to be significant at the .05 level.

The previous discussion concerned the variables involved when selecting an apartment. Those factors which were not found to differ

significantly at the .05 level between the m.s.h. and community housing groups included the rating of cost, regulations and rules, size, recreational facilities, social environment, and maintenance. Those variables considered significant at the .05 level included the rating of neighbors, neighborhood, a furnished apartment, location, and the main reason given by the respondent for their apartment selection. With these significant findings it must be acknowledged that the sample size was small, although trends may be seen. With the findings cited above, the second null hypothesis was partially rejected.

Ho₃: There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of housing satisfaction between married students who live in the university-owned and privately-owned community rental apartments.

Information regarding resident satisfaction after moving and living there for awhile was gathered. A rating scale from 1 to 5 was also utilized to collect some of the data. A rating of 1 was very unspacious or dissatisfied, 2 was unspacious or dissatisfied, 3 was neutral, 4 was spacious or satisfied, and 5 was very spacious or satisfied. The variable categories were later collapsed for analysis, due to the small sample size where a rating of 1, 2, and 3 became the unspacious or dissatisfied to neutral category and 4 and 5 became the spacious or satisfied category. The researcher felt a neutral response (3) reflected an unspacious or dissatisfied status in the interviewee's response. Information regarding place of study, apartment complex management, fulfillment of needs, basic likes or dislikes about the living space, location preference, and present living conditions were also analyzed.

Data regarding the location of where students liked to study revealed a significant difference between the m.s.h. and community housing respondents at the .05 level. The χ^2 value was 12.63 (Table VII).

TABLE VII
CHI-SQUARE VALUE FOR THE REASONS OF STUDY
LOCATION PREFERENCE BY HOUSING TYPE

Housing Type	Quiet		Convenient	
	n	%	n	%
<u>M.S.H.</u> Study at home	13	(26.5)	24	(49.0)
<u>M.S.H.</u> Study on campus	8	(16.3)	4	(8.2)
<u>Community</u> Study at home	4	(14.3)	14	(50.0)
<u>Community</u> Study on campus	8	(28.6)	2	(7.1)

Note: $\chi^2=12.63$; significant at .05 level.

When asked where they liked to study, 24 (49 percent) m.s.h. residents stated they liked to study at home because of convenience, which included "family involvement." Of the same group, 13 (26.5 percent) stated it was quiet at home. This included the responses "less distractions" and feelings of "privacy." Fifty percent (14) of the community respondents said they liked to study at home because of

convenience, which again included "family involvement." There was a larger percentage of m.s.h. respondents who preferred to study at home. Of those respondents who liked to study on campus, many felt it was quieter on campus and that there were less distractions on campus.

Additional data were obtained to show where the respondent studied when at home and findings revealed no significant difference between the m.s.h. and community respondents at the .05 level. The χ^2 value was 2.69. Twenty-six (53 percent) m.s.h. residents studied at a table. The rest studied on a sofa, recliner, or bed. There were 11 (39.3 percent) community respondents who studied at a desk, while 9 (32.1 percent) said they studied at a table. The remaining respondents studied on a sofa, recliner, or bed.

The previous discussion revealed a significant difference between m.s.h. and community residents when asked where they preferred to study, but no significant findings occurred between the m.s.h. and community respondents when stating where they studied when inside their apartment. The following discussion included information regarding perceptions of apartment spaciousness, management, maintenance, satisfaction with the apartment, and needs fulfilled by the apartment. A rating of unspacious or dissatisfied versus spacious or satisfied was utilized (Table VIII). None of these five findings were significant at the .05 level.

Over half of the m.s.h. and community residents found their apartment to be non-spacious (Table VIII). There were 31 (63.3 percent) m.s.h. and 17 (60.7 percent) community respondents who stated

their apartment was not spacious, which reflected a non-significant difference between the m.s.h. and community respondents.

TABLE VIII
CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR PERCEPTION OF SPECIFIC
VARIABLES RELATED TO THE APARTMENT
BY HOUSING TYPE

Variable	n	%	n	%	χ^2
<u>Apartment Spaciousness</u>	Non-Spacious		Spacious		
M.S.H.	31	(63.3)	18	(36.7)	.05
Community	17	(60.7)	11	(39.3)	
<u>Management</u>	Dissatisfied		Satisfied		
M.S.H.	14	(28.6)	35	(71.4)	.42
Community	10	(35.7)	18	(64.3)	
<u>Maintenance</u>					
M.S.H.	8	(16.3)	41	(83.7)	.82
Community	7	(25.0)	21	(75.0)	
<u>Apartment Satisfaction</u>					
M.S.H.	13	(26.5)	36	(73.5)	.03
Community	7	(25.0)	21	(75.0)	
<u>Needs Fulfillment</u>					
M.S.H.	12	(24.5)	37	(75.5)	1.9
Community	11	(39.3)	17	(60.7)	

When rating the management of their apartment complex, 35 (71.4 percent) from m.s.h. felt satisfied, while 18 (64.3 percent) community respondents were satisfied. Most from both the m.s.h. (83.7 percent) and community (75 percent) groups stated they were satisfied with the maintenance. Again, most from the m.s.h. and community groups stated

they were satisfied with their apartment and that it fulfilled their perceived needs.

