

HOUSING SOLUTIONS MADE AND SATISFACTIONS ATTAINED BY
PROFESSIONAL FAMILIES MOVING FROM ONE COMMUNITY
TO ANOTHER AND SOME FACTORS RELATED TO
THESE SOLUTIONS AND SATISFACTIONS

By

ELEANOR PERRY BRISTOW

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

1960

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
August, 1965

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY
400 TAPSCOTT DRIVE
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106
TEL. 734-763-1000

Thesis
1965
B8611
cop. 2

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
LIBRARY
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
48106

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY
400 TAPSCOTT DRIVE
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106
TEL. 734-763-1000

NOV 24 1965

HOUSING SOLUTIONS MADE AND SATISFACTIONS ATTAINED BY
PROFESSIONAL FAMILIES MOVING FROM ONE COMMUNITY
TO ANOTHER AND SOME FACTORS RELATED TO
THESE SOLUTIONS AND SATISFACTIONS

Thesis Approved:

Maie Aygren

Thesis Adviser

Leaven Pepin

Sara Smith Suther

J. H. Boyce

Dean of the Graduate School

PREFACE

What are the solutions to housing needs made by families who move into a community? What are the processes these families go through in reaching housing solutions? Are there differences in the ways various families satisfy their housing needs or in the procedure they go through in reaching a solution? These questions provided focus for the study reported in the pages which follow.

The writer wishes to express her deepest gratitude to Dr. Maie Nygren, Professor and Head, Department of Housing and Interior Design, for her competent guidance in bringing this study to completion. Indebtedness is also acknowledged to Dr. Sara Smith Sutker, Associate Professor of Sociology, and Miss Leevera Pepin, Assistant Professor of Housing and Interior Design, for their contributions as members of the advisory committee. The writer also acknowledges indebtedness to Dr. Carl E. Marshall, Professor and Director of the Statistics Laboratory, for his help in drawing the sample; to Mrs. Donna Eaton, Programmer, and other staff of the Computing Center for processing the data, and to Mrs. Wayne Metz for her assistance in conducting a portion of the interviews. The writer also expresses appreciation to the respondents who so willingly cooperated in the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of The Problem	4
Purpose.....	4
Assumptions.....	4
Hypothesis	5
Description of Variables.....	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
Summary.....	18
III. METHODOLOGY	20
The Pre-Testing Instrument	20
Development of Interview Schedule.....	20
Selection of Sample.....	21
Treatment of Data.....	22
Description of The Sample.....	23
IV. INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA.....	24
Solutions.....	24
Satisfactions.....	33
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	43
Summary.....	43
Conclusions.....	44
Recommendations.....	47
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	48
APPENDIX.....	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Composition of Sample According to Major Variables.	23
II. Present Tenancy.	25
III. Age of Housing Presently Occupied	26
IV. Proportion of Income Spent For Housing.	27
V. Informative Sources Used In Locating First and Present Residences.	28
VI. Reasons Given For Selecting Present Residence	30
VII. Mobility Patterns and Mobility Intentions	31
VIII. Tenancy Patterns of Families Who Had Made One or More Intra-Community Moves	32
IX. Changes Made In Present Residence	33
X. Reasons Given For Available Housing Being Considered As Unsuitable	35
XI. Reasons Given For Making the First Intra-Community Move.	36
XII. Feelings About Costs of Present Housing	38
XIII. Changes Made and Changes Desired In Present Residence	39
XIV. Percent of Respondents Rating House and Selected Features As Very Satisfactory	42
XV. Percent of Respondents Rating House and Selected Features As Very Unsatisfactory	42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A family moving from one house to another in the same community sets up a demand for one unit but adds another to the same supply. The long distance mover, on the other hand, creates a demand in the community to which it moves and leaves a vacancy in the community from where it came. The ease with which this demand is met is dependent upon the supply of housing available. Supply here refers not only to number of houses but also to the nature of the housing available. When houses which are in the supply do not meet the needs of incoming families, usually an unsatisfactory solution is made which is generally regarded as a temporary measure. Subsequent moves within the community may then follow.

Over the past several years one out of every five families in the United States has moved each year. If a different twenty percent of the population moved each year, a full 100 percent of the population would change place of residence by the end of five years. Instead, only 50 to 60 percent of the population change their addresses during any five year period. After ten years, approximately 75 percent of the total population have moved and by the end of twenty years, 90 percent of the people are no longer living at the same address they were at the

beginning of that period.¹

Of this group of movers, nearly two-thirds (about 13 percent) travel only short distances and remain within the same community or county. These movers, referred to as intra-community movers, are trying primarily to adjust housing to personal needs and preferences.² The other one-third, referred to as inter-community movers, go longer distances--to another county or even to a new state. Most long-distance movers are moving because of better working opportunities, as a result of actual job transfers or offers.

The rates of both types of mobility, intra-and-inter-community, are important in estimating housing demand. Statistics on long distance mobility are of particular value in relation to migratory movements. Statistics on short distance movers are of value as an indication of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with housing.

Full families, consisting of both parents and their young children, show the greatest tendency to change residences. The younger the head of the family, the less likely the family is to be living in the same residence it occupied five years earlier. Single individuals and, to a lesser degree, childless couples are far less mobile.

Foote states that movers, in general, have lower income and more education than non-movers.³ This education-mobility relationship is probably another facet of the youth-mobility tie. It may be true,

¹Nelson Foote, et al, Housing Choices and Housing Constraints, (New York, 1960), p. 1.

²Ibid, p. 134.

³Ibid, p. 44.

though, that education per se induces mobility. Advanced training increases the job potential and, therefore, those with higher education may be expected to range farther afield in search of employment.

Young, college-educated people, even after the start of their careers, may be more likely to receive offers which take them to another city. A possible confirmation of this lies in the fact that professional people and those in related services, in marked contrast to every other occupational group, are most likely to make an inter-community move when they change residences.⁴

Since the more highly educated people tend to move with greater frequency, there may also be a difference in the factors that affect the family's choice as to place of residence, once it makes this move.

Montgomery states:

....I believe all will agree that the more we have to spend for housing and the better educated we are, the greater will be our desire to exercise choices in securing housing.⁵

A number of studies have investigated the relationship of income to housing selection, and various factors associated with different rates of mobility. Little emphasis has been placed, however, on housing solutions made as a result of inter-community migration or on the satisfactions and dissatisfactions families receive from housing solutions made.

One can assume that certain housing needs are created by mobility

⁴Ibid, p. 152.

⁵James E. Montgomery, "Housing Values: Meaning, Measurement and Implications," (Address at Oklahoma Home Economics Association Annual Meeting, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, October 5, 1957).

and that the solutions to these needs vary from family to family. The solutions to these needs, moreover, reflect to a degree some of the needs experienced by a family. This study is focused on solutions made for housing needs, and the satisfactions which accrue from the solutions once they have been reached.

Statement of the Problem

What are the solutions to housing needs made by professional families moving from one community to another? Are size of family and education of the homemaker related to the solutions made by these professional families? How satisfied are these families with the solutions, once they have been reached?

Purpose

The study is conducted to identify: 1) ways professional families go about solving housing needs created by inter-community mobility, 2) satisfactions and/or dissatisfactions experienced by the professional families with their solutions, and 3) factors related to the solutions made and the satisfactions attained.

Assumptions

1. An immediate need for a residence is created by mobility from one community to another.
2. Factors affecting the solutions to this need can be identified.
3. Housing adjustments, e.g. the changing of residence or the revisions made to the acquired residence, are indicative of one or more needs in housing.

Hypothesis

The solutions to housing needs and satisfactions with the solutions reached by professional families moving from one community to another are related to size of family and the educational level of the homemaker.

Description of Variables

Independent Variables

The independent variables investigated in this study were size of family and educational level of the homemaker. These variables were chosen after a review of the literature disclosed that both size of family and education are highly related to mobility. Foote found, for example, that full families move more often than do childless couples and that college educated people tend to make inter-community moves more often than do less highly educated people. The variables are defined as:

1. Size of Family: Size of family was divided into three categories:
 - A. No children
 - B. One or two children
 - C. Three or more children

2. Education of the Homemaker: Education was divided into eight categories:
 - A. Did not graduate from high school
 - B. Graduated from high school
 - C. Trade school
 - D. Some college
 - E. Graduated from college
 - F. Some graduate work
 - G. Completed master's degree
 - H. Doctoral degree

For analysis, this variable was dichotomized into two categories:

- A. High school to some college

B. Graduated from college or more.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables used in this study are: 1) solutions made to housing needs by the professional families and 2) satisfactions and/or dissatisfactions with the housing solutions made.

