HOUSEWIVES' EVALUATION OF THEIR HOUSING

BY

Karin J. Bargar

A PROBLEM

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Arts

1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful for a long association with Dr. Gertrude Nygren in under-graduate and graduate studies. A sincere personal interest was shown in her assistance in helping develop this research problem.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Mary Gephart Donnell, Dr. Carmyn Morrow and Mrs. Bonnie Morrison for their suggestions for developing the study and their evaluation of the paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

A home to live in is of major importance to most people. A choice of a home involves value judgments that are characterized by each person's need for physical, sociological and psychological satisfactions.

But how well are people housed? For example, are they aware of the conveniences, comforts, privacy and socialization functions that well planned housing could offer a family? Or are they so accommodating that they adjust to their living space without conscious effort and are satisfied with low quality housing or unjustifiably dissatisfied with good housing.

Winston Churchill once said that we shape out buildings and then they shape us. These buildings he speaks of could well be our homes. "Once a family occupies a house or apartment, it has to adjust itself to the plan and conveniences (or lack or conveniences) provided."[1]

For this reason it seems important to learn more about people as they are influenced by their housing. They may be housed well or poorly without being aware of what characteristics are responsible for either negative or positive reactions.

---

[1]Glen H. Beyer, Housing: A Factual Analysis (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1958), p. 169.

This study is an attempt to learn if housewives are able to objectively evaluate the quality of their housing and how the ratings compare to their expressed reactions of satisfaction or dissatisfaction for their housing.

An instrument described as "A Housing Quality Measuring Scale"[2] is used as a questionnaire for an interview. The rating instrument proposes to be an objective means of recording the existence and condition of basic facilities of a dwelling unit and the total score should reflect housing quality.

The author using the same rating instrument for each house attempts to be a constant in each case to help determine if the housewives rate more positive or negative according to their general reactions.

Also several open-end questions are asked the housewives in regard to any additional factors not included in the questionnaire that may contribute or subtract from the quality of their housing. If features are suggested by the housewives on the open-end questions that are physical, sociological or psychological aspects of housing, it may be concluded that these factors are not included in the instrument and should be a part of a measure for living environments.

While it is recognized that if disagreements between the investigator and housewives occur, it cannot be established that

---

[2]C. M. Edwards and Annette J. Schaeffer, A Housing Quality Measuring Scale (Michigan State University: Rural Manpower Center, Report No. 8, Revised November 1966), pp. 35-50.

housewives do not give a true reflection of the quality of their housing. It may be that the author is not entirely objective in her ratings, or that the instrument is inadequate. But it is conceivable that evidence would emerge for how another study could be designed to accomplish this objective.

Information in this research could be a guide in the selection of subject matter and learning experiences for teaching high school students an understanding of housing needs for family situations.

Review of Literature

An evaluation of housing to determine the extent to which it meets a families' needs is an involved task. The many variables and subjective factors make the concept of quality housing difficult to define. The majority of references in the field of housing still do not know how to determine if people are housed well or poorly and if they are satisfied or dissatisfied with their housing.

Glen H. Beyer, a pioneer in the field of housing studies, discusses housing design in his book, Housing: A Factual Analysis. There is no formula for a house that will meet all requirements. Families differ from each other not only in what they can afford and where they live, but also families within themselves are constantly changing and with those changes different housing design requirements develop.[3]

The Ford Foundation supported studies entitled Action Series

---

[3]Beyer, op. cit.

in Housing and Community Development. One of the books published in this series entitled, Housing, People, and Cities, discusses the preferences of the consumer. "But what does the consumer want? Unfortunately, no one knows, at least with sufficient assurance to cause the building industry to make many drastic changes in its present practices. The purchase or rental of any dwelling represents a series of compromises by the consumer. He does not like every feature in the house he selects, nor does he dislike every feature in the house he rejects. He makes his decision by striking the best balance he can, within his means, between what he likes and what he dislikes."[4]

The authors go on to say that the principle criteria for satisfaction with a dwelling unit are the amount and distribution of space, physical condition, and equipment. As long as conditions and equipment are well below the standards of the household, concern about space remains relatively dormant...Space is a sophisticated preference, a largely self-generated luxury that accompanies a higher standard of living.[5]

So it seems, the basic factor that makes families differ from each other are the "human values" they hold. A Cornell Value Study Group identified nine basic values as having relevance to the selection of housing design. These values included family centrism,

---

[4]Martin Meyerson, Barbara Terrett and William L.C. Wheaton, Housing, People, and Cities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), p. 83.

[5]Ibid., p. 86.

equality, economy, freedom, physical health, aesthetics, leisure, mental health and social prestige.[6]

Tessie Agan and Elaine Luchsinger refer to these nine basic values in their book entitled The House. While dominant values such as these may be apparent in many people, most people tend to hold many, if not all, in varying degrees. In addition, the ways in which the values are satisfied are relative and are affected by the educational level, the cultural background, the economic situation, and other aspects of each individual.[7]

The Action Series makes the conclusion that they (some industries) were beginning to realize that there is no single faced, single purpose consumer for any commodity...even for housing. There probably never was, but the fiction was preserved for a long time by many groups, including the producers of housing.[8]

Objectives of the Study

1. To ascertain if these is any agreement of housewives' rating of of their housing by M.S.U. Manpower Center's, "A Housing Quality Measuring Scale" to the author's rating of the same house with the same instrument.

---

[6]Glen H. Beyer, Thomas W. Mackesey and James E. Montgomery, Houses Are For People, A Study of Home Buyers Motivations (Cornell University Research Center, Research Publication No. 3 (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1955)), pp. 2-7.

[7]Tessie Agan and Elaine Luchsinger, The House (New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1965), p. 9.