The previous discussion was concerned with the rating of five variables related to the apartment to determine satisfaction with one's living space. Those variables which did not differ significantly ($p < .05$) between the two housing types included apartment spaciousness, management, maintenance done by the management, satisfaction with the apartment, and needs fulfillment by the living space.

The next findings were also found not to be significant at the .05 level. A χ^2 value of .03 for the first finding indicated there was not a significant difference between the m.s.h. and community housing groups when asked if they were now living in worse, the same, or better conditions than previous housing conditions. Twenty-four (49 percent) m.s.h. and 15 (53.6 percent) community respondents thought they were living in better conditions than their previous living space. Fifteen (30.6 percent) m.s.h. and 8 (28.6 percent) community respondents believed they were living in worse conditions than their previous dwelling.

The residents then stated their major like of the present arrangement. This was asked in the form of an open-end question and there were 77 responses (Table IX). From the m.s.h. group, 22 (45 percent) said they liked their apartment location, while 11 (22.4 percent) said they liked the size of the apartment. There were 9 (32.1 percent) community respondents who stated their major like was management, maintenance, or building construction, which was placed in an "other" category. There were 8 (28.6 percent) community

respondents who stated they liked the size of their apartment. The χ^2 value of 5.99 indicated there was not a significant difference at the .05 level between the m.s.h. and community housing group when determining a major like regarding the apartment.

TABLE IX
CHI-SQUARE VALUE FOR THE MAJOR LIKE OF THE
APARTMENT BY HOUSING TYPE

Housing Type	Location		Size		Cost		Other		χ^2
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
M.S.H.	22	(45.0)	11	(22.4)	10	(20.4)	6	(12.2)	
Community	7	(25.0)	8	(28.6)	4	(14.3)	9	(32.1)	5.99

The interviewees were given a chance to respond to an open-end question regarding the major dislike of the apartment. All 77 respondents stated one major dislike (Table X).

The most frequent complaint among the m.s.h. group was management, which included maintenance and furnishings. There were 19 (38.8 percent) m.s.h. residents who stated management as a major complaint, while 12 (24.5 percent) m.s.h. claimed building construction or outside facilities which were classified as "other." Among the community group there were 11 (39.3 percent) complaints, which included cost,

building construction, or outside facilities. A χ^2 value of 4.69 indicated there was no significant difference at the .05 level between the m.s.h. and community housing residents when stating their major apartment dislike.

TABLE X
CHI-SQUARE VALUE FOR THE MAJOR DISLIKE OF
THE APARTMENT BY HOUSING TYPE

Housing Type	Size		Management		Location		Other		χ^2
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
M.S.H.	11	(22.4)	19	(38.8)	7	(14.3)	12	(24.5)	
Community	4	(14.3)	6	(21.4)	7	(25.0)	11	(39.3)	4.69

The respondents were given a chance to express where they would prefer to live (Table XI). Results of this data could possibly reflect perceptions of satisfaction with the present apartment. Of the m.s.h. respondents, there were 26 (53 percent) who preferred to stay where they were. Twenty-three (47 percent) m.s.h. dwellers wanted to move into an off campus community apartment. There were 17 (60.7 percent) community dwellers who preferred to stay off campus in the community where they were. Of the 49 m.s.h. dwellers, 21 (42.9 percent) preferred to stay on campus in m.s.h. because of the location of their

apartment in relation to classes. There were 23 (46.9 percent) m.s.h. dwellers who said they would prefer to move to a community apartment off campus. Nine reasons (18.4 percent) given by the m.s.h. residents were management-maintenance related and 8 (16.3 percent) preferred the environmental variety or "nicer looks" of the community apartments.