The solutions made to housing needs are considered as:

A. Tenancy

1. Buying
2. Building
3. Renting

B. Age of the housing attained as:

1. Old
2. New

C. Type of housing attained as:

1. Single family residence
2. Apartment
3. Duplex or other multi-family residence

D. Size of housing attained as indicated by:

1. Number of bedrooms
2. Number of bathrooms

E. Proportion of family income spent for housing. The proportions were categorized as:

1. Less than 1/6 or 16%
2. 1/6 or 16%
3. 1/5 or 20%
4. 1/4 or 25%
5. 1/3 or 33%
6. More than 33%

For analysis, these proportions were dichotomized as:

1. 1/6 or less
2. 1/3, 1/4 or 1/5.

F. Processes used in attaining housing:

1. Changing residence and the resultant tenancy pattern
2. Adapting the residence by
 - a. Reorganization of space
 - b. Addition of space
 - c. Repair and redecoration
 - d. Addition of equipment
3. Using or not using informative sources such as:
 - a. Real estate agent or home builder
 - b. Friends, former residents or employment connections
 - c. Newspaper advertisements placed
 - d. Newspaper advertisements read
 - e. Stumbling upon the residence

The satisfactions and/or dissatisfactions realized by families from the housing solutions made were considered as:

- A. Those satisfactions and/or dissatisfactions evidenced by:
 1. Revisions made in the residence
 2. Revisions desired in the residence
 3. Expressed mobility intentions
 4. Reasons for moves made
 5. Number of moves made
 6. Proportion of the family income spent for housing
- B. Those satisfactions and/or dissatisfactions expressed directly by the respondents regarding:
 1. The residence and specific features about the residence such as:
 - a. Amount of space
 - b. Amount of storage area
 - c. Amount of privacy offered each member to pursue individual interests
 - d. Appearance from the standpoint of beauty
 - e. Location
 - f. Neighborhood
 2. Feelings about housing costs
 3. Suitability of the housing available to them at the time of entry into community.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A survey of literature revealed that whereas considerable attention has been given to both inter-community and intra-community mobility, only studies on intra-community mobility have been in any way related to housing. These studies have been focused primarily on the role housing plays in intra-community mobility. None of these studies have investigated the processes families coming into a community go through in reaching a solution to their need for housing, the housing solutions reached, or the subsequent intra-community mobility engendered by failure to attain a satisfactory first solution. The studies which are reviewed, therefore, have a more indirect than direct relation to the problem under investigation. They are, however, related to residential mobility and to social factors associated with mobility and with housing choices.

Residential mobility may be related to many adjustments of families as well as to the socio-economic problems of the families. A study by Columbia University of Philadelphia families disclosed that only about nine percent of the families studied had had only one address since the family was created.¹ Over 50 percent had lived in at least three

¹"Mobility and Migration as Factors in Housing Demand," Housing Research, No. 6. (Washington, D.C., October, 1953).

different places and 20 percent had lived in five or more residences. With renters, the degree of mobility was even greater; nearly two-thirds of those interviewed had had three or more addresses, and one-fourth reported five or more different addresses.

Several studies have been made regarding the mobility incidence of families. Glick found that among families in which the head is under 35 years of age in 1950, the mobility rate was twice as high as for that of families in which the heads were over 35.² It is, then, he concludes, younger couples who account for most of the changes in living quarters. His analysis shows that changes in type of housing and tenancy pattern during the family life cycle are somewhat different for owners and renters. In 1950, for households whose heads were under 35, about 86 percent of the homeowners, as compared with 32 percent of the renters, lived in detached homes occupied by their households alone. The proportion of owners who lived in such houses decreased somewhat with the age of the family head, while the proportion of renters increased with the age of the family head.

Hollingshead observed that an upwardly mobile family living in an apartment or flat in a residential area quite often considers its housing as a temporary residence.³ As a higher economic status is achieved, however, the family tends to move into a single family house further from the city center.

²Paul C. Glick, American Families, (New York, 1957), pp. 88-102.

³August B. Hollingshead, "Class Differences in Family Stability," Class, Status and Power, (Glencoe, Illinois, 1953), pp. 284-292.

Abu-Lughod's exploratory study of center city residents from the upper-middle and upper classes in three large American cities, revealed that 30 percent of the households in her study were mobile; 70 percent were classified as stable.⁴ She further found that 40 percent of the renters were mobile while only 10.5 percent of the owners were mobile. The index of mobility used for this study was a scale consisting of three dimensions:

1. Length of time respondent had occupied his previous dwelling unit;
2. Length of time respondent had occupied his current dwelling unit;
3. Respondent's own intention to move from his current residence within two years.⁵

The study revealed a relationship between the respondent's satisfaction with his residence and his intention to move: the percentage of renters expressing dissatisfaction was twice as high as that of owners. Although dissatisfaction with the present residence was not the sole determinant of mobility, it was found to be highly related.

Mobility puts families into a position of reaching a solution for housing needs. Factors involved in solutions made have been examined by several investigators. Families who had recently purchased new houses were studied by Beyer, Mackesey and Montgomery to ascertain what housing values were held by urban families, and to what extent these values affected the respondents' selections of houses and their

⁴Janet Abu-Lughod, "A Survey of Center-City Residences," Nelson N. Foote et al., Housing Choices and Housing Constraints, (New York, 1960), pp. 387-447.

⁵Ibid, p. 418.

subsequent satisfactions or dissatisfactions with their housing.⁶ The families had a median income of \$5,320. Occupationally, they were distributed thusly:

25 percent professional and semi-professional,
 21 percent managerial,
 16 percent clerical and sales,
 22 percent craftsman,
 16 percent unskilled.

This study revealed greater housing satisfaction among women who placed a higher emphasis on the values of leisure, aesthetics, and family centrism. No relationship was found, however, between the other values examined and housing satisfaction, nor between a respondent's value position and his/her satisfaction with his/her housing. According to Montgomery, this indicates that values play a relatively minor role for families in the selection of their houses. In reference to this, he states:

First, I doubt seriously that very many of the families studied had reflected upon their values, then had gone out in search of a house and location in line with their several values. Their values were here, but they were not sufficiently articulated or translated to become effective guideposts in the process of securing new housing. This seems to have been the case for men even more than for women. Second, perhaps the main reason why values were not satisfied is the fact that they really did not have an opportunity to exercise their values in buying houses. To put the matter another way, I believe that the vast majority of these families were unable to find a variety of houses, reflecting different values, at a price they could afford to pay.⁷

⁶Glenn H. Beyer, Thomas W. Mackesey, and James E. Montgomery, Houses Are For People, (Cornell University Research Publication No. 3, 1955).

⁷James E. Montgomery, "Housing Values: Meaning, Measurement and Implications," (Address delivered at Oklahoma Home Economics Association, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, October 5, 1957).

Several investigators have examined factors related to renting or owning as housing solutions. Schiro found that dwellings occupied by owners generally were of higher quality and had more modern facilities than those occupied by renters.⁸ He further found that of the 75 cities surveyed, home ownership tended to be greater in smaller places. Only in New York City did apartment rental prevail as the solution to need for housing.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency engaged the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan to make a sample study of considerations that may have influenced the purchases of single-family homes.⁹ The sample used for this study was drawn from the lists of owner-occupants who registered deeds of ownership between January 1, 1949, and July 1, 1950. They were living in nine of the 15 largest metropolitan areas and in 30 counties not encompassed by metropolitan areas, which contained cities or towns with populations of 2,500 or more.

The sample consisted of proportionately more professional, managerial, self-employed, clerical and sales people than are found in either the total of the nation's homeowners or in all of its nonfarm families. The proportion of skilled and semi-skilled workers (about 30 percent of the group) approximated the national figures.

Free discourse interviewing was the technique used for obtaining

⁸Bruno A. Schiro, "Housing Surveys in 75 Cities: 1950 and 1952," Monthly Labor Review, LXX, No. 7 (July, 1954), pp. 744-750.

⁹Edward T. Paxton, What People Want When They Buy A House, (Washington, D.C., 1955).

data. Questions were designed to cover the entire range of economic, social and physical factors which had brought respondents into the housing market and had influenced and determined their selections of the particular houses purchased.