[8]Myerson, Terrett and Wheaton, op. cit., p.96.

2. To observe if these is any agreement between the housewives' rating of their housing and their expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction for their housing.
3. To learn:
   a. if these is evidence that the questionnaire honestly describes quality housing.
   b. if other features should be included in the questionnaire in order for it to be a measure of physical, sociological and psychological aspects of housing.
4. To gain some information relative to consumers and their basis for making housing decisions as a guide for teaching housing to high school students.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

Selection of Sample

Interviews were conducted with ten housewives living within the city limits of St. Johns, Michigan. They were all homeowners and living in single-family detached homes.

Other than the above constants, no formal sampling plan was used, although consideration was given so as to include different (1) ages and sizes of houses, (2) neighborhoods, (3) size of families, (4) economic levels, and (5) life cycles of families.

The author chose housewives with which she had an acquaintance and thought would be willing and had the time to spend for an interview. The contact and interview date was established by telephone. The duration of an interview was approximately one and one-half hours with each housewife.

Description of the Instruments

The Michigan State University Manpower Center Report No. 8 contains a rating instrument for measuring quality of housing. It is organized in environmental groupings of related housing facilities which provide for the satisfaction of physical human needs. These groupings are called "systems" and are categorized as follows: (1) Inside and Outside Structure, (2) Plumbing, (3) Electrical, (4) Heating, (5) Family Activity, and (6) Site Characteristics. Components within the systems are arranged on a checklist ranging in progression from basic to luxury, or given

a score if the condition exists. System scores are weighted to have approximately equal value.

The total number of points places dwelling units on a continuum classified as follows:

50	100	165	230	280
Basic	Adequate	Comfortable	Luxury	

Thus the higher the score on the continuum, the more "conveniences" and "comfort" the dwelling provides.

According to the Kuder-Richardson formula no. 21, the estimate of reliability of all systems of the instrument average .85 and over. The validity is not mentioned and the instrument was not tested after revisions were made.

The open-end questions developed by the author were especially intended to determine if any sociological or psychological factors were not observable in the questionnaire but could be considered responsible for housewives' expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of their housing. Such findings would indicate that housewives are conscious of more factors than the instrument reflects. Therefore the instrument would not be highly related to satisfactions.

Administration of the Instruments

An interview was conducted in the following manner:

(1) The housewife was asked if she was satisfied or dissatisfied with her house. The author recorded her exact response.

(2) The housewife evaluated her housing using the Michigan State University Manpower Center's, "A Quality Housing Measuring Scale".

(3) The housewife was asked these open-end questions:

a. Are there any features about your house which you think are responsible for satisfying or meeting your needs which were not included in the questionnaire?

b. Are there any features about your house which you think are responsible for dissatisfaction or not meeting your needs which were not included in the questionnaire?

(4) Immediately following each interview the author rated each house using the same instruments.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Description of the Sample

The population included:

AGE OF STRUCTURE

No. of years	No. of houses
Less than 5	2
5 - 9	1
10 - 19	2
20 or more	5

MARKET EVALUATION OF HOUSES

No. of families	Price of houses
2	$16,000
1	$18,000
1	$22,500
2	$25,000
1	$30,000
1	$32,000
2	$42,000

TENURE OF OCCUPANCY

Months or years	No. of families
0 - 5 months	0
6 - 12 months	2
1 - 5 years	2
Over 5 years	6

NUMBER OF OCCUPANTS

No. of families	No. of members in family
2	2
3	4
2	5
2	6
1	7

FLOORS FOR LIVING

No. of floors	No. of houses
1	5
2	4
3	1

NUMBER OF ROOMS IN HOUSES

No. of rooms	No. of houses
6	3
7	5
8	0
9 or more	2

NUMBER OF BEDROOMS

No. of bedrooms	No. of houses
3	7
4	3

INCOME FROM HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

Income	No. of heads of household
No answer	2
$7,000 - $8,999	2
$9,000 - $10,999	1
$11,000 - $12,999	2
$13,000 - $14,999	2
$15,000 - $16,999	0
$17,000 or more	1

INCOME FROM WIVES

Income	No. of wives
Not employed	7
$9,000 - $10,999	2
$11,000 - $13,000	1

TYPE OF OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

Type of occupation	No. of heads of household
Salesman	1
Jeweler	1
Insurance agent	1
High School Administrator	2
Teacher	5

TABLE I - ENVIRONMENTAL SYSTEM SCORES AS RATED BY HOUSEWIVES AND INVESTIGATOR

	Structure Inside	Structure Outside	Plumbing	Electrical	Heating	Family Activities	Site Characteristics	Totals	Differences	Expressed Reactions
FAMILY I										Quite Satisfied
Housewife	39	49	56	40.5	36	56	55	331.5		
Investigator	39	49	56	40.5	36	56	55	331.5	----	
FAMILY II										Very Satisfied
Housewife	39	51	56	43.5	36	54	40	319.5		
Investigator	39	51	56	43.5	36	53	40	318.5	-1	
FAMILY III										Satisfied
Housewife	35	46	57	39	42	52	40	311		
Investigator	35	46	57	39	42	46	40	305	-6	
FAMILY IV										Satisfied
Housewife	34	53	52	30	33	52	50	304		
Investigator	34	52	52	30	33	52	50	303	-1	
FAMILY V										Satisfied
Housewife	39	50	56	40.5	36	51	25	297.5		
Investigator	39	49	56	40.5	36	51	25	296.5	-1	
FAMILY VI										Satisfied
Housewife	32	47	50	31.5	33	47	50	290.5		
Investigator	32	47	50	31.5	33	45	50	288.5	-2	
FAMILY VII										Completely Satisfied
Housewife	28	43	54	34.5	33	41	50	283.5		
Investigator	28	43	54	34.5	33	41	50	283.5	----	
FAMILY VIII										Generally Satisfied
Housewife	26	43	51	34.5	39	47	40	280.5		
Investigator	26	43	49	34.5	39	47	40	278.5	-2	
FAMILY IX										Satisfied
Housewife	27	48	50	22.5	36	37	40	260.5		
Investigator	27	48	50	22.5	36	36	40	259.5	-1	
FAMILY X										Dissatisfie
Housewife	22	47	51	30	36	40	25	251		
Investigator	22	45	50	30	36	36	25	244	-7	