TABLE XI

CHI-SQUARE VALUE FOR THE PREFERENCE OF M.S.H.
APARTMENTS OR OFF CAMPUS COMMUNITY
APARTMENTS BY HOUSING TYPE

Housing Type	Location		Management		Other		Total n
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Presently <u>on</u> Campus Prefer <u>on</u> Campus	21	(42.9)	3	(6.1)	2	(4.1)	26
Presently <u>on</u> Campus Prefer <u>off</u> Campus	6	(12.2)	9	(18.4)	8	(16.3)	23
Presently <u>off</u> Campus Prefer <u>on</u> Campus	11	(39.3)	0	0	0	0	11
Presently <u>off</u> Campus Prefer <u>off</u> Campus	8	(28.5)	4	(14.3)	5	(17.9)	17
Total N	46		16		15		77

Note: $\chi^2=24.19$; significant at .05 level.

Among those respondents in the community apartments (off campus), 11 (39.3 percent) preferred to move to the m.s.h. facilities on campus because of the m.s.h. location to classes (Table XI). There were 17 (60.7 percent) respondents who preferred to stay in their present community apartments. Eight (28.5 percent) of these responses were location because of privacy, neighborhood, and "less crowding overall." Five (17.9 percent) responses in the category referred to as "other" included "environmental variety," "less standardization," and "nicer looking." There was a larger percentage of community residents than m.s.h. residents, although over half from each housing group, who wanted to stay where they were presently living. The χ^2 value of 24.19 indicated there was a significant difference at the .05 level between the m.s.h. and community residents when expressing where they would prefer to live.

The previous discussion included findings regarding H_{03} and much of the data were not significant at the .05 level. Those findings that indicated there were not significant differences between the m.s.h. and community residents included study location when inside the apartment, perceived apartment spaciousness, management, maintenance, satisfaction with apartment, and whether the apartment fulfilled the resident's needs. Other non-significant findings included present versus previous living conditions, major like and major dislike regarding the apartment. Significant findings included preference of study location and where the respondent preferred to live. With the citations above the third null hypothesis was partially rejected.

Chapter IV was designed to present and analyze the data for this study. The first null hypothesis was in regard to the differences between socio-demographic factors of the m.s.h. and community residents. The second null hypothesis was concerned with the reasons for apartment choice and differences between the m.s.h. and community residents in those choices. The third null hypothesis was designed to determine the differences in housing satisfaction between the m.s.h. and community residents. All three null hypotheses were partially rejected due to both significant and non-significant findings.

Those findings that indicated a significant difference at the .05 level between the m.s.h. and community housing residents included the following: length of tenure in apartment, expected moving date, importance or unimportance of neighbors, neighborhood, a furnished apartment and location when choosing an apartment, and the main reason for original apartment selection. Other significant findings included study location preference and the reason for their preference for apartment location.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine if differences existed between married students residing in university-owned apartments and those residing in privately-owned community rental apartments in terms of selected socio-demographic factors of sex of respondents, family size, student classification, length of tenure and expected length of tenure in residence, rent, utilities, apartment size, and whether the apartment was furnished. The study also examined differences in the reasons for choosing university-owned apartments (on campus) or privately-owned community rental apartments (off campus). Differences in perceptions of housing satisfaction between the married students living in privately-owned rental apartments, in the community were also determined. At the time this study was being designed, Oklahoma State University was studying the economic feasibility of replacing a section of the older married student housing apartments.

The method used in this research was a comparative descriptive study with data collected via telephone interview. The data source consisted of married students enrolled at Oklahoma State University in the spring semester and who had a telephone number on record. The interview schedule was designed to measure socio-demographic characteristics, the importance of variables in choosing an apartment, and

perceived satisfaction with those choices. Data were collected in June, 1979. Students in the sample were selected at random and assured anonymity. The sample included 49 married students residing in married student housing facilities and 28 married students residing off campus in privately-owned community apartments. Chi-square was utilized for the analysis of the data, using $p < .05$ as the accepted significance level. Statistical validity was questionable, due to the small cell size.

Conclusions

The following discussion will summarize the three null hypotheses and will present conclusions about the findings in this research study. The first null hypothesis was in regard to basic socio-demographic factors of the two groups in the sample. Significant differences that occurred between residents in married student housing apartments and community apartments included how long the residents had lived in the present apartment and how much longer they planned on living there. There was a larger percentage of m.s.h. residents than community residents who had lived in their present apartment at least a year. When determining how much longer the respondent planned to live in the present apartment, over half of the m.s.h. residents planned to move in a year or more, while over half of the community residents planned to move in less than one year.

The two groups did not differ significantly in terms of sex of respondent, number of children, student classification, and whether the resident owned his or her own furniture. The largest percentage

from both the m.s.h. and community groups were childless and owned some furniture. Research (Fink and Cooke, 1973, p. 42) showed that married students in m.s.h. had fewer children per family than those married students in other housing facilities. This study was concerned with the difference between the m.s.h. group and community group in having or not having a family and found no difference in the variable of one child or more per family.

