

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

SHIRLEY HOLWEGNER PETERSON for the M. S.
(Name) (Degree)
in HOME MANAGEMENT presented on March 6, 1968
(Major) (Date)

Title: FACTORS CONSOCIATED WITH SELECTION AND SATIS-
FACTION OF NON-UNIVERSITY RENTAL HOUSING AS
STATED BY THE WIVES OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS
ATTENDING OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Abstract approved: Redacted for privacy
Freda Teitzel

This study was designed (1) to determine if selected family oriented factors influence student wives' housing satisfaction, (2) to determine which housing factors have the greatest influence on the student wives' satisfaction with their housing, (3) to determine which housing factors influence most the selection of married student housing, (4) to determine if married undergraduate students attending Oregon State University have difficulty finding satisfactory housing due to limited financial resources and a limited number and variety of rental units from which to choose, and (5) to obtain a description of married student rental housing.

The participants in this study were the wives of undergraduate students attending Oregon State University and residing in

non-university-owned rental housing with a Corvallis, Oregon address. The sample was selected systematically and numbered 40 in size.

An interview schedule was used in collecting data pertaining to family-oriented factors, financial resources, cost of housing, satisfaction with housing, description of housing, housing factors consociated with selection of housing and housing factors consociated with housing satisfaction.

Fifty-two percent of the participants were employed full-time outside the home. Over 50 percent of the couples had one or more children, had been married two or more years, had resided in their present dwelling less than one year, and had moved one or more times in Corvallis.

Sixty-two percent of the wives expressed satisfaction with their rental housing. Two-thirds of the wives indicating dissatisfaction with their present housing planned to move within the next few months.

The family-oriented factor, mobility of married students in Corvallis, appeared to influence the wives' satisfaction with their housing. The wives who had moved one or more times in Corvallis expressed more satisfaction with their housing than those wives who had not moved.

Employment of the wife outside the home provided the greatest financial assistance for one-half of the families. Thirty-five percent of the wives cited annual incomes for their families of less than \$4000.

Forty percent of the wives interviewed estimated that their housing costs--rent, utilities, and transportation to campus--totaled \$110 or more per month.

Fifty-five percent of the families were residing in houses or duplexes. Seventy percent of the families were residing in dwellings not meeting the minimum space requirements for their family size as recommended by the American Public Health Association.

Two-thirds of the wives felt that when selecting their present housing there was not an adequate number and variety of rental units from which to choose. Three-fifths of the wives in this study said they had difficulty locating a dwelling within their financial means.

The housing factors--cost, location and amount of space within the dwelling--were indicated by the participants in this study as the most influential factors in selection of rental housing.

At least three-fourths of the 40 wives considered cost, amount of space within the dwelling, amount of storage space, and whether the unit was furnished or unfurnished as important housing factors when selecting their present rental units.

At least three-fourths of the 40 wives were satisfied with the following housing factors: location, cost, adequacy of daylight, unit furnished or unfurnished, laundry facilities provided or nearby, number of bedrooms, size of bedrooms and adequacy of ventilation.

Satisfaction with the selected housing factors--freedom from bothersome noise, privacy, amount of space within the dwelling, and number of bedrooms--appeared to influence the wives' satisfaction with housing. The majority of wives satisfied with these factors expressed satisfaction with their housing. The majority of wives dissatisfied with these factors expressed dissatisfaction with their housing.

Factors Consociated with Selection and Satisfaction of
Non-University Rental Housing as Stated by the Wives
of Undergraduate Students Attending
Oregon State University

by

Shirley Holwegner Peterson

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science

June 1968

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Instructor of Home Management
in charge of major

Redacted for privacy

Acting Head of Department of Home Management

Redacted for privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented March 6, 1968

Typed by Donna Olson for Shirley Holwegner Peterson

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Miss Freda Teitzel, Major Professor, for her guidance in preparation of the thesis; and to members of the Home Management faculty, Mrs. Harriet Sinnard, Dr. Martha Plonk, Dr. Priscilla Crabtree, Mrs. Charlotte Harter and Mrs. Dorothy Miller for their helpful suggestions and advice.

Grateful acknowledgment is extended to Dr. Lyle Calvin, Head of the Department of Statistics, who provided statistical advice and to Mr. Herbert Sinnard, Head of the Department of Architecture, who offered helpful suggestions concerning content of the interview schedule.

The author is also indebted to the 40 student wives who readily consented to interviews, and to all others who provided information and assistance in this study.