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

A Comparison of Housewives' and Investigator's Ratings

Referring to Table I, the ratings of housewives and the investigator when evaluating the same house were so closely related that any differences could be considered of little significance. No differences occurred in ratings between housewives and the investigator in four systems, namely, Outside Structure, Electrical, Heating, and Site Characteristics. The greatest difference in rating can be noted in the Family Activity system. The author believes this area in a house has more sociological and psychological implications and the housewives and investigator were forced to make less tangible judgments on these items. But an average of 2.2 points difference of the 234 to 331.5 total points scored by the houses would possibly indicate that both the housewives and the investigator used almost the same criteria in their evaluations.

"Halo Effect"

The possibility of the housewives exhibiting a slight "halo effect" is in evidence. Total ratings of eight of the housewives were slightly higher than the investigator, and two housewives had identical scores with the investigator. None of the housewives rated their houses lower than the investigator.

The items in disagreement never operated as equalizing factors

in total scores, but in each instance of disagreement between the housewife and the investigator the same item was involved.

The greatest difference in ratings appeared between Housewife X and the investigator. This housewife expressed dissatisfaction for her house but still rated it higher on three systems. Because the house is listed for sale, it is possible the housewife does not wish to degrade the house hoping for a better market price and quicker sale.

Relationship of Housewives' Ratings to Satisfactions and Dissatisfactions Expressed

Table I indicates the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction the housewives expressed for their housing in relation to their ability to objectively rate their housing.

Housewives I, II and VII could be categorized as expressing the highest degree of satisfaction with their housing. Their expressed reactions toward their houses were "quite satisfied", "very satisfied" and "completely satisfied". Housewives I and VII's ratings were in complete agreement with the investigator's and Housewife II rated her house only one point higher.

It appeared that the highest degree of satisfaction for a house did not tend to make a housewife rate it higher in quality than was reflected by the rating instrument.

Housewives III, IV, V, VI, VIII, and IX expressed "satisfied" or "generally satisfied" with their housing. The differences in scoring of this second category of housewives and the investigator

ranged from one to six points, although, only one housewife rated six points higher while the others rated one to two points higher. This indicates a tendency of the housewives in this category to rate their houses only slightly higher than the investigator, but the points difference even then is not an appreciable difference considering the 374 points possible.

In a third category, Housewife X expressed "dissatisfied" with her house and rated it seven points higher than the investigator. This housewife's rating however, was only 9.5 points less than Housewife IX who expressed "satisfied" with her housing. This suggests the instrument is not a measure of satisfaction because it does not include all the qualities important to housing. The author can support this statement by remarks made by Housewife X referring to her dislike for her neighborhood and neighborhood children, the desire for more space between houses and a larger yard for the children to play, for pets and a garden.

There is no evidence in this study that housewives tend to score their housing higher when they express satisfaction and lower when they express dissatisfaction. But the author is aware of certain implications such as:

(1) Most housewives' ratings agreed closely to those of the investigator.

(2) Certain factors that rate satisfaction or dissatisfaction in housing were not included.

(3) There needs to be further study to be sure if sociological and psychological factors remain unmentioned by either the housewives or the instrument.

Instrument Analysis

The close relationship of scoring between the housewives and the investigator may be attributed to the objectivity of the instrument. But the objectivity is questioned when it is observed by the author that many items were difficult for the housewives and investigator to interpret. Also, the items were not definitive at the "luxury" level at which all houses in the sample measured. For instance, the following items were difficult to interpret or did not seem to directly effect the quality of housing:

Item 13...Porches and patios

One family had no porch so was penalized in total score.

Several families had two porches or a porch and a patio, so a decision had to be made as to which to score.

Item 15...Walls and ceilings--finish

The alternatives were not comparable within categories.

The third alternative...one or two repairable cracks or defects

The fourth alternative...no defects, no cracks, plumb square windows and door frames

Item 18...Floor, condition of

The third and fourth alternatives are of equal value.

The third alternative...level, smooth and solid

The fourth alternative...floor finish appropriate and well maintained

Item 19...Windows, condition of

The second and third alternatives are too near the same meaning.

The second alternative...one or two not working as intended

The third alternative...one or two need maintenance

Also, one house had more than two windows not working as intended or needing maintenance.

Item 33...Double glass windows

The item is plural and some houses had only one double glass window.

Item 34...Storm windows

It was not understood if this item could be checked if some windows had storm windows or it meant that all windows had storm windows.

Item 41...Privacy

Most of the housewives pulled curtains at night for privacy. It was a decision to make if this should be considered privacy from neighbors.

Item 55...Trash

The city of St. Johns provides trash pick-up which is as desirable as an inside incinerator, yet it receives a lower rating.

Item 95...Sink

The desirability of a double sink is questionable if the housewife has a dishwasher.

Item 108...Food storage--Facilities for freezer

It was not understood if a freezer in combination with the refrigerator should be considered. Also, a separate freezer was sometimes in the basement, then it was undecided if the next item (109...Adjacent work space), referred to the refrigerator or the freezer.