Ownership had been the previous tenancy experience of one-third of the buyers. Six percent had been renters just prior to their purchase, but one-half of all the buyers had never previously owned a home.

The primary reason for 20 percent of the purchases was a move from one city to another, usually for business or employment reasons. Desire to change residences within the same city was seldom a factor.

The buyers participating in the study gave a number of reasons for purchasing rather than renting a house. The two most often cited reasons were that buying is an investment and that ownership is cheaper than renting. Other factors given were: the ideal of ownership, being forced to buy because of lack of places to rent, a desire for independence, having found "just the right place." Twenty-five percent of the buyers thought they had a reasonable number of choices from which to select, nearly 60 percent felt they had very little choice within their price ranges, and one buyer in seven bought the first home considered.

Families with no children or small children more generally bought small two bedroom houses. Most of the families paid between \$5,000 and \$15,000 for the houses; almost one-half of the buyers with incomes of \$7,500 and over paid \$20,000 or more.¹⁰

¹⁰Ibid., p. 6.

The study disclosed a substantial number of buyers who were dissatisfied with their purchases. Nearly 30 percent were dissatisfied with the size of the lot and nearly 25 percent said they wanted more bedrooms. Almost 50 percent of the buyers were dissatisfied with the size of their rooms; about 20 percent criticized the arrangement of the rooms.

The most frequent complaint given was in connection with the storage. Those most satisfied with their storage space were the buyers who had both a basement and a garage in the house.

In 1956, the Housing and Home Finance Agency sponsored a Woman's Congress on Housing, the first effort by this agency to seek information from the homemakers' point of view about their homes.¹¹ Five out of every six owned their homes; 17 percent had moved into their homes only within the previous year. An additional 47 percent had lived in their present homes no more than five years. The main reasons given for moving into these homes were: 28 percent to have a home of one's own, 26 percent needed more room, 23 percent were because of job transfers. Moving into better neighborhoods and getting away from the city were less important reasons for moving. Prior to moving into their present houses, 54 percent had been living in rented apartments or houses, and 46 percent had owned their homes.¹²

Smith, Kivlin and Sinden assumed that choices families make in the selection of housing during mobility reflect values and certain felt

¹¹Women's Congress On Housing, (Washington, D.C., Housing and Home Finance Agency, October, 1956).

¹²Ibid, p. 82.

needs of families in relation to housing.¹³ In their study, they endeavored to: 1) discover causative factors which impelled families to move from one owned house to another, 2) develop a configuration of housing features with a high value rating in particular family situations, and 3) relate changes in life situations to changes in choices concerning housing.

Interviews were conducted with two groups of homemakers, 154 living in a small city and 100 living in a suburban area. The participants were homeowners who had lived in their present houses from one to five years and prior to their moves had owned homes located within the same area.

A card-sorting technique was used in identifying the factors which had motivated each family to move from its former house and in establishing a value rating for housing features related to the selection of the present house.

The two sample groups were similar in sizes of families, number of families in each stage of the family life cycle, ages of the husbands and wives, and socio-economic levels. They differed in the educational level of the husbands and wives and in occupational classifications.

The investigators found that all but four of the families spent more in buying their present houses than they had spent for their former houses.¹⁴ In general, purchase price of the house was related

¹³Ruth H. Smith, Laura D. Kivlin and Cecile P. Sinden, Housing Choices and Selections as Evidenced by Residential Mobility, (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University College of Home Economics Research Publication 204, May, 1963).

¹⁴Ibid, p. 13.

to stage of the family life cycle, income, husband's occupation and socio-economic level. Lack of space was the most common causative factor for moving as evidenced by such complaints as: the house was too small, lack of bathroom facilities, lacked a sufficient number of bedrooms. An increased number of children and more needed space for older children were given as reasons for the families' needing additional space.

Housing features given a high rating by the respondents had been attained in their second residence by over 85 percent of the families in both groups.

The study revealed that for small-city families, more features were related to socio-economic level and occupation of the husband than was true for suburban families. There were greater differences among choices expressed by small-city families than there were differences among the expressed choices of suburban families. The small-city lower socio-economic group was less interested than the comparable suburban group in such features as a separate entry way, a special area for study, a second or third bathroom, a dishwasher, a fireplace and large window areas. The investigators did not determine, however, if family living patterns influence housing choice or if choice is determined by other factors with living patterns being shaped by the choice.

The extent of residential mobility as well as various physical factors associated with housing were recently examined by Perry under the assumption that there is a relationship between the housing occupied by the individual in the family and their attitudes toward family life.¹⁵

¹⁵Mignon Perry, "Relationship of Space in Housing to Attitudes Toward Family Life," (Unpub. Doctoral Thesis, Cornell University, 1958).

The study placed emphasis on the importance of the physical environment of the family--its housing--to the effective functioning of the individual and the family unit.

Perry examined the housing values investigated in the Cornell study to ascertain the possible influences of education, profession, income, age and sex of the respondent, and the number and ages of the children, on family attitudes toward housing. The respondents, all of whom had moved to their present housing quite recently, were classified as high, middle, or low in regard to socio-economical status. The investigator found that education, income, and profession were highly correlated. The findings indicated that there are some attitudinal differences between families living in apartment and those living in single family housing. Whether or not this difference was due to the location of the apartment, difference in the arrangement of space, amount of space, proximity of one family's living quarters to another, or to other unique qualities of the apartment or the single-family house was not determined.

Perry's finding that those who live in spacious housing are more satisfied with their housing than those who live in less adequate housing is in agreement with findings from previous investigations relative to housing satisfactions. Perry also found a higher rate of satisfaction with the location by those who live in more spacious housing. More than 50 percent of those living in less adequate space were classified in the low status group while only 12.6 percent of those living in spacious housing were in the low status group.

Personal values can or could be just as important in the selection of a house as size, style, cost and similar factors. Beyer states that

good housing can be provided only if there is an understanding of the people who are going to live in it.¹⁶ He feels that housing must provide a setting in which the individual can enjoy the most healthy and stimulating life possible; and that emotional factors often take precedence over all else with reference to the satisfaction a house provides.

Summary

Abu-Lughod's study, as well as other investigations, show renters to be more mobile than are those who own their own homes. Glick found that it is the younger couples who move most often. Hollingshead purports that young upwardly mobile families often consider their housing temporary and plan later moves as the family achieves higher status.

Mobility puts families into positions where some type of solution to housing needs must be made. Buying as a solution has been the focus of several investigations. Beyer, Mackesey and Montgomery studied the effect certain values held by families have on their housing selections and on subsequent satisfactions or dissatisfactions with their housing. The investigators concluded that values play a relatively minor role in the selection of housing.

Paxton, in examining possible influences leading to the purchase of single-family homes, found that buyers feel buying is an investment and that owning is less expensive than renting. He also found that 60 percent of the owners studied felt they had little choice within their price ranges when selecting their housing. Schiro found owner-occupied

¹⁶Glenn H. Beyer, "Future Explorations in Home Economics: Housing," Journal of Home Economics, LII (October, 1960), p. 643.

dwellings of higher quality and with more modern facilities than are rented ones.

The Women's Congress on Housing disclosed that the major reasons given by Congress delegates for moving into homes which they had purchased recently were: the idea of owning, more room, job transfers, and moving into better neighborhoods. A lack of space in housing was found to be a major factor related to the mobility of families studied by Smith, Kivlin and Sinden. This study disclosed that families often spend a larger proportion of their incomes for housing after a move than was spent prior to the move.

Satisfactions with housing solutions were examined by Beyer, Mackesey and Montgomery. Their study revealed that women who held the values of leisure, aesthetics and family centrism tended to be more satisfied with their housing. Paxton found a substantial number of buyers who were dissatisfied with their purchases. Lack of a sufficient amount of space was the most frequently mentioned source of dissatisfaction.

Perry studied family attitudes toward housing as they relate to several factors about the families. Attitudinal differences were found to exist between those living in apartments and those living in single family housing. Perry also found that those who live in more spacious housing expressed greater satisfaction with their housing than did those who lived in less spacious housing.

Beyer contends that good housing can be provided only if there is an understanding of those who are to occupy it. He believes that in regard to an individual or a family's satisfactions with housing, emotional factors often take precedence over all other factors.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

An interview was deemed an appropriate means of collecting the data to fill the purposes of this study. The interview, which has been widely used, is an accepted means of collecting data in housing research.