This study would not have been possible without the assistance, encouragement and cooperation of the author's husband, C. Adrian Peterson.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Housing and Housing Standards	6
Renting and Rental Housing	8
Housing and Economics	12
Housing Selection	12
Satisfaction with Housing	13
Married Students and Married Student Housing	16
GENERAL METHOD AND PROCEDURE	19
Sample	19
Development of the Interview Schedule	20
Procedure	23
Treatment of Data	25
FINDINGS	27
Family-Oriented Factors	27
Satisfaction with Housing	34
Family-Oriented Factors Compared with Housing Satisfaction	36
Assessment of Financial Resources	43
Housing Costs	48
Description of Rental Housing	52
Selection of Rental Housing	63
Satisfaction with Selected Housing Factors	70
Satisfaction with Selected Housing Factors Compared with Housing Satisfaction	74
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	84
Summary	84
Purpose	84
Method and Procedure	84
Family-Oriented Factors	85
Satisfaction with Housing	86
Family-Oriented Factors Compared with Housing Satisfaction	86

	<u>Page</u>
Assessment of Financial Resources and Housing Costs	87
Description of Rental Housing	88
Selection of Rental Housing	89
Satisfaction with Selected Housing Factors	90
Satisfaction with Selected Housing Factors Compared with Housing Satisfaction	91
Conclusions	92
Limitations	94
Recommendations for Future Research	95
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 96
 APPENDIX A	 99
 APPENDIX B	 100

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Employment of 40 student wives outside the home.	27
2. Amount of schooling for 40 student wives.	28
3. Age distribution of 40 student wives.	28
4. Number of children for 40 student families.	29
5. Length of marriage for 40 student families.	29
6. Number of dwellings resided in since marriage for 40 student families.	30
7. Number of moves in Corvallis, Oregon since marriage for 40 student families.	30
8. Length of residence in present dwelling for 40 student families.	31
9. Parents assisting in selection of rental housing for 40 student families.	31
10. Social position of 40 student wives' families and their husbands' families as determined by Hollingshead's Two Factor Index.	33
11. Satisfaction with housing as rated by 40 student wives.	34
12. Reasons for moving in Corvallis, Oregon as stated by 30 student wives.	35
13. Housing satisfaction compared with number of moves in Corvallis, Oregon since marriage for 40 student families.	36
14. Housing satisfaction compared with employment of 40 student wives outside the home.	38

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
15. Housing satisfaction compared with amount of schooling for 40 student wives.	38
16. Housing satisfaction compared with age distribution of 40 student wives.	39
17. Housing satisfaction compared with number of children for 40 student families.	40
18. Housing satisfaction compared with length of marriage for 40 student families.	40
19. Housing satisfaction compared with number of dwellings resided in since marriage for 40 student families.	41
20. Housing satisfaction compared with length of residence in present dwelling for 40 student families.	42
21. Housing satisfaction compared with parents assisting in selection of rental units for 40 student families.	42
22. Housing satisfaction compared with 40 student wives' families social position and their husbands' families social position as determined by Hollingshead's Two Factor Index.	44
23. Types of income for 40 student families.	45
24. Types of income providing the greatest assistance for 40 student families.	46
25. Annual income for 40 student families.	47
26. Annual income for 40 student families compared with size of family.	47
27. Monthly cost of rent for 40 student families.	48
28. Average monthly cost of utilities for 40 student families.	49

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
29. Utilities paid for in addition to rent for 40 student families.	50
30. Average monthly cost of transportation to campus for 40 student families.	50
31. Average monthly total cost of housing for 40 student families.	51
32. Comparison of gross rent paid and maximum gross rent 40 student wives felt they could afford.	52
33. Classification of housing types resided in by 40 student families.	53
34. Rental housing classified as to furnished or unfurnished for 40 student families.	54
35. Number of rooms per dwelling for 40 student families.	55
36. Number of rooms per dwelling compared with size of family for 40 student families.	56
37. Persons per room ratio for 40 student families.	56
38. Size of dwellings in square feet for 40 student families.	57
39. Size of dwellings in square feet compared with size of family for 40 student families.	58
40. Number of bedrooms per dwelling and size of bedrooms for 40 student families.	60
41. Number of bedrooms per dwelling compared with size of family for 40 student families.	61
42. Description of rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.	62

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
43. Methods employed to locate rental housing by 40 student families.	63
44. Forty student wives' feelings concerning availability of rental housing compared with when housing was selected.	65
45. Reasons for selecting rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.	66
46. Housing factors liked most when selecting rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.	68
47. Importance of specific housing factors when selecting rental housing as rated by 40 student wives.	69
48. Housing factors liked most in rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.	71
49. Housing factors disliked most in rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.	71
50. Satisfaction with selected housing factors as rated by 40 student wives.	73
51. Satisfaction with the housing factor, freedom from bothersome noise, compared with housing satisfaction.	75
52. Satisfaction with the housing factor, privacy, compared with housing satisfaction.	75
53. Satisfaction with the housing factor, amount of space within the dwelling, compared with housing satisfaction.	76
54. Satisfaction with the housing factor, number of bedrooms, compared with housing satisfaction.	76
55. Satisfaction with the housing factor, size of bedrooms, compared with housing satisfaction.	78