Item 110...Adjacent storage area

It was not known if the adjacent storage space referred to the refrigerator or the freezer.

The instrument did produce considerable agreement (within 2 points on 8 of the scores) between the housewives and the investigator. The greatest variations were 6 to 7 points. This amount is not great when a possible score on the evaluation is 374 points.

Directional consistency can be noted in the study. The satisfied housewives did rate their housing higher than the one dissatisfied housewife. However, 9.5 magnitude of difference between the satisfied and dissatisfied housewife did not appear to be an adequate amount to place much confidence in the response. The fact that there was only one dissatisfied housewife also made any generalization impossible.

Sociological and Psychological Aspects of Housing as Expressed by the Housewives

The Michigan State University Manpower Center Report No. 8 declares the instrument it developed to be "a measuring device whereby any dwelling unit could be scored according to the degree to which it supplied human physical, psychological, and social living needs". Yet, when the housewives were asked if there were any other features about their houses which they thought were responsible for satisfaction or dissatisfaction that were not included in the questionnaire, there were many responses.

The responses from the housewives when asked the question, "Are there any features about your house which you think are responsible for satisfying or meeting your needs which were not included in the questionnaire?", could be classified as follows:

(1) Living space

The family room was especially enjoyed by three housewives. Although Item 85 on the fourth alternative states, "Place for group activities to go on at the same time without conflict", this does not necessarily refer to a family room. Two housewives enjoyed their large yards that made them feel that were not crowded and gave the children lots of room for play.

(2) Conveniences

One housewife enjoyed the finish of floors, woodwork, etc. in respect to easy care.

Two housewives liked the traffic flow in their houses.

(3) Location and status

Three housewives liked their geographic location in the city and further qualified it by saying it was a nice neighborhood, with houses similar in value and people took pride in their homes and yards.

Five housewives mentioned liking their location in respect to shopping, schools and the city park.

Eight housewives mentioned they liked their neighborhood and two liked their neighbors.

(4) Aesthetics

One housewife liked the colors in the rooms in her house, and another felt the carpeting in her bathroom was luxurious.

One housewife enjoyed the challenge of a big old house for remodeling and redecorating.

The responses from the housewives when asked the question, "Are there any features about your house which you think are responsible for dissatisfaction or not meeting your needs which were not included in the questionnaire?", could be classified as follows:

(1) Living space

Three housewives would like to have larger yards or lots to have more space for children to play, for pets, for a garden or more space between neighbors.

Three housewives would like more space for storage for things such as bicycles, sporting and camping equipment.

Three housewives would like more room for entertaining, such as a family room, or entertaining more than one age group at a time.

(2) Conveniences

One housewife disliked having her utility room in the basement.

One housewife disliked the large house in respect to the amount of cleaning it involved.

(3) Location

Two housewives disliked their neighbors and one disliked the neighbor's children.

One housewife disliked living so far from the high school and the city park.

(4) Aesthetics

One housewife would like some trees in the yard.

In order for the questionnaire to be a better measure of quality of housing for family living, the housewives are suggesting that additional items be included that pertain a little more specifically to (1) living space, (2) convenience, (3) location, and (4) aesthetics.

Some other sociological and psychological features the author suggests could be included in the instrument are, (1) pride of possession, (2) status desired, (3) security, (4) privacy for family members, (5) orderliness, (6) beauty, and (7) symbolism.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Conclusions

Housewives tended to be satisfied with their present housing, not that they did not express some dissatisfaction on various features of their houses and neighborhoods. One housewife stated, "I guess I am easily satisfied", and the evaluation instrument did not reveal that her satisfaction was unwarranted.

The houses in the study were evaluated from $16,000 to $42,000 and all scored on the "luxury" level according to the rating instrument developed by the M.S.U. Rural Manpower Center. The size and age of the houses and the facilities they included varied widely. Such a finding suggests then that the evaluation instrument is a gross measure of housing quality. There are however, some moderating factors.

It is generally assumed that house size should be related to the size of the family living in it. But housewives were satisfied when there was a large amount of variation in the space in their housing. It seems that people have different personal preferences for the amount of living space desired.

One housewife expressed her satisfaction in the security and coziness offered by her small house. Whereas, another housewife with the same size family liked the spacious rooms, additional room for entertaining, family activities and privacy in her big house.

The smaller size house mentioned above had one bathroom, greater density in bedrooms, eating space only in the family room, little storage space and little room for entertaining and special interest activities. The larger house had an inefficient kitchen, required much effort in cleaning and had greater expenditures for maintenance, repairs and utilities. One can only hypothesize that these families have different life styles and needs which their housing appears to accommodate to their satisfaction. Could they be wrong in being satisfied or do they give up something to gain another important value?

Newer homes in the survey (6 months to 5 years residency), did not seem to bring more satisfaction to the housewives than older homes that were 60 to 100 years old. There still seemed to be many additions or changes that people wished to make even in new homes. Various features were desired by these housewives, such as finishing the basement, putting in lawns, shrubs and trees, and a hard surface road in front of the house. There seemed to be a slight indication from the conversation with these people that they were not secure in the feeling that the quality of materials and workmanship used in building houses today is equitable to the prices being paid for the houses.

Older homes seemed more solidly built but some had defects in ceilings and walls, needed paint, a new roof, the basement was damp, and the kitchen needed remodeling.

From this comparison of houses and families it is suggested that the evaluation instrument used is a gross measure of housing quality. As revealed, a wide variation in housing characteristics still illicited a generalized statement of satisfaction.

It is in this respect and for these reasons that one begins to ask if housewives can evaluate the quality of their housing. The family in the smaller house may be quite poorly housed because there is not sufficient room for personal privacy. It is conceivable that the family in the larger house is poorly housed because there is too little family communication. Or both may be well housed because their lives outside the home are different and because their personalities are different. These are the questions we need to study further to be able to understand the responses.