The Pre-Testing Instrument

One-parent professional and non-professional families who had recently moved to Stillwater, Oklahoma, from outside Payne County were used for pretesting the instrument. This group was used for pretesting because one-parent families were excluded from the sample on the assumption that housing needs are different.

A pretest instrument of 26 questions was administered. The questions pertained to past experiences with solving housing needs, present solutions and feelings about the present solution. After the pretest, order of the questions was altered to reduce the possibility of the respondent being influenced by order; revisions were made to give greater clarity to several questions.

Development of Interview Schedule

An interview schedule consisting of 27 questions was the final instrument used in collecting the data. Approximately 1/3 of the

questions pertained to the independent variables, size of family and education of the homemaker; 1/3 of the questions pertained to the dependent variable, solutions to housing needs; and 1/3 pertained to the dependent variable, satisfactions and/or dissatisfactions with the solutions made.

The questions were asked by the interviewer and responses were recorded on the schedule. To insure clarity for five of the questions, alternative responses were presented to the homemaker in a printed form. As each of the five questions was asked, a card containing the alternative responses, typewritten, was handed the respondent so that she could comprehend more fully the nature of the responses desired and the range of responses possible.

Selection of The Sample

Wives of professional families who had moved to Stillwater, Oklahoma, from outside Payne County within the period of January, 1963, to January, 1965, were defined as the sample. Names of the professional families were taken from the local Newcomer List. Of the 151 names on the list, 108 were interviewed.

The study was limited to two-parent homes on the assumption that housing needs and solutions may be different for one-parent families. Families who had moved to Stillwater from other communities inside Payne County were excluded on the assumption that they would be familiar with the housing market in Stillwater, and therefore, would have a different frame of reference. Foreign-born wives who were not able to readily communicate in English were not included. It was felt also that they would have a different frame of reference. Families who had

established residence outside the city limits of Stillwater were not included because of the possibility there would be a difference both as to supply of housing available and as to the needs of those families. Because of the limitations of time and money, three calls were arbitrarily set as the number to be made to any one address.

Treatment of Data

Size of family and educational level of the homemaker are the independent variables by which all data were analyzed. Frequency counts of the responses were tabulated for each of the variables.

Frequency counts were obtained for each of the sub-groups of the dependent variables, solutions reached and satisfactions felt. Treatment of the satisfactions which were expressed directly by the respondents was through the use of a five-point rating scale which was used to measure six different aspects of housing. Frequency counts were obtained for each point on the scale, then a sum score of the six scales was dichotomized as to satisfied or not satisfied.

The Chi-square test was used to determine association between the independent variables and the dependent variables. The responses for each interviewer were recorded on IBM Data Cards. Frequencies, percentages, and Chi-square values were obtained on an electronic high speed computer in the Computing Center at Oklahoma State University. Daniel's table of "Statistically Significant Differences in Observed Percents" was used to determine significant differences between proportions of populations of relatively equal size.¹

¹Cuthbert Daniel, "Statistically Significant Differences in Observed Percents," Journal of Applied Psychology, VI (1940), 826-827.

Description of The Sample

Of the 108 homemakers who were interviewed, 10 had no children living in the home, 57 had one or two children and 41 had three or more children living in the home. Of these 108 homemakers, 44 had graduated from college or had advanced degrees, while 64 had an educational level of some college work or less. Seventy-eight percent of the large families with three or more children were in the lower educational level; only 45 percent of the homemakers in medium-sized families were in the lower educational level group. Data showing composition of the sample according to the independent variables are summarized in Table I. A significant difference was found to exist between the two variables.

TABLE I
COMPOSITION OF SAMPLE ACCORDING TO
MAJOR VARIABLES

Educational Level	Size of Family		
	Small	Medium	Large
	Percent		
Low	60.0	45.6	78.0
High	40.0	54.4	22.0

$\chi^2 = 10.39$ Tab. $\chi^2_{.01}$ (9.21) d.f. = 2

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

In this chapter, the solutions and satisfactions reflected in the responses of the 108 homemakers of professional families in Stillwater are discussed. These solutions and satisfactions, in many cases, were not significantly different when the respondents were classified according to the two independent variables--educational level of the homemaker and size of family. Certain solutions and satisfactions, however, did appear to be related to one or both of the independent variables.

A significant relationship was found to exist between size of family and educational level of the homemaker; therefore, differences between the groups classified according to educational level may stem more from differences in family size than from the differences in educational attainment.

Solutions

Solutions to housing needs which must be made by families who are new in a community involve: deciding whether to own or rent, locating the type, size and quality of housing to fit the needs and preferences of the family, and allocating a proportion of the family income to be spent for housing. The processes necessary to reach the solution may also be considered a part of the solution made. These include using

informative sources to locate possible residences, changing residences when the first solution proves unsatisfactory, or adapting the residence so it better fits the needs of the family.

Ownership was a pattern typical of large families much more than it was of smaller families (see Table II). In the latter group the proportion of renters and owners was very similar--49 percent rent and 51 percent own their homes whereas, with large families, only 39 percent rent and 71 percent own their homes. Seven of the large families having three or more children were living in homes they had had constructed. Among childless couples, however, none were living in houses built specifically for themselves.

Among the families whose homemakers had a low educational level, more own their home than rent; almost three-fifths own as compared with two-fifths who rent. The distribution of owners and renters was about equal for the homemakers of the higher educational level.

TABLE II
PRESENT TENANCY

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large*	Low	High**
	Percent			Percent	
Rent	60.0	47.4	39.0	40.6	52.3
Buy	40.0	43.9	43.9	45.3	40.9
Build	0.0	8.8	17.0	14.1	6.8

* Small families were defined as childless couples; medium families were comprised of one-two children. Large families had three or more children.

** Low educational level was defined as some college or less; high educational level was defined as a college degree or more.

TABLE III
AGE OF HOUSING PRESENTLY OCCUPIED

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
		Percent		Percent	
New	100.0	80.7	73.2	73.4*	88.6*
Old	0.0	19.3	26.8	26.6*	11.4*

N = 108

* $\chi^2 = 3.7$ Tab. $\chi^2_{.05}$ (3.8) d.f. = 1

When analyzed by both size of family and educational level of the homemaker, acquisition of a new house, previously unoccupied, was much more frequently the solution to a need for housing than was acquisition of a house which had been occupied formerly. Data showing this finding are in Table III. Generally speaking, almost nine-tenths of these families who had lived in the community only two years or less were living in a house that had not been previously occupied.

A house was selected over an apartment by more than 90 percent of the respondents. Only one family in the sample lived in a duplex; six families, one of which included more than three children living at home, were living in apartments. None of the childless couples lived in an apartment. Large families tended to live in houses slightly more frequently than did medium-sized families.

As could be expected, a one or two-bedroom house was the solution for childless couples more than for families. However, three or more bedrooms were the general solutions for approximately three-fifths of both the smaller and the larger families. A house having three or

more bedrooms had been acquired by almost nine-tenths of the large families. Three-tenths of this group had houses containing as many as four or five bedrooms.

When the data were analyzed according to educational level of the homemaker, three-bedroom houses were occupied by homemakers having a higher educational level significantly more frequently than by those of lower educational level group. Almost three-tenths of the homemakers with a lower educational attainment lived in a two-bedroom residence, while over one-tenth of the more highly educated had houses with four or five bedrooms.

One-sixth or less of the monthly family income was spent for housing by six-tenths of the large families as compared with approximately one-half of the middle-sized families and two-tenths of the childless couples. As shown in Table IV, when expenditure for housing was further analyzed according to educational level of the homemaker, both groups were approximately evenly divided with almost one-half allocating 1/6 or less of their incomes and one-half allocating from 1/5 to 1/3 of their incomes to housing.