It was concluded that there were many more similarities than differences between the m.s.h. and community residents, related to socio-demographic characteristics. The only difference which occurred was that most of the m.s.h. respondents said they had lived in their apartment for at least one year and they planned to live there for at least another year. Most of the community respondents stated they had lived in their apartment less than one year and planned to move in less than one year.

The second null hypothesis was designed to analyze differences in reasons for apartment choice. There was a significant difference between the m.s.h. and community group in the importance of neighbors, neighborhood, a furnished apartment, and location. More m.s.h. respondents thought neighbors and neighborhood were unimportant when making an apartment selection. Other research that supported this (Moore, Forrest, and Hinkle, 1972, p. 46) found that over half of the m.s.h. residents stated their best friends lived outside of the m.s.h. facility. When considering a furnished apartment there was a larger percentage of m.s.h. respondents who thought it was important to have a furnished apartment.

Location was considered to be important to a larger percentage of the m.s.h. group than the community group. This study was supported by findings (Moore et al., 1972, p. 42) that indicated students in university-owned housing moved there and stayed there because it was close to campus.

A significant difference between the m.s.h. and community respondents occurred when stating why the apartment was chosen. It was found that location and cost were the main reasons given, although more m.s.h. residents mentioned cost than did the community respondents. No data determining the difference in rent payment between the m.s.h. and community group were gathered although research (Chambelis, 1961, pp. 413-414) indicated some married students were willing to accept any kind of housing if the rent was cheap.

Differences that occurred revealed more m.s.h. respondents than community respondents considered neighbors and neighborhood unimportant when choosing an apartment. There were more m.s.h. respondents than community respondents who felt a furnished apartment close to campus was important. Location and cost were mentioned by more m.s.h. residents than community residents when stating reason for apartment selection.

Non-significant differences showed that most respondents from the m.s.h. and community groups felt regulations and rules, recreational facilities, and social environment were unimportant factors when making an apartment selection. Some research (Dressel, 1965, p. 912 and Rogers, 1958, pp. 195-199) supporting this study indicated that married students participate at a minimal level in activities on campus,

but less participation (Rogers, 1958, p. 198) may mean the married student has a social life of a different kind. Other research (Moore et al., 1972, p. 42) agreed that respondents did not move into university-owned housing with a primary aim of meeting social needs and that social change was not a goal after arriving there.

Cost and maintenance were not significantly different, being important to most respondents. Apartment size was unimportant to more m.s.h. residents than community residents.

The findings of the second null hypothesis revealed a significant difference between the m.s.h. and community respondents when rating certain variables. A larger percentage of the m.s.h. residents than community residents thought location near campus, cost, and a furnished apartment were important. A larger percentage of the m.s.h. group than community group thought neighbors and neighborhood were unimportant when making an apartment selection.

There were similarities between the m.s.h. and community group when considering other variables. Those variables considered important by most respondents included cost and maintenance, while regulations and rules, recreational facilities, and social environment were considered unimportant. About half from each of the m.s.h. and community groups considered apartment size important when selecting an apartment.

The third null hypothesis was designed to examine differences in perceptions of housing satisfaction. A significant difference occurred when reporting preference of study location. Most of the respondents from m.s.h. preferred to study at home because of convenience.

The other difference included where the resident would prefer to live. A larger percentage of the community residents preferred to stay in their present apartment location.

There were many differences that were not significant when determining housing satisfaction. Most of the respondents felt their apartment was not spacious. More residents from the m.s.h. group than the community group complained of apartment size. Other research (Mann, 1972, p. 49) supported this study when it found that married students complained of the inadequacy of space. Again, most of the residents were satisfied with the management and maintenance of their apartment. They also felt satisfied with their apartment, while more of the m.s.h. respondents than community respondents felt the apartment fulfilled their needs. Other research supported these findings. Hutter (1969, p. 14) concluded families in university apartments had their needs fulfilled by facilities close to home.

Most of the respondents also believed they were living in better conditions than their previous living space, rather than the same conditions or worse. The largest proportion of community residents reported they liked the management, maintenance, and building construction which were included in the category referred to as "other."

Complaints from the m.s.h. group included apartment size, management, and location. Management included maintenance and furnishings. Other research supporting this study also found (Chamblis, 1961, pp. 413-414) the m.s.h. dwellers complained of maintenance, and that the off campus dwellers felt exploited by the management. Other complaints voiced by the m.s.h. and community groups included building

construction and outside facilities. Some research agreed with these findings (Moore et al., 1972, p. 42) in the conclusions that married students in m.s.h. facilities complained of poor design and construction problems.