Recommendations

This study indicates housewives can evaluate the physical aspects of their housing fairly well and are able to suggest some sociological and psychological features of their houses that are satisfying or dissatisfying to them.

Yet the author was aware of many more negative sociological and psychological aspects related to some of the houses than the housewives mentioned. For instance: (1) the room arrangement was awkward in several houses, (2) some rooms were too large or too small for their intended use, (3) utility rooms with washers

and dryers were located far from bedrooms and bathrooms where clothing and linens are stored, (4) many houses in the study were not very creatively or interestingly decorated on the interior, and (5) one house had a great deal of noise from heavy trucks and general traffic on the highway in front.

It may be that people are not conscious of some sociological and psychological factors until they have lived in a house a while, or they become accustomed and do not think it can be otherwise.

To prevent families from being poorly or inconveniently housed, some questions need to be answered such as:

(1) How values of families are reflected in their housing?

(2) How can we tell if people are accommodating their living too much because of their housing?

(3) What "stress signals" may be exhibited by family members because of their housing?

(4) How might family members be affected if certain needs are not met or met satisfactorily by their housing?

(5) How can a family assess the physical, sociological and psychological factors of a house for all its members before buying it?

Research in the area of housing is needed to learn what questions to ask, if there are more aspects of which we are not aware, how to analyze people's reactions, and if an objective instrument can be developed to measure housing quality for family living.

Implications for Teaching

High school home economics classes today are attempting to prepare students to face their housing problems of the future.

Hopefully the students will learn to evaluate the physical aspects of a house as well as how it should provide space, comfort, convenience and privacy for their families. Also, that the dwelling may be a source of aesthetic pleasure and furnish individualism and status that they desire...and all these characteristics available at a price within their income.

Teachers should propose decision-making processes that demonstrate how family's needs, attitudes, values, and tastes must be considered when they decide where and how they will live.

But teachers would not be realistic in presenting housing concepts if they did not emphasize the fact that the choice of housing is a series of compromises of the physical, sociological and psychological factors. The housing market functions crudely for the consumers. The industry offers a more or less standard product to which families must often conform their way of life. Even though a consumer can decide how and where he would like to live, he may be forced to make a choice often from too small a selection and in too short a time. The decision-process may be as simple as preparing a list of "likes" and "dislikes" and

then making a decision as to which features about the houses take precedence over others.

A teacher needs to develop a sensitivity within her students so that they will be aware of the needs of family members. Through reading, observation and talking to those with knowledge, high school students will be more likely to reach an understanding of the multi-facet topic of housing, and be better prepared to make wiser housing decisions in their future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Abrams, Charles. Man's Struggle for Shelter in an Urbanizing World. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1966.

Agan, Tessie and Luchsinger, Elaine. The House. New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1965.

Beyer, Glenn H. Housing: A Factual Analysis. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1958.

Faulkner, Ray and Faulkner, Sara. Inside Today's Home. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1960.

Meyerson, Martin, Terrett, Barbara, and Wheaton, William L.C. Housing, People and Cities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Periodicals

Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, Teaching Housing in Senior Senior High. University of Illinois: Home Economics Education, Vol. IV, No. 6, 1961.

Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, Teaching Housing in Senior High Schools, Part II. University of Illinois: Home Economics Education, Vol. V, No. 8, 1962.

Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, Housing: An Important Area in Today's Home Economics Program. University of Illinois: Home Economics Education, Vol. VI, No. 7, 1966.

Tips and Topics in Home Economics, Teaching Housing. Texas Technological College: School of Home Economics, Vol. VII, No. 2, 1966.

APPENDIX A

NAME_____

I. Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your house?

II. Are there any features about your house which you think are responsible for satisfying or meeting your needs which were not included in the questionnaire?

III. Are there any features about your house which you think are responsible for dissatisfaction or not meeting your needs which were not included in the questionnaire?

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

FAMILY HOUSING SCORE SHEET
(Revised Form)

Michigan State University
Rural Manpower Center

Number_____

Property Location:
County_____
Township_____
Road_____

Score_____

Housing Unit Score Sheet

Instructions

Use the entire score sheet for each individual living unit. Check the number which best describes the condition in each item. If none of the conditions applies, omit the item.

I. STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

A. Outside

1. Obsolescence

_____ Remodeling abandoned
_____ Remodeling progressing
_____ Remodeling completed
_____ Facilities kept up to date
_____ Nearly new construction

Size of Structure

2. Area-living space

_____ 500 square feet or under
_____ 501 to 1,000 square feet
_____ 1,001 to 1,500 square feet
_____ 1,501 to 2,000 square feet
_____ Over 2,000 square feet

3. Roof, condition of

_____ Badly worn, many leaks, needs replacing
_____ Few small leaks easily repairable
_____ Roof with no leaks, general good condition

Prepared by C.M. Edwards and Annette J. Schaeffer, March 1966.
Revised November 1966.

4. Chimneys, condition of

_____ Deteriorating, in need of replacement
_____ Deteriorating, in need of repair
_____ Sound, appropriate to fuel being used

5. Materials

_____ Uninsulated metal pipe through roof or wall
_____ Brick or block construction--without liner
_____ Insulated metal or other material---with liner
_____ Brick or block construction--with liner

6. Siding, condition of

_____ Loose and some missing
_____ In need of maintenance, e.g. Paint, caulking, ets.
_____ Sound, well maintained

7. Foundation, signs indicating condition of

_____ Floors and walls much out of line from settling
_____ Walls seriously cracked in one or two places
_____ Slight wall movement in structure apparent in one or two places
_____ Entire structure supported well, indicated by no visible movement of any part of structure

8. Garage

_____ None
_____ Garage, single
_____ Garage, double

9.