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
56. Satisfaction with the housing factor, location, compared with housing satisfaction.	78
57. Satisfaction with the housing factor, outdoor living area, compared with housing satisfaction.	78
58. Satisfaction with the housing factor, residing close to friends, compared with housing satisfaction.	79
59. Satisfaction with the housing factor, care and upkeep of the area (neighborhood), compared with housing satisfaction.	79
60. Satisfaction with the housing factor, playground nearby or play area for the children, compared with housing satisfaction.	79
61. Satisfaction with the housing factor, study area, compared with housing satisfaction.	80
62. Satisfaction with the housing factor, circulation (movement pattern between the rooms), compared with housing satisfaction.	80
63. Satisfaction with the housing factor, unit furnished or unfurnished, compared with housing satisfaction.	80
64. Satisfaction with the housing factor, amount of storage space, compared with housing satisfaction.	81
65. Satisfaction with the housing factor, adequate daylight, compared with housing satisfaction.	81
66. Satisfaction with the housing factor, garage or carport, compared with housing satisfaction.	81
67. Satisfaction with the housing factor, adequate ventilation, compared with housing satisfaction.	82

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
68. Satisfaction with the housing factor, swimming pool, compared with housing satisfaction.	82
69. Satisfaction with the housing factor, view from the window, compared with housing satisfaction.	82
70. Satisfaction with the housing factor, residing near shopping facilities, compared with housing satisfaction.	83
71. Satisfaction with the housing factor, cost, compared with housing satisfaction.	83
72. Satisfaction with the housing factor, laundry facilities provided or nearby, compared with housing satisfaction.	83

FACTORS CONSOCIATED WITH SELECTION AND
SATISFACTION OF NON-UNIVERSITY RENTAL
HOUSING AS STATED BY THE WIVES OF
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ATTENDING
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

"Housing touches every individual at all periods of his life span. It may be a determining factor in his whole standard of living, his attitudes, and his way of life" (Beyer, 1960, p. 646). Glenn Beyer (1967), a leading authority in the field of housing, stresses the need for housing research, research that will objectively and patiently study what shelter should do to improve living conditions. Housing economics, rental housing and housing for low-income families are some of the areas cited by Beyer as in need of more intensive investigation. This study will touch on these three aspects of housing in relation to married undergraduate students.

The Bureau of Census (1966) reported that as of October, 1966, 25.4 percent of the men and 16.2 percent of the women enrolled in American universities and colleges were married. Riker and Lopez (1961) estimate that enrollment of married students, graduate and undergraduate, will approach 1,321,000 and total student enrollment will approach 6,006,000 in 1970. Undergraduate married student enrollment is estimated to reach 930,600. The number of married students enrolled in universities is increasing. Riker and Lopez

(1961) assert that this is a trend that must be faced and a housing problem that must be met.

Most married student families have the housing needs of a low-income, working family. Low-income student families require housing that provides an adequate amount of space, meets certain minimum standards of quality, is within reasonable commuting distance of campus and is available at a cost that is not prohibitive. In addition to this, an arrangement to accommodate studying is usually required (Riker, 1956 and Riker, 1965). Rafkind (1966, p. 32) states, "...it is apparent married students find it even more difficult than single students to obtain adequate housing properly located at a price they can afford."

University-owned married student housing has been well-researched in the past, but, to the author's knowledge, little research has been conducted in relation to non-university-owned married student rental housing.

When selecting a rental unit, Dora S. Lewis (1953) suggests that a typical family should look for the following: location, rent and utilities, type of housing unit, rooms and arrangement, storage space, utilities (condition and wash space), sunlight and ventilation, garden and other outdoor space, and condition of the housing. The married student family should also consider noise control, a study area, and floor space when selecting housing (Riker, 1965).

Most housing authorities would agree that factors such as the amount of space in a housing unit, location, cost, design, quality of construction, and others, contribute to consumer satisfaction or dissatisfaction with housing. Are housing factors the only factors influential in housing satisfaction, or are certain family-oriented factors also influential?

In this study, family-oriented factors refer to composition of the family, characteristics of the wives, and characteristics related to the family or family life situation. In a recent study (Teitzel, 1966), house design scores were related to forty homemaker's expressed satisfaction with housing. The mean of expressed satisfaction with housing was compared with certain family characteristics. To the author's knowledge, this is the only study that has compared family characteristics with housing satisfaction. Beyer (1967, p. 498) does mention, "Such simple facts as family composition and size, stage in life cycle, educational attainment and age have important influences on changing housing demand and housing needs."

Do married undergraduate students attending Oregon State University have difficulty finding satisfactory housing due to limited financial resources and a limited number and variety of rental units from which to choose? In what kinds of rental housing