Differences occurred when more of the m.s.h. group reported having lived in their apartment at least one year with plans to live there at least another year. Most respondents claimed to prefer studying at home. When making an apartment selection, neighbors and neighborhood were more often considered unimportant among the m.s.h. group than among the community group. On the other hand, having a furnished apartment near campus was more frequently important to the m.s.h. respondents than the community respondent. It appeared the respondents from the m.s.h. and community groups had chosen their location and were satisfied with that choice. Both the m.s.h. and community groups considered location and cost important when making an apartment selection and over half from the m.s.h. group and over half from the community group preferred to stay in the apartment location they had chosen and were presently living in.

Recommendations

It is recommended by the author that:

1. A similar study using a larger sample be conducted during the academic school year to have a more representative sample.
2. A study be conducted to examine cultural differences related to housing perceptions and satisfaction.

3. A similar study be conducted asking specific questions about apartment size, neighbors, and management.

4. A similar study be conducted to investigate why a particular response was given.

It is recommended to Oklahoma State University that:

1. The new married student housing apartments be both furnished and unfurnished.

2. The new apartments should be constructed in several different square footage arrangements.

3. Storage facilities be constructed.

4. The new apartments should have the utility bills separated from the rent payment.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahlbrandt, R. S., and Brophy, P. C. Management--an important element of the housing environment. Environment and Behavior, 1976, 8(4), 505-526.
- Altman, I. The Environment and Social Behavior. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1975.
- Becker, F. D. Design for Living--The Resident's View of Multi-Family Housing. Ithaca, N.Y.: Center for Urban Development Research, Cornell University, 1974.
- Becker, F. D. The impact of different amounts of student participation in the original design of dormitories on satisfaction of subsequent generations of students. In F. D. Becker, S. Ashworth, D. Beaver, and D. Poe (Eds.), User Participation, Personalization, and Environmental Meaning: Three Field Studies. Ithaca, N.Y.: Program in Urban and Regional Studies, Cornell University, 1977a.
- Becker, F. D. Social-psychological consequences of living in less than ideal housing: A comparison of occupants' coping strategies in single family tract and public housing. In F. D. Becker, with S. Ashworth, D. Beaver, and D. Poe (Eds.), User Participation, Personalization, and Environmental Meaning: Three Field Studies. Ithaca, N.Y.: Program in Urban and Regional Studies. Cornell University, 1977b, 163-239.
- Bennett, C. Spaces for People. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Beyer, G. H. Housing and Society. N.Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1965.
- Bixenstine, R. S. Psychological stress and the coping process. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1955, 50, 138-143.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., and Rodgers, W. L. The Quality of American Life. N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Chamblis, R. Married students at a state university. The Journal of Educational Sociology, 1961, 34(9), 409-416.
- Chapin, F. S. The psychology of housing. Social Forces, 1951, 30(1), 11-15.

- Cooper, C. The house as symbol. In Wedin, C. S., and Nygren, L. G. (Eds.), Housing Perspectives. Minneapolis, Minn.: Burgess Publishing Co., 1976.
- Daun, A. Methods of documenting the individual's value-relevant relation to his living environment. Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference of the Environmental Design Research Association, 1978, 9, 338-343.
- Davis, G., and Roizen, R. Architectural determinants of student satisfaction in college residence halls. Proceedings of Environmental Design Research Association/2 Conference, 1971, 28-38.
- Dean, J. P. Housing design and family values. Land Economics, 1953, 29(1), 128-141.
- Dilman, D. A. Mail and Telephone Surveys--The Total Design Method. N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- Dober, R. P. Campus Planning. N.Y.: Reinhold Publishing Corp., 1968.
- Dressel, F. B. Logic, research, and the married college student. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 43(9), 920-924.
- Enrollment Statistics: Enrollment by Class, Sex, and Marital Status. Registrar's Office, Oklahoma State University, Whitehurst Hall, 1979.
- Falk, L. L. A comparative study of problems of married and single students. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26(2), 207-208.
- Ferguson, R. S. User-need studies to improve building codes. Proceedings of the EDRA 3/ar 8 Conference, University of California at Los Angeles, 1972, 9-4-1 to 9-4-4.
- Fink, I. S., and Cooke, J. Married Students: A Study of Decreasing Marriage Rates and Family Sizes at the University of California (Berkeley). Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education, 1973.
- Hansen, W. B. Personalization as a predictor of success and early termination in college. Salt Lake City. Unpublished Honors Degree of Bachelor of Arts, University of Utah, 1974.
- Harris, C. M. The measurement of quality in housing and its relationship to housing satisfaction. Housing Educators Journal, 1976, 3(2), 7-13.
- Hayward, D. G. Psychological concepts of 'home.' HUD Challenge, 1977, 8(2), 10-13.