_____ None
_____ Garage, inadequate
_____ Garage, adequate

10.

_____ None
_____ Garage, detached
_____ Garage, attached

11.

_____ None
_____ Carport, single
_____ Carport, double

12.

_____ None
_____ Carport detached
_____ Carport attached

13. Porches and patios

_____ None
_____ Unroofed paved or floored area
_____ Roofed, open sides
_____ Screened enclosure
_____ Glass enclosed and unheated
_____ Enclosed heated for all-season use

14. Design

_____ Does not apply
_____ Planned by professional (other than carpenter)

B. Inside

15. Interior walls and ceiling, condition of
Walls and ceiling--structure

_____ Some areas need replacing
_____ Many repairable cracks and defects
_____ One or two repairable cracks and defects
_____ No defects, no cracks, plumb, square window and door frames

16. Walls and ceilings--finish

_____ Needs replacing
_____ Needs much maintenance
_____ Needs some maintenance
_____ Well maintained, finish in good condition

17. Space below grade

_____ Dampness occasionally apparent
_____ Dry and ventilated as well as above ground

18. Floors, condition of

_____ Badly worn, some holes and/or cracks
_____ Some visible signs of wear and few cracks
_____ Level, smooth and solid
_____ Floor finish appropriate and well maintained

19. Windows, condition of

_____ One or more missing where intended to be
_____ One or two not working as intended
_____ One or two need maintenance
_____ All functioning as intended

20. Size

_____ None
_____ At least one window large enough for escape in every room except bath

21. Light

_____ Window area less than 10 percent floor area
_____ Window area 10 percent or more than floor area

22. Steps and stairs, condition of (If more than one set, score the one set of steps or stairs most frequently used.)

_____ No stairs required or used (omit items 23-29)

23. Treads and supports

_____ One or more treads broken, missing or unsafe
_____ Treads much worn, warped, cracked
_____ Treads worn, need maintenance
_____ Treads solid, supports solid

Design (Consider all steps and stairs)

24.____ Straight run or landings at least 1½ times as wide as the door if a door opens on a landing, landing must be at least as wide as door
25.____ Riser--7 inch maximum, no variation
26.____ Approximately 3 foot minimum width stairs
27.____ Hand rail
28.____ Treads 10 inch minimum width, no variation
29.____ Outside entrance located within a few feet of stairway

Insulation

None
30.____ Insulation in ceiling or under roof
31.____ Insulated outside walls
32.____ Partitions insulated and/or sound-proofed
33.____ Double glass windows
34.____ Storm windows
35.____ Storm doors

Doors location

Outside doors

36.____ More than one door
37.____ Most used, opens into entranceway
38.____ Place to put outdoor clothing and footwear near principal family entrance
39.____ Clothing storage near guest entrance

40. Inside doors

_____ Does not apply
_____ All doors swing free of interference

41. Privacy

_____ None
_____ Sight--normally neighbors can't see in

42.

_____ None
_____ Sound--normally noises of neighbors not heard

II. PLUMBING SYSTEM

43. Water source

_____ Open creek or spring
_____ Covered spring
_____ Dug well
_____ Shallow drilled or driven well--up to 30 feet
_____ Deep well drilled
_____ Municipal water supply

44. Means of supply

_____ Hand pump
_____ Automatic pump
_____ Municipal water system

45. Supply piping operation

_____ Works seasonally
_____ Restricted flow but operates year round
_____ Full flow--3 gallons per minute or more

46.

_____ Does not comply
_____ Complies with local health and building code on water supply

47. Water distribution

Cold water

_____ Carried from outside source
_____ Cold water available within unit---hand pump
_____ Cold running water within unit

48. Hot water

_____ Water heated on stove
_____ Hot running water

49. Water condition

_____ Hot water
_____ Both hot and cold

50. Kitchen sink

_____ Sink installed
_____ Sink with cold running water
_____ Sink with cold and hot running water

51. Bathing Facilities

Description

_____ Primitive facilities--tub, pan, improvised shower
_____ Bathtub within unit--not piped
_____ Bathtub or shower--piped cold water
_____ Bathtub or shower--piped hot and cold water
_____ Multiple bathtubs or showers--hot and cold water

52. Location--outside housing unit

_____ Privy available--shared with others
_____ Privy for each housing unit
_____ Flush toilet available---shared with others
_____ Flush toilet for each housing unit

Location--inside housing unit

_____ Toilet not sewer connected(other than privys) chemical or otherwise
_____ Toilet--sewer connected
_____ More than one toilet in housing unit

53. Laundry facilities

_____ Available only at sink
_____ Separate water and rain for laundry
_____ Connections for automatic washing machine
_____ Connections for automatic clothes dryer and automatic washing machine

54. Garbage

_____ Carried away from dwelling, buried or burned outside
_____ Removed to a recognized dump
_____ Inside incinerator or sink disposer

55. Trash

_____ Carried away from dwelling, buried or burned outside
_____ Removed to a recognized dump
_____ Inside incinerator or outside

56. Waste disposal system

_____ Drain connected to cesspool or tile line only
_____ Drain connected to septic tank
_____ Drains connected to sewage disposal plant

57. Drainage piping operation

_____ Works but has some problems
_____ Completely effective--no problem

Bathroom arrangements

58.