TABLE IV
PROPORTION OF INCOME SPENT FOR HOUSING

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent			Percent	
1/6 of Less	22.2	54.6	60.6	52.5	55.8
1/3, 1/4 or 1/5	77.8	45.4	39.5	47.5	44.2

N = 108

TABLE V
INFORMATIVE SOURCES USED IN LOCATING FIRST AND PRESENT RESIDENCES

		Size of Family			Education	
		Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
		Percent			Percent	
Real Estate Agent	First ¹	50.0	26.3	29.4	30.8	28.6
	Present ²	40.0*	48.2*	53.7*	47.6	52.3
Friends, Employment Connections	First	50.0	47.4	52.9	50.0	50.0
	Present	20.0*	18.6*	16.8*	30.2	22.7
Placed Advertisement	First	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	7.1
	Present	10.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0
Read Advertisement	First	0.0	21.0	0.0	11.5	7.1
	Present	30.0*	8.9*	9.8*	11.1	11.4
Stumbled Upon	First	0.0	5.3	11.8	7.7	7.1
	Present	0.0	14.3	9.7	9.5	13.6

¹N = 40

²N = 108

* $\chi^2 = 15.6$ Tab. $\chi^2_{.05}$ (15.5) d.f. = 8

One means of reaching a solution to housing needs is the use of informative sources. Either a real estate agent or friends and/or employment connections were most often the means used in locating both the first and the present residences (see Table V). Newspaper ads, either placed or read, were used very little by all groups in locating houses. As might be expected, simply stumbling upon the residence was the means of locating the respondents' present residences more often than it had been for the first residences. Size of family was significantly related to the use of informative sources as a means of locating the present residence.

Giving serious consideration to more than one residence was more frequently the approach to housing solutions by large families than it was the behavior of small families. Less than four-tenths of the large families gave serious consideration to only one house whereas one-half of the smaller families focused on only one house. One other house was given serious consideration by thirty-four percent of the large families as compared with only 15 percent of the medium-sized families. Three or more residences were considered by 17 percent of the larger families as compared with 15 percent medium-sized and 10 percent of the small families.

Giving consideration to three or more houses was the approach of two-tenths of the lower educational group whereas less than one-tenth of the higher educational group considered this many residences. This possibly could be attributed to the higher educational group having a better ability than those with lower education to discriminate more readily those features which are suitable for their families.

Contrary to what one might have expected, the data in Table VI show that cost was not as important a factor in the selection of housing as were other special features. Cost and location were factors in the selections made by large families more often than they were factors influencing the selections made by childless couples and medium-sized families. Features about the house itself and outside space were listed as a factor more often by childless couples than by families. The supply of housing from which one could choose was given as a factor influencing selection by almost one-half of the total group. "Features about the house" were most important to the higher educational level

group, whereas "location" and "lack of choice" ranked highest with the lower educational level group.

TABLE VI
REASONS GIVEN FOR SELECTING PRESENT RESIDENCE

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent			Percent	
Cost	10.0	22.8	29.3	21.9	27.3
Location	40.0	38.6	51.2	45.3	40.9
Features of House	50.0	38.6	41.5	35.9	47.7
Outside Space	40.0	12.3	19.5	18.7	15.9
Lack of Choice	50.0	38.6	46.3	45.3	38.6
Other	40.0	15.8	17.1	17.2	20.4

N = 108

Finding a satisfactory solution to housing needs for the family may involve making an intra-community move after having made an inter-community move. One intra-community move has been made by at least four-tenths of the total group (see Table VII). Such a move has not been the pattern of childless couples as much as it has been the pattern of those with children. This finding is in keeping with Rossi's finding that families with children move more often than do childless couples. Among the childless couples only three-tenths had moved once within the community while over four-tenths of the families with children had moved at least once.

An intra-community move was made more frequently by families

classified within the lower educational group than by those within the higher group. The more frequent moves by the lower educational group may be related to their having larger families or it may be an indication they were less discriminating with the first solution.

TABLE VII
MOBILITY PATTERNS AND MOBILITY INTENTIONS

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent			Percent	
Have not Moved Not Planning to Move	30.0	26.3	36.6	34.4	25.0
Have not Moved Planning to Move	20.0	28.1	12.2	18.7	25.0
Have Moved Planning to Move	10.0	12.3	9.8	9.4	13.6
Have Moved Not Planning to Move	20.0	21.0	31.7	28.1	20.4
Have Not Moved Don't Know	20.0	8.8	4.9	3.1	15.9
Don't Know Have Moved	0.0	3.5	4.9	6.2	0.0

N = 108

Of the families who had moved at least once since coming to Stillwater, more large families had moved than of either the medium-sized families or childless couples. Of those families who had moved, the data in Table VIII show that medium-sized families more than large families followed the tenancy pattern of "rent-rent." The distribution was about equal for all groups who had rented, then bought a house.

Almost four-tenths of the large families as compared with two-tenths of the medium-sized families first rented a residence, then built.

TABLE VIII
TENANCY PATTERNS OF FAMILIES WHO HAD MADE ONE OR MORE
INTRA-COMMUNITY MOVES

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent			Percent	
Rent-Rent	66.7	33.3	10.5	25.0	26.7
Rent-Buy	33.3	47.6	47.6	42.9	53.3
Buy-Buy	0.0	0.0	5.3	3.6	0.0
Rent-Build	0.0	19.0	36.8	28.6	20.0

N = 47

More of the higher educational level group followed the pattern of "rent-buy" and more of the lower educational level group followed the pattern of "rent-build." This may be because the lower educational level group had larger families, thus they were less able to find suitable housing and were, therefore, more or less forced to build.

Making some adaption of space to the housing acquired was a solution made by almost one-half of the total sample as shown by the data in Table IX. Significantly more large families than medium families had added space to their residences. Moreover, some type of space organization in the residence had been accomplished by almost two-tenths of these large families. Repairs and redecoration of the residence were effected by about two-thirds of all families, regardless of size.

TABLE IX
CHANGES MADE IN PRESENT RESIDENCE

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent*			Percent*	
Reorganization of Space	0.0	12.3	17.0	12.5	13.6
Additional Space	0.0	1.7	14.6	9.4	2.3
Repair and Redecoration	20.0	22.8	24.4	20.3	27.3
Addition of Equipment	30.0	33.3	24.4	26.6	34.1
Other	0.0	3.5	4.9	3.1	4.5

* Percents do not equal 100 as respondents may have made more than one type of change.

The addition of space was an adjustment made by more of the lower educational level group (who had larger families) whereas the addition of equipment and repairing and redecorating were made by the higher educational level group.

Satisfactions

Satisfactions attained from housing by the family which has recently entered a community may be evidenced by: 1) the number of moves made and the reasons given for moving, 2) further mobility intentions of the family, and/or, 3) the changes both made and desired in the residence. Their feelings about the supply of available housing offered by the new community when they entered the market are indirect clues as to one of the reasons why the first solution was not satisfactory and why mobility within the community and adaptations in

housing ensued. For the purposes of this study, direct expressions by the respondents regarding the house and six specific aspects of the house and their feelings about costs of housing also were used as measures of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction.

Failure of a community to have available a supply of housing suitable for the needs of incoming families often forces families into making an unsatisfactory first solution to their need for housing. Intra-community mobility then becomes one recourse whereby families bring their housing into adjustment with their needs. An inadequate supply of housing suitable for their families confronted approximately four-tenths of all of the families on their entry into Stillwater. One-half indicated that "a few" suitable houses had been available to them but only one-tenth said there were "several" suitable houses available.

Of the factors identified as being related to the unsuitability of the available housing, the data in Table X show that quality and size were found to be significantly related to size of family. A straight line relationship exists between quality and family size. More childless couples were concerned with this aspect of the housing, whereas large families were least concerned. As might be expected, size was identified as a factor most frequently by large families and least frequently by medium-sized families. Cost was the factor named most frequently by the lower educational group while no one factor appeared dominant among the higher educational group.

Making at least one intra-community move in an effort to acquire satisfactory housing was the pattern followed by more large families than by either small families or childless couples. Approximately one-half of the large families had moved since coming to Stillwater as

compared with four-tenths of the medium and three-tenths of the childless couples. Families whose homemakers had a lower educational level moved more than did those families in the higher educational group. Approximately one-third of the higher group had made at least one move as compared with two-fifths of the lower educational level group.

The reasons given for the moves described above can be considered indicative to some extent of wherein the housing first obtained by these families failed to satisfy their needs and/or preferences.

TABLE X
REASONS GIVEN FOR AVAILABLE HOUSING BEING CONSIDERED
AS UNSUITABLE

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent ¹			Percent ¹	
Cost	33.3	47.7	23.5	42.0	29.4
Quality	66.7*	43.2*	17.6*	36.0	32.3
Location	33.3	25.0	23.5	24.0	26.5
Size	50.0**	20.4**	47.1**	36.0	29.4
Other	33.3	46.5	50.0	57.1	32.3

* $\chi^2 = 8.5$ Tab. $\chi^2_{.025}$ (7.4) d.f. = 1

** $\chi^2 = 6.9$ Tab. $\chi^2_{.05}$ (5.9) d.f. = 1

¹Percents do not equal 100 as respondents may have given more than one reason.