- Helson, H. Adaptation-Level Theory/An Experimental and Systematic Approach to Behavior. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.
- Hewes, H. The college housing program. American Institute of Architects Journal, 1963, 40(3), 73-78.
- Hutter, M. Campus housing and identity of married students. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, Inc., 1969, No. 70-5574.
- Inman, M. Activity locations and family social climate. Priorities for Environmental Design Research, 1978, 8, 425.
- Krejcie, R. V., and Morgan, D. W. Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1970, 30, 607-610.
- Kurtz, S. A. And now a word from the users . . . Design and Environment, 1971, 2(1), 41-49, 64.
- Lee, H. S. Housing attitudes and preferences as expressed by single graduate students at Oklahoma State University. (Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1966.)
- Lumpkin, C. A. Space needs as perceived by selected unmarried graduate women, Oklahoma State University. (Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1969.)
- Mann, M. N. Survey of a selected group of married junior college students relative to their household decision-making experiences. (Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1972.)
- Melson, G. F., Inman, M., and Kemp, P. Perceived environmental stress and family functioning in married student families. Priorities for Environmental Design Research, 1978, 8, 175-181.
- Montgomery, J. E. Housing and its effect on behavior. What's New in Home Economics, 1969, 33, 53-55, 95-96.
- Montgomery, J. E. Housing values: Meaning, measurement, and implications. (Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of Oklahoma Home Economics Association, Oklahoma City, October, 1957.)
- Moore, M., Forrest, D., and Hinkle, J. E. An interest-opinion survey of married students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13(1), 40-47.
- Morris, E. W., Crull, S. R., and Winter, M. Housing norms, housing satisfaction and the propensity to move. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38(2), 309-320.

- Married Student Housing Handbook. Married Student Housing Office, Oklahoma State University, 1978-79.
- Morris, E. W., and Winter, M. Housing, Family, and Society. N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1978.
- Obata, G. All about residence halls and things you need to know to design them. College and University Business, 1962, 33(4), 58-64.
- Onibokun, A. G. Evaluating consumers' satisfaction with housing: An application of a systems approach. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 1974, 40(3), 189-200.
- Oppelt, N. T. Characteristics and activities of married college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1965, 6(4), 228-232.
- Perin, C. With Man in Mind. Cambridge, Mass. and London, England: The MIT Press, 1970.
- Proshansky, H. M., Ittelson, W. H., and Rivlin, L. G. Freedom of choice and behavior in a physical setting. In H. M. Proshansky, W. H. Ittelson, and L. C. Rivlin (Eds.), Environmental Psychology. Printed in the United States of America: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1976.
- Proshansky, H. M., Ittelson, W. H., and Rivlin, L. G. The influence of the physical environment on behavior: Some basic assumptions. In H. M. Proshansky, W. H. Ittelson, and L. G. Rivlin (Eds.), Environmental Psychology: Man and His Physical Setting. Printed in the United States of America: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Pruitt, L. K. The influence of residential domain satisfactions and life domain satisfactions on overall satisfaction with quality of life. Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference of the Environmental Design Research Association, 1978, 9, 226-238.
- Rainey, M., Nickols, S., and Stewart, K. Oklahoma family profiles: Quality of life among Oklahoma families. Proceedings of the Family Study Center Conference, 1977, 9-16.
- Rakoff, R. M. Ideology in everyday life: The meaning of the house. Politics and Society, 1977, 7, 85-104.
- Riemer, S. Sociological perspective in home planning. American Sociological Review, 1947, 12(2), 155-159.
- Riemer, S., and Demarath, N. J. The role of social research in housing design. Land Economics, 1952, 28, 230-243.