_____ Place to wash hands near family entrance
_____ Toilet near family entrance
_____ Both toilet and lavatory near family entrance

59._____ Main bathroom entrance other than through another room
60._____ Bathroom privacy from sight
61._____ Bathroom privacy from sound
62._____ Bathroom privacy with a lock

III. ELECTRICAL SYSTEM

63. Size of entrance

_____ 30 amperes
_____ 60 amperes
_____ 100 amperes or more

64. Number of circuits for lights and convenience outlets

_____ One circuit
_____ Two circuits
_____ Three circuits
_____ Four circuits
_____ Five circuits
_____ Six circuits
_____ Seven circuits
_____ Eight circuits
_____ Nine circuits or more

65. Number of separate circuits provided for major appliances such as: Refrigerator, freezer, range, furnace, water heater, washer, dryer, water pump, sump pump, etc.

_____ One circuit
_____ Two circuits
_____ Three circuits
_____ Four circuits
_____ Five circuits
_____ Six circuits
_____ Seven circuits
_____ Eight circuits
_____ Nine circuits or more

66. Capacity

_____ In addition to lighting circuits only one appliance circuit of 20 amperes
_____ Separate appliance circuits for kitchen and utility room or wherever needed

67. Grounded receptacles

_____ Only outlets on kitchen circuits are grounded
_____ All convenience outlets in all circuits are grounded

68. Fusing

_____ Lighting circuits---15 ampere fuses; appliance circuits--20 ampere fuses
_____ All convenience outlets in all circuits are grounded

Switching

69.___ Pull chain or button at infrequently used lights and wall switch for more frequently used lights
70.___ Three-way switches used where needed
71.___ Low voltage controlled or master panel switching

Wiring

72.___ Surface wiring in metallic or nonmetallic covering
73.___ Concealed wiring in walls
74.___ Receptacles according to latest code
75.___ Workmanship according to latest code

IV. HEATING SYSTEM

76. Method of heating

_____ Noncirculating space heater
_____ Space heater with forced circulation
_____ Hand fired central heating system
_____ Automatic controlled central heating system

77. Extent of Heating

_____ Facilities present to heat all living space
_____ Central heat to all living space

78. Fuel supply

_____ Hand supplied to heater
_____ Oil or L.P. gas--automatic feed
_____ Utility company piped gas or electricity

Ventilation and air conditioning

79.____ Natural air movement (cross ventilation)
80.____ Some mechanical air movement
81.____ One room air-cooled
82.____ One room humidity controlled
83.____ All rooms air cooled
84.____ All rooms humidity controlled

V. FAMILY ACTIVITY AREAS

85. Family living

____ One room for all family living activities other than sleeping and personal care
____ Two rooms for all family living activities other than sleeping and personal care
____ Living room, dining room, kitchen available for all family living activities other than sleeping and personal care.
____ Place for group activities and individual activities to go on at the same time without conflict

86. Eating area

____ Only in kitchen
____ Only in dining room
____ Both in kitchen and dining room

Space

87.____ There is space for each regular occupant to sit down and eat at the same time.

88. Sleeping

____ Separate area for parents and for children
____ Separate areas for parents and for children by sex
____ Separate areas for parents and for each child

89. Fabric care

____ Stationary built-in ironing equipment
____ Space for ironing convenient and out of the way of other activities

90.

____ Some space for storing household linens
____ Adequate space for storing household linens

91.

____ Some space for storing all family clothing
____ Adequate space for storing all family clothing

92. Laundry

____ Done in space usually used for other purposes
____ Done in specific area reserved for equipment
____ Done in specific area reserved for equipment and with work space

Opinion of kitchen facilities in relation to size of housing unit

93. Homemaker's opinion

_____ Additional work or storage space necessary
_____ Some additional work or storage space desirable
_____ Ample work space and storage to prepare food for normal houseful

94. Enumerator's opinion

_____ Additional work or storage space necessary
_____ Some additional work or storage space desirable
_____ Ample work space and storage to prepare food for normal houseful

95. Provisions for cooking

_____ Wood fire range
_____ Oil fire range
_____ Gas or electric range

96. Sink

_____ Single well
_____ Double well

Work space and facilities

97.___ Separate special purpose sink
98.___ Work space adjacent to sink
99.___ Appropriate storage adjacent to sink
100.___ Space for dishwasher
101.___ Work space adjacent to range
102.___ Appropriate storage adjacent to range
103.___ Baking oven

Dish storage

104.___ Shelves provided
105.___ Adjustable shelves provided
106.___ Appropriate storage located near eating or dishwashing area

Food storage

107.___ Facilities for refrigerator
108.___ Facilities for freezer
109.___ Adjacent work space provided
110.___ Adequate storage area provided

Kitchen arrangements

111.___ Second kitchen in separate location
112.___ Meets one of USDA standard kitchen arrangements (L, U or Broken U shaped)

Miscellaneous

113.____ Space for sewing out of the way of other activities
114.____ Place to put outdoor clothes and footwear near family entrance

VI. SITE CHARACTERISTICS

115. Turf

_____ None
_____ Some grass
_____ Full lawn

116. Drives

_____ None
_____ Gravel or stone
_____ Hard surfaced

117. Landscaping

_____ None
_____ Few shrubs
_____ Extensively planted with shrubs and trees

118. Location

_____ Located between ½ and 1 mile from heavy industry
_____ Located more than one mile from heavy industry

119.
_____ Unit removed at least 1000 feet from a main traffic artery

12o. Drainage

_____ No puddles of water stand more than a few minutes after a heavy rain within 100 feet of house
_____ No water ever standing within 100 feet of house (except where planned)

APPENDIX D

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION on DWELLING and OCCUPANTS

(Revised Form)

I. STRUCTURE

1. Number of family units in housing structure

_____ Single family--detached
_____ 2-family--attached
_____ 3-family--attached
_____ 4-family--attached
_____ 5-family--attached
_____ 6-family--attached
_____ 7-family--attached
_____ 8-family--attached
_____ Barracks