Intra-community mobility was seldom generated by cost of housing (see Table XI). A move to attain less expensive housing was given as a reason for the first move within Stillwater by only one-tenth of the medium-sized families. None of the childless couples or large families

gave housing costs as a reason for their first move. To acquire a more attractive house was given as a reason for moving more often by homemakers of smaller households than by large families.

TABLE XI
REASONS GIVEN FOR MAKING THE FIRST INTRA-COMMUNITY MOVE

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent *			Percent *	
A More Attractive House	33.3	40.0	16.7	30.8	26.7
Cost Less	0.0	10.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Convenient Location	33.3	15.0	16.7	23.1	6.7
Nicer Neighborhood	0.0	30.0	11.1	11.5	33.3
A Larger House	66.7	50.0	38.9	50.0	40.0
More Outside Space	33.3	40.0	22.2	34.6	26.7
Wanted to Own	33.3	40.0	50.0	46.1	40.0

N = 47

*Percents may not total 100 as more than one response could be given.

Attainment of a more convenient location was given as the purpose for moving by childless couples and by the lower educated group more frequently than by the other groups. Neighborhood appears to be a factor related to the first moves of families with children more than it is for those without children. The absence of children in the family may explain the lack of concern with the neighborhood on the part of these childless couples. A nicer neighborhood was also sought by more of the higher educated group than by the lower educated group.

A larger house and more outside space were being sought by small and medium-sized families more than by large families when the first move within Stillwater was made. Perhaps this indicates that large families had made a deliberate attempt to acquire these features in their first residences and had been successful. A desire to own a home was given as a reason for moving more often by the large families and by the lower educated homemakers than by the homemakers of the other groups.

Some measure of satisfaction with housing may be obtained by the family's planned mobility. A future move within the community was planned by four-tenths of the medium-sized families, as compared with only three-tenths of the childless couples and two-tenths of the large families. Moves were planned by more of the families whose homemakers are of the higher educational level group than of the lower educational group. It is, by this measurement then, the medium-sized families and those families whose homemakers have a high educational attainment who are least satisfied with their present housing solution.

Dissatisfaction with the cost of their housing was expressed more by large families who, as a whole, are spending a smaller proportion of the family income for housing than was expressed by medium-sized families. One-half of the childless couples felt their housing costs were too high and none felt the costs could be higher. The lower educational level group, who were the ones with larger families, felt their present housing costs were too high significantly more often than did the higher educational group (see Table XII).

Addition of space or some type of space reorganization in housing is another recourse to which a family can resort in bringing housing

into adjustment with needs. As seen in Table XIII, additions of space had been made most frequently by large families; furthermore, these families desire more changes in the amount of space in their present housing than do the smaller families. Reorganization of space, which was made most often by the large families, was also most desired by the large families. Repairs and redecorations and the addition of equipment were desired with approximately equal frequency for all three groups. By and large, repairs and redecorations were desired by more families than any other type of change.

TABLE XII
FEELINGS ABOUT COSTS OF PRESENT HOUSING

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent			Percent	
Cost Too High	50.0	22.8	26.8	34.4*	15.9*
Cost About Right	50.0	61.4	68.3	59.4*	68.2*
Could be Higher	0.0	15.8	4.9	6.2*	15.9*

N = 108

* $\chi^2 = 6.0$ Tab. $\chi^2_{.05} (5.9)$ d.f. = 2.

Changes in the amount of space in the residence had been made more frequently by the lower than by the higher educational level group. Even so, they desired additions of space significantly more often than did the group with higher education. Repairs and redecorations, which had been made by more of the higher group, were desired significantly more often by the lower educational level group.

TABLE XIII
CHANGES MADE AND CHANGES DESIRED IN PRESENT RESIDENCE

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
Reorganization of Space	Percent			Percent	
Made	0.0	12.3	17.0	12.5	13.6
Desired	0.0	8.8	14.6	10.9	9.1
Addition of Space					
Made	0.0	1.7	14.6	9.4*	2.3*
Desired	10.0	2.10	29.3	31.2*	11.4*
Repair and Redecoration					
Made	20.0	22.8	24.4	20.3*	27.3*
Desired	20.0	21.0	17.0	23.4*	9.1
Addition of Equipment					
Made	30.0	33.3	24.4	26.6	34.1
Desired	10.0	14.0	14.6	15.6	11.4
Other					
Made	0.0	3.5	4.9	3.1	4.5
Desired	0.0	5.3	4.9	4.7	4.4

* Significant differences at .05 level of confidence.

Dissatisfaction with their present housing was expressed by very few homemakers when they were asked to rate their housing on a five-point scale. Approximately three-tenths of the homemakers expressed satisfaction at the "Very Satisfied" level for six aspects of the house and less than one-tenth indicated they were "Very Unsatisfied" with any aspect of the house. The proportion of homemakers who were "Very Satisfied" with their housing was about equal for families of all sizes,

but more large-sized families were only "Fairly Satisfied." Satisfaction was expressed by more of the homemakers of the lower educational level group than by those having a higher education; conversely, dissatisfaction with housing was expressed by the higher educational group more frequently than by the lower group (see Tables XIV and XV).

The six different aspects of their housing respondents were asked to rate were: amount of space, total storage area, amount of privacy to pursue individual interests, appearance from the standpoint of beauty, location, and neighborhood. Satisfaction with the amount of space in their housing was expressed more frequently by homemakers from medium-sized families and those more highly educated than by homemakers from large families and those who were less highly educated.

Storage in their housing was rated as satisfactory to some degree by more than two-thirds of the families. However, a straight line relationship exists between satisfaction with storage and the size of family. Fully one-half of the childless couples were "Very Satisfied" with storage while slightly more than four-tenths of the medium-sized families and only three-tenths of the larger families expressed this much satisfaction. A higher degree of satisfaction with the storage in their residence was expressed by the higher educational level group than by the lower group. This may be because the more highly educated group tend to have smaller families or be among the childless couples.

As might be expected, greater satisfactions with amount of privacy in their housing were expressed significantly more often by childless couples and families of medium-size than by large families. Three-fifths of the childless couples were "Very Satisfied" whereas only one-third of the medium sized and one-fifth of the large families expressed this

much satisfaction with the privacy afforded by their housing. The higher educational group was more satisfied with the amount of privacy offered in their present residence than was the lower level group.

Appearance from the standpoint of beauty of their housing was rated "Very Satisfactory" by large families more frequently than by either the small or medium-sized families. Homemakers having lower educational attainment were more satisfied with the appearance of their houses than were the higher educational level homemakers.

Location and neighborhood were rated as "Very Satisfactory" by almost a majority of all families. Large-sized families more so than the other two groups listed both their locations and neighborhoods as "Very Satisfactory." The higher educational level group gave a rating of "Very Satisfactory" to these two aspects of their housing more frequently than did the lower level group; the higher group, however, also expressed greater dissatisfaction with their location more than did those with a lower education.

Satisfaction scores derived according to the procedure described on page 22 show larger families to be less satisfied with six different aspects of their houses and childless couples to be more satisfied. The higher educational group expressed more satisfaction with the six aspects of their housing than did the lower educational level group. The results obtained from this scoring system are inconsistent with respondents' evaluations of their houses as a whole.

TABLE XIV
 PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS RATING HOUSE AND SELECTED FEATURES
 AS VERY SATISFACTORY

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent			Percent	
House as a Whole	30.0	31.6	29.3	31.2	29.5
Amount of Space	30.0	36.8	26.8	29.7	36.4
Total Storage Area	50.0	43.9	31.7	35.9	45.4
Amount of Privacy	60.0	33.3	21.9	28.1	36.4
Appearance	20.0	19.3	36.6	28.1	22.7
Location	50.0	45.6	56.1	48.4	52.3
Neighborhood	60.0	43.9	43.9	50.0	38.6

TABLE XV
 PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS RATING HOUSE AND SELECTED FEATURES
 AS VERY UNSATISFACTORY

	Size of Family			Education	
	Small	Medium	Large	Low	High
	Percent			Percent	
House as a Whole	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	2.3
Amount of Space	0.0	7.0	2.4	6.2	2.3
Total Storage Area	0.0	12.3	4.9	10.9	4.5
Amount of Privacy	0.0	7.0	7.3	6.2	6.8
Appearance	0.0	10.5	7.3	9.4	6.8
Location	0.0	7.0	2.4	1.6	9.1
Neighborhood	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.6	0.0

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The study is an investigation of: 1) ways professional families go about solving housing needs created by an inter-community move, 2) satisfactions and/or dissatisfactions experienced by the families with their solutions, and 3) factors related to the solutions made and to the satisfactions attained. It is based on the assumption that from such an examination one can develop guidelines pertaining to the kinds of housing that should be made available for similar families who may enter the same community.

The hypothesis related to the third purpose is: solutions to housing needs and satisfactions with the solutions reached by professional families moving into a community are related to size of family and the educational level of the homemaker.

Professional families who had moved to Stillwater, Oklahoma, within the two year period, 1963-1965, were chosen as the population because their income level would allow a wider range of possible solutions and their entry into the community was recent enough to ensure a more accurate recall of the solutions made and of the processes used in reaching these solutions. Names of families meeting sample limitations were obtained from the local Newcomer Listing. A total of 108 respondents

composed the sample.

An interview schedule was devised for obtaining data with the questions pertaining to: solutions, processes, and satisfactions. Data were collected from homemakers by individual interviews held in their homes.

The data were processed by staff of the Computing Center at Oklahoma State University. The Chi-square Test for Independence was used in determining significance of difference between variables. Daniel's table of "Statistically Significant Differences in Observed Percents" was used in determining significant differences between two samples of nearly equal size.

Conclusions

From analysis of the data, the following conclusions relating to the hypothesis are drawn:

1. Few significant differences emerged between groups classified according to level of education and size of family. The hypothesis-- that solutions to housing needs and satisfactions with the solutions reached by professional families moving into a community are related to size of family and educational level of the homemaker--cannot be unconditionally accepted.

2. Size of family appears to be related to:

- A. The type of informative sources used in locating the present residence.
- B. Type of changes made in present residence.
- C. Size of housing now occupied.
- D. Reasons given for the unsuitability of housing available upon entry into the Stillwater market.

3. Educational level of the homemaker appears to be related to:

- A. Age of housing now occupied.
- B. Size of housing now occupied.
- C. Type of changes desired in the residence.
- D. Feelings about costs of present housing.

4. Because a significant difference emerged between the two independent variables, educational level and size of family, differences in the dependent variables which appear to be related to education may stem more from differences in family size than from differences in educational attainment.

5. The basic overall patterns relative to the solutions, processes and satisfactions were:

Solutions: Ownership of a new single-family house was the predominant solution at the end of a two year period following entry into a community. Apartments or older houses were seldom the solutions made. Three bedroom houses were occupied by approximately three-fifths of the families. One-sixth or less of the family income was spent for housing by approximately one-half of the families.

Processes: Employment connections or friends were more often sources used in locating residences than were real estate agents. The limited supply of housing from which to choose was given as a factor influencing selection by almost one-half of the total group. Cost was not a major factor influencing selection.

Making one or more intra-community moves as a process in reaching a satisfactory housing solution was a pattern of large families more than it was a pattern of childless couples. Of those who had moved, "rent-buy" was the most frequently reported tenancy pattern. Making

some adaptation of space was a solution made by almost one-half of the total sample.

Satisfactions/Dissatisfactions: Dissatisfaction with cost of housing was the factor given least frequently as a reason for making an intra-community move. Attainment of a more attractive house, a larger house, and more outside space were the most frequently given reasons for having moved within the two year period. Approximately three-tenths of the families were sufficiently dissatisfied with their present housing that they were planning a future move.

For the kind of housing attained, housing costs were considered to be "about right" by nearly three-fourths of the families; approximately one-fourth felt they were too high. Repairs, redecorations, and the addition of equipment are most often the changes desired in order to make the present housing more satisfactory.

Dissatisfaction was expressed by very few of the homemakers in their ratings of their houses on a five-point scale. Satisfaction with six aspects of their housing was expressed at the "Very Satisfied" level by approximately three-tenths of the families; less than one-tenth were "Very Dissatisfied." More than two-thirds of the families were "Very Satisfied" with storage; three-tenths were "Very Satisfied" with the amount of space in their residences. An inverse relationship emerged between satisfaction with amount of privacy afforded by the residence and size of family; large families expressed least satisfaction. Satisfaction with appearance was expressed by homemakers of large families and by those having a lower educational attainment more than by homemakers of small families and those with a higher education. Location and neighborhood were rated as "Very Satisfactory" by approximately

one-half of all families.

6. Several characteristics of housing seemed to be playing a role in the mobility of the families who had moved during the two-year period. Almost one-half had moved; of those families who had moved, nearly all identified some aspect of the house itself, e.g., a more attractive house, a larger house, more outside space, as a reason for having moved.

Recommendations

The writer submits the following recommendations relative to further study in the area of housing solutions and satisfactions:

1. That a comparable study be conducted using a larger, less homogeneous sample.
2. That the present study be enlarged using other factors which may influence patterns of solutions such as the nature and location of the community from which the families came, type of housing the family had occupied previously, income level of the families, stages in the family life cycle, and values relative to housing held by the home-maker.
3. That a more detailed study of satisfactions and dissatisfactions with different aspects of housing be conducted to discover what specific improvements in the existing housing supply of a given community may be necessary to achieve housing which will meet better the needs of families.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu-Lughod, Janet. "A Survey of Center-City Residents." Housing Choices and Housing Constraints. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Beyer, Glenn H. "Future Explorations in Home Economics: Housing." Journal of Home Economics, LII (October, 1960), 643-45.
- _____. Housing: A Factual Analysis. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1958.
- Beyer, Glenn H., Thomas W. Mackesey and James E. Montgomery. Houses Are For People. Research Publication No. 3. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1955.
- Bureau of The Census. United States Census of Population, 1960. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, p. 49.
- Case, Fred E. Cash Outlays and Economic Costs of Home Ownership. Los Angeles: Bureau of Business and Economic Research, 1957.
- Chapin, F. Stuart. "The Psychology of Housing," Social Forces, XXX (October, 1951), 11-15.
- Daniel, Cuthbert. "Statistically Significant Differences in Observed Per Cents." Journal of Applied Psychology, VI (December, 1940), 826-827.
- Davies, Joseph E. Fundamentals of Housing Study. New York: Columbia University, 1938.
- Dean, John P. "Housing Design and Social Relations." Social Science Research Council. Mimeograph, 1951.
- _____. "The Myths of Housing Reform." American Sociological Review, XIV (1949), 281-88.
- Foote, Nelson N., Janet Abu-Lughod, Mary Mix Foley, and Louis Winnick. Housing Choices and Housing Constraints. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Glick, Paul C. American Families. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1957.

- Heady, Earl O. "Family Mobility In Our Dynamic Society." Ames, Iowa: Center for Agriculture and Economic Development, 1963.
- Hollingshead, August B. "Class Differences in Family Stability." Class, Status and Power. Ed. Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953, 284-292.
- Housing and Home Finance Agency. Women's Congress On Housing. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956.
- Internal Migration In The United States: April, 1940, to April, 1947. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, 1948.
- Leslie, Gerald R. and Authur H. Richardson. "Life Cycle, Career Pattern and the Decision to Move." American Sociological Review. XXVI (December, 1961), 894-902.
- "Mobility and Migration As Factors In Housing Demand." Housing Research No. 6. Washington, D.C.: Housing and Home Finance Agency, (October, 1953), 1-7.
- Montgomery, James E. "Housing Values: Meaning, Measurement and Implications." Address delivered at Oklahoma Home Economics Association, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, (October 5, 1957).
- Niemi, Tynni. "Present Practices and Activities of 84 Ohio Families and Factors Affecting Their Housing Preferences." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ohio State University, 1949.
- Paxton, Edward T. What People Want When They Buy A House. Washington, D.C.: Housing and Home Finance Agency, 1955.
- Perry, Mignon. "Relationship of Space In Housing To Attitudes Toward Family Life." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Cornell University, 1958.
- Rossi, Peter H. Why Families Move. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.
- Schiro, Bruno A. "Housing Surveys in 75 Cities, 1950 and 1952." Monthly Labor Review, LXXVII (July, 1954), 744-750.
- Schmitt, Robert C. "Differential Mobility in Honolulu." Sociological Abstracts. VIII, No. III, 197, 7890.
- Smith, Ruth H., Laura D. Kivlin and Cecile P. Sinden. Housing Choices and Selections As Evidenced by Residential Mobility. College of Home Economics Research Publication 204, University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1963.
- Stuckert, Robert P. "Occupational Mobility and Family Relationships," Social Forces, XL (March, 1963), 253-260 and 301-307.

Sullenger, Earl T. "The Social Significance of Mobility: An Omaha Study," The American Journal of Sociology, LV (May, 1950), 559-564.

Wallace, Anthony. Housing and Social Structure. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Reproduced by the Philadelphia Housing Authority, 1952.

APPENDIX

(7)___ 4. Which of the statements on this card best describes the amount of education you have completed?

___ 1. Did not graduate from high school.

___ 2. Graduated from high school.

___ 3. Trade School
(Specify)_____

___ 4. Some college but did not graduate.

___ 5. Graduated from college.

___ 6. Have some graduate work.

___ 7. Completed Master's degree.

___ 8. Doctoral degree.

FEATURE CARDS

On these cards are a number of features which contribute more or less to the adequacy of a housing unit. I should like you to sort them into three stacks. With this card will you put those features that you think are so Important that you would not consider renting or buying a unit which did not provide them? With this card, put the features which you consider to be Fairly Important; i.e., you would like to have them, but would rent or buy a unit which did not provide them. With this card, put features which you consider to be Not Important; i.e., you would give them little consideration in renting or buying a unit.

Will you look through the Important stack and see if there are any features which you consider to be so important that you would pay more to have them? Put them with this card

(Card: Very Important.)

(8)___ 5. How long have you lived in Stillwater?

___ 1. Less than one month.

___ 2. 1-6 months.

___ 3. 7-12 months.

___ 4. 13-18 months.

___ 5. 19-24 months.

(9)___ 6. Are you the first occupants of this house/apartment?

___ 1. No.

___ 2. Yes.

(10)___ 7. Do you rent or own this residence?

___ 1. Rent.

___ 2. Own.

IF OWN

7A. Did you build or buy this house?

___ 1. Buy.

___ 2. Build.

(11)___ 8. Which of the percentages or proportions listed on this card best represent the portion of your family income which you spend for housing?

___ 1. Less than 1/6 or 16%.

___ 2. 1/6 or 16%.

___ 3. 1/5 or 20%.

___ 4. 1/4 or 25%.

___ 5. 1/3 or 33%.

___ 6. More than 1/3 or over 33%.

___ 7. Not relevant.

(12) 9. Which of the statements on this card best describes your feelings about your housing costs?

- 1. I think the cost of this housing is higher than it should be for the kind of housing it is.
- 2. I think the cost of this housing is about right for the kind of housing it is.
- 3. I think the cost of this housing is not as high as it could be for the kind of housing it is.

10. Have any changes or modifications been made to this house/apartment by yourself/the landlord to make it more suitable for your family?

- 1. No.
- 2. Yes.

IF YES

(13-18) 10A. What changes or modifications have been made?

11. Do you feel some changes need to be made in this house/apartment to meet the needs of your family?

- 1. No.
- 2. Yes.

IF YES

(19-24) 11A. What changes need to be made?

- (25) 12. How many bedrooms do you have in this residence?
(Circle number)

1 2 3 4 5

- (26) 13. How many bathrooms do you have in this residence?

1 1½ 2 2½ 3

On this card is a five-point scale. Would you please use this scale in giving your answers to the next few questions I ask?

- (27) 14. Would you say that, for your family, this house/apartment is:

1 2 3 4 5
V.S. F.S. S. F.U. V.U.

- (28) 15. Do you feel that, for your family, the amount of space in this house/apartment is:

1 2 3 4 5
V.S. F.S. S. F.U. V.U.

- (29) 16. Would you say that, for your family, the total storage area in this house/apartment is:

1 2 3 4 5
V.S. F.S. S. F.U. V.U.

- (30) 17. Is the amount of privacy offered each member of your family to pursue individual interests in this house/apartment:

1 2 3 4 5
V.S. F.S. S. F.U. V.U.

- (31) 18. Would you say that the appearance from the standpoint of beauty of this house is:

1 2 3 4 5
V.S. F.S. S. F.U. V.U.

- (32) 19. Would you say that, for your family, this location is:

1 2 3 4 5
V.S. F.S. S. F.U. V.U.

- (33) 20. Do you feel that, for your family, this neighborhood is:

1 2 3 4 5
V.S. F.S. S. F.U. V.U.

(34-37)21. Can you tell me some of the reasons why you selected this house/apartment?

- ___ 1. No.
 ___ 2. Yes. (Specify)

A. _____
 B. _____
 C. _____
 D. _____

(38)___

(39-44)22. Can you tell me some features you wanted but were unable to get in a house/apartment before you decided on this one?

- ___ 1. No.
 ___ 2. Yes. (Specify)

A. _____
 B. _____
 C. _____
 D. _____
 E. _____

(45-50)

(51)___ 23. How many other residences did you seriously consider for your last move before you decided on this one? (Circle number).

0 1 2 3 ___ More than 3

(52)___ 24. Do you plan to remain in this particular residence while you are in Stillwater?

- ___ 1. No.
 ___ 2. Yes.
 ___ 3. I don't know.

IF NO

24A. Are you planning to make a change in residence:

1. Within six months.
 2. Within one year.
 3. Within three years.
 4. Undetermined.

25. Is this residence the first place you have lived in Stillwater?

1. No.
 2. Yes.

IF NO

25A. How many times have you moved since coming to Stillwater?
(Circle number)

- 1 2 3 More than 3

(53) 25B. What type of residence did you move into when you first came to Stillwater?

1. Rented apartment.
 2. Rented house.
 3. Bought house.
 4. Other (Specify) _____

25C. Do any of the statements on this card describe your reasons for moving from your first residence in Stillwater?

1. No. (Specify) _____

 2. Yes. _____

IF YES

Will you give me the number(s) of the statement(s)?

- (54)___ ___ 1. We wanted a more attractive house/apartment.
 (55)___ ___ 2. We wanted a house/apartment that cost less.
 (56)___ ___ 3. We wanted a more convenient location.
 (57)___ ___ 4. We wanted to live in a nicer neighborhood.
 (58)___ ___ 5. We wanted a larger house/apartment.
 (59)___ ___ 6. We wanted more outside space.
 (60)___ ___ 7. We wanted to own a home, rather than rent.

(61)___

(62-70)26. To what extent was satisfactory housing available to your family when you first came to Stillwater, i.e., were there

- ___ ___ 1. No suitable houses.
 ___ ___ 2. A few suitable houses.
 ___ ___ 3. Several suitable houses.

IF 1 or 2

In what ways were the houses that were available not suitable?

27. A. How did you locate your first residence in Stillwater?

B. How did you locate your present residence?

A. First B. Present

- | | | | |
|------|-----|-----|---------------------------------------------------------|
| (71) | ___ | ___ | 1. Real Estate Agent or home builder. |
| (72) | ___ | ___ | 2. Friends, former residents or employment connections. |
| | ___ | ___ | 3. Placed newspaper advertisement. |
| | ___ | ___ | 4. Read newspaper advertisement. |
| | ___ | ___ | 5. Stumbled upon it. |
| | ___ | ___ | 6. Not relevant. |

VITA

Eleanor Perry Bristow

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: HOUSING SOLUTIONS MADE AND SATISFACTIONS ATTAINED BY
PROFESSIONAL FAMILIES MOVING FROM ONE COMMUNITY TO ANOTHER
AND SOME FACTORS RELATED TO THESE SOLUTIONS AND SATISFACTIONS

Major Field: Housing and Interior Design

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Braggs, Oklahoma, the daughter of W. G.
and Janie Evans Perry.

Education: Attended Fort Gibson Grade School, Ft. Gibson, Oklahoma;
graduated from Wilburton High School, Wilburton, Oklahoma, in
May, 1954; received Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma
State University with a major in Home Economics Education,
May, 1960; completed requirements for the Master of Science
degree, August, 1965.

Professional Experience: Taught Vocational Home Economics, Stroud
Public School, Stroud, Oklahoma, 1960-1963; served as
Graduate Research Assistant, 1965, in the Department of
Housing and Interior Design, Oklahoma State University.

Organizations: Phi Upsilon Omicron, Omicron Nu, Kappa Delta Pi,
Phi Kappa Phi.