- Riker, H. C. Planning Functional College Housing. New York: Bureau of Publications, 1956.
- Rogers, E. M. The effect of campus marriages on participation in college life. College and University, 1958, 33(2), 193-199.
- Rossi, P. H. Why Families Move. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- Saegert, S. Stress-inducing and reducing qualities of environments. In H. M. Proshansky, W. H. Ittelson, and L. G. Rivlin (Eds.), Environmental Psychology. Printed in the United States of America: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Shearer, J. Sense of place--sense of home. HUD Challenge, 1977, 8(2), 6-7.
- Sherrod, D. R. Crowding, perceived control, and behavioral after-effects. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1974, 4(2), 171-186.
- Sims, B. Programming environments for human use: A look at some emerging approaches to generating user oriented design requirements. Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference of the Environmental Design Research Association, 1978, 9, 489-498.
- Stea, D. Environmental cognition and the architecture of human settlement: An interdisciplinary and cross-cultural approach. Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference of the Environmental Design Research Association, 1978, 9, 444-450.
- Stokols, D. The experience of crowding in primary environments. Environment and Behavior, 1976, 8(1), 49-86.
- Stokols, D. A social-psychological model of human crowding phenomena. American Institute of Planners Journal, 1972, 38(2), 72-83.
- Student Information List. Registrar's Office, Oklahoma State University, 1979.
- Turin, M. H. Environmental stress and flexibility in the housing process. Proceedings of the 4th International Environmental Design Research Association Conference, 1973, 1, 47-58.
- Weber, M., Managan, P., and Windsor, P. Satisfaction of tenants in rental housing. Funded by Division of Home Economics, Stillwater, Oklahoma, Spring, 1978.
- Yockey, K. M. Space norms and housing satisfaction of low income families. Housing Educators Journal, 1976, 3(1), 2-9.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

LETTER REQUESTING MARRIED STUDENT ENROLLMENT

April 18, 1979

Dear Mr. Girod:

I am a graduate student majoring in Housing, Design, and Consumer Resources, in Home Economics, and am in the process of working on my master's thesis. My research involves assessing satisfaction levels of the rented living spaces of married students residing both in married student apartments on campus and those apartments off campus in the community. I am planning to compare the satisfaction levels between the two sample groups.

In order for my research to be the most encompassing, as well as accurate, I will need access to a general information listing from the registrar's office. This will certainly be appreciated and absolute privacy of the information is guaranteed. Addresses will only be used for contact, then each respondent will be classified by number in an anonymously statistical way with no reference to the individual. Only my adviser and myself will have access to the statistics and when the research is complete, the data will be destroyed.

I would need the addresses and phone numbers of all the married students enrolled at Oklahoma State University fulltime during spring semester, 1979. I am interested in getting more of an insight related to the present feasibility study regarding married student housing and consequent impact on future housing facilities, both on campus and off campus.

I presently have a computer account (no.). Can you use this account for running the program?

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Margaret Weber
Graduate Student Adviser
Housing, Design, and
Consumer Resources
Oklahoma State University

Kathleen V. Gardner
Graduate Student in
Housing, Design, and
Consumer Resources
Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX B

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT FOR THE
PILOT STUDY

1. Are you male ___ or female ___?
2. Are you presently living in and renting an apartment?
yes ___ no ___
3. Is your apartment in married student housing or in the community of Stillwater? m.s.h. ___ community ___
4. How much do you pay monthly for rent? _____
5. Does rent include utilities? yes ___ no ___
If not, how much do you pay on the average per month in utilities? _____
6. How many and what types of rooms make up your apartment?

7. What classification are you in school?
graduate student ___ upper classman ___ under classman ___
8. How many children do you have living with you? _____
9. How many people live in your dwelling? _____
10. How long have you been living in your present apartment? _____
11. How much longer do you expect to live in this apartment? _____
12. Was your apartment furnished when you moved in? yes ___ no ___
13. Do you have any of your own furniture in the apartment?
yes ___ no ___
14. Which of the following were important to your choice of apartment and how important were they? Use the 1-5 scale where 5 is very important, 3 is neutral, and 1 is very unimportant.

	Very Unimportant		Neutral		Very Important
A. Neighbors	1	2	3	4	5
B. Neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5
C. Cost	1	2	3	4	5
D. Regulations	1	2	3	4	5
E. Size	1	2	3	4	5
F. Recreational Facilities	1	2	3	4	5
G. Social Environment	1	2	3	4	5
H. Furnished	1	2	3	4	5
I. Location	1	2	3	4	5
J. Maintenance	1	2	3	4	5

15. What are your two major reasons for having chosen this apartment? _____
16. If the rent in the on campus and off campus apartments was the same, in which would you prefer to live?
on _____ off _____ Why? _____
17. In terms of spaciousness, how would you describe the interior of your apartment?

Not at All Spacious	Neutral	Very Spacious
1	2 3 4	5
18. In terms of management, how do you feel about your apartment?

Very Dis- satisfied	Neutral	Very Satisfied
1	2 3 4	5
19. In terms of maintenance, how do you feel toward your apartment?

Very Dis- satisfied	Neutral	Very Satisfied
1	2 3 4	5
20. Where do you usually study? _____
Why? _____
21. Where do you study when inside your apartment? _____

22. What are the two major things you like best about your apartment? _____
23. In terms of satisfaction how do you feel about your apartment?

Very Dis- satisfied	Neutral	Very Satisfied
1	2 3 4	5
24. Are your needs fulfilled by your apartment?

Definitely No	Neutral	Definitely Yes
1	2 3 4	5
25. What are the two major complaints about your apartment?

26. Do you feel you are living in better, the same, or worse conditions than the place you lived in just previously to this apartment? better _____ same _____ worse _____

APPENDIX C

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT - "PERCEIVED
SATISFACTION ASSESSMENT"

Introduction

May I speak with the person who is enrolled at Oklahoma State University as a student? Hello, I am a graduate student in Housing, Design, and Consumer Resources. I am doing research with regard to the married students enrolled at Oklahoma State University and living in a rented apartment, excluding duplexes and houses. Do you fall into the remaining category? (If it is established that the party is not renting an apartment, the researcher said, "I am sorry, but I am looking at apartment dwellers for this study and apologize for bothering you.")

You are a part of a carefully selected sample and I need your help in collecting data as your opinions are important. I assure you absolute privacy on all responses as the data are coded. When the research project is complete, the data will be destroyed.

I would like to ask you a few questions right now related to you and your apartment. I will repeat any of the questions that you would like clarified. I will ask you a few background questions first.

"Perceived Satisfaction Assessment" Survey

1. Are you a male or a female?
2. Are you presently living in and renting an apartment which excludes a house and duplex?
3. Is your apartment in married student housing or in the community of Stillwater?
4. How much do you pay monthly for rent?
5. Does rent include utilities?--If not, how much do you pay on the average per month in utilities?
6. How many and what types of rooms make up your apartment?
7. What classification are you in school?
8. How many children do you have living with you?
9. How many people live in your dwelling, including you?
10. How long have you been living in your present apartment?
11. How much longer do you expect to live in this apartment?
12. Was your apartment furnished when you moved in?

13. Do you have any of your own furniture in the apartment?
14. Which of the following were important to your choice of apartment and how important were they? Use the 1-5 scale where 1 is very unimportant, 3 is neutral, and 5 is very important.
 - a. Neighbors
 - b. Neighborhood
 - c. Cost
 - d. Regulations and Rules
 - e. Size
 - f. Recreational Facilities
 - g. Social Environment
 - h. Furnished
 - i. Location
 - j. Maintenance
15. What are your major reasons for having chosen this apartment?
16. If the rent in the on campus and off campus apartments was the same, in which would you prefer to live?--Why?
17. In terms of spaciousness, how would you describe the interior of your apartment? 1: not at all spacious
3: neutral
5: very spacious
18. In terms of management, how do you feel about your apartment? 1: very dissatisfied
3: neutral
5: very satisfied
19. In terms of maintenance provided by the management, how do you feel about your apartment? 1: very dissatisfied
3: neutral
5: very satisfied
20. Where do you usually study?--Why?
21. Where do you study when inside your apartment?
22. What are the major things you like best about your apartment?
23. In terms of satisfaction, how do you feel about your apartment? 1: very dissatisfied
3: neutral
5: very satisfied
24. Are your needs fulfilled by your apartment? 1: definitely no
3: neutral
5: definitely yes

25. What are the major things you most dislike about your apartment?
26. Do you feel you are living in worse, the same, or better conditions than the place you lived in just previously to this apartment?

This concludes your telephone interview. I really appreciate you sharing your time and information with me. Do you have any questions? Thank you again.

VITA 2

Kathleen Virginia Green Gardner

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: SATISFACTION WITH RENTED LIVING SPACE AMONG MARRIED
STUDENTS AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Major Field: Housing, Design, and Consumer Resources

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Lincoln, Nebraska, November 9, 1951, the daughter of Richard G. and Virginia A. Green.

Education: Graduated from Lincoln High School, Lincoln, Nebraska, in June, 1970; attended University of Nebraska, majored in Textiles, Clothing, and Design, 1970-73; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Art History from University of Florida in August, 1976; received Broker's License from Raleigh Institute of Realty, Raleigh, North Carolina, in October, 1977; received Sales Associate License from Stillwater School of Real Estate, Stillwater, Oklahoma, October, 1978; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1980.

Professional Experience: Prepared and rendered perspectives for Henderson Real Estate Investments, Inc., listing and selling homes in the real estate market.

Professional Organizations: American Society of Interior Designers.