2. Construction

_____ Built on site
_____ Pre-fab
_____ Mobile home
_____ Converted

3. Floors for living

_____ One
_____ Two
_____ Three
_____ Four

4. Basement use

_____ No basement
_____ Used primarily for storage and utilities
_____ Used primarily for living

5. Total number rooms--exclude baths

_____ One
_____ Two
_____ Three
_____ Four
_____ Five
_____ Six
_____ Seven
_____ Eight
_____ Nine or more

6. Total number of bedrooms

_____ None
_____ One
_____ Two
_____ Three
_____ Four
_____ Five
_____ Six or more

7. Age of structure

_____ Less than 5 years
_____ Five through 9 years
_____ Ten through 20 years
_____ Twenty-one or more years

8. Condition of housing unit

_____ Dilapidated
_____ Deteriorating
_____ Sound

Personal Care Facilities

9. Toilets--stools

_____ None
_____ One
_____ Two
_____ Three or more

10. Lavatory

_____ None
_____ One
_____ Two
_____ Three or more

11. Bathtub or shower

_____ None
_____ One
_____ Two
_____ Three or more

II. HIGHWAY

12. Public Road

- ____ Hard surface
- ____ Gravel
- ____ Dirt

III. FIRE PROTECTION

13. Number of miles from fire station

- ____ Less than a mile
- ____ One to less than 2 miles
- ____ Two to less than 5 miles
- ____ Five to less than 10
- ____ Ten miles and over

14. Distance to water source for fire fighting equipment

- ____ 500 ft. or less
- ____ 501-1000 ft.
- ____ Approximately ¼ mile
- ____ Approximately ½ mile
- ____ Over ½ mile

IV. OCCUPANCY

15. Occupancy

- ____ Occupied
- ____ Vacant

16.

- ____ Year round housing
- ____ Vacation use
- ____ Labor housing

17. Number months housing unit was occupied last year

- ____ Not occupied
- ____ Less than one month
- ____ One but less than six
- ____ Seven but less than twelve

18. Tenure of occupants in unit

- ____ Not occupied
- ____ Less than one month
- ____ One to six
- ____ Six to twelve months
- ____ One to five years
- ____ Over five years

19. Place of occupant's last residence before living in this housing unit

- ____ Same community
- ____ Same county
- ____ Same state
- ____ Neighboring state
- ____ Farther away than neighboring state
- ____ Foreign country

Number of occupants in housing unit

20. Male adults

- ____ None
- ____ One
- ____ Two
- ____ Three
- ____ Four
- ____ Five or more

21. Female adults

- ____ None
- ____ One
- ____ Two
- ____ Three
- ____ Four
- ____ Five or more

22. Male school age, grades 1-12

- ____ None
- ____ One
- ____ Two
- ____ Three
- ____ Four
- ____ Five or more

23. Female school age, grades 1-12

- ____ None
- ____ One
- ____ Two
- ____ Three
- ____ Four
- ____ Five or more

24. Preschool age boys

- ____ None
- ____ One
- ____ Two
- ____ Three
- ____ Four
- ____ Five or more

25. Preschool age girls

- ____ None
- ____ One
- ____ Two
- ____ Three
- ____ Four
- ____ Five or more

26. Occupant's feelings about dwelling

- ____ Owner-occupant
- ____ cash renter
- ____ Rent is partial compensation for labor
- ____ Other

V. VALUATION

28.-32 _____ assessed

33.-37 _____ market (owner's appraisal)

VI. INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT

38. Major source income, head of household

- ____ Farm operator
- ____ Farm laborer
- ____ Agribusiness
- ____ Other business
- ____ Nonfarm profession
- ____ Skilled trade
- ____ Public assistance
- ____ Pension, retirement income
- ____ Other

39. Retirement status, head of household

- ____ Not retired
- ____ Part retirement
- ____ Full retirement

40. Amount of income from major source, head of household

- ____ Less than $3000
- ____ 3000 - 4999
- ____ 5000 - 6999
- ____ 7000 - 8999
- ____ 9000 -10999
- ____ 11,000 -12999
- ____ 13,000 -14999
- ____ 15,000 -16999
- ____ 17,000 or more

42. Amount of nonwork family income, investments, insurance, gifts, social security, pensions.

- ____ Less than 3000
- 3000 - 4999
- 5000 - 6999
- 7000 - 8999
- 9000 -10999
- 11,000 -12999
- 13,000 -14999
- 15,000 -16999
- 17,000 or more

43. Amount of wifos's work incomo

Loss than 3000
3000 - 4999
5000 - 6999
7000 - 8999
9000 - 10999
11000 - 12999
13000 - 14999
15000 - 16999
17000 or moro

44. Amount of othor family mombors' incomo

Loss than 3000
3000 - 4999
5000 - 6999
7000 - 8999
9000 - 10999
11000 - 12999
13000 - 14999
15000 - 16999
17000 - or moro

45. Distanco principal wago-oarnor travols to work

Works at homo
Loss than 1 milo
Ono to 5 miles
Fivo to 10 milos
Ton to 20 miles
Twonty to 25 milos
Twonty-five or moro

46. Numbor of wago-oarnors in housohold

Nono
Ono
Two
Throo
Four
Fivo or moro

VIII. USE OF SERVICE---DENSITY IN HOUSING UNIT

Bodrooms (Scoro oach bodroom separatoly.)

1. Room usod by four porsons or moro
2. Room used by three porsons
3. Room usod by two porsons
4. Room used by one porson

No. 1

_____1.
_____2.
_____3.
_____4.

No. 2

_____1.
_____2.
_____3.
_____4.

No. 3

_____1.
_____2.
_____3.
_____4.

No. 4

_____1.
_____2.
_____3.
_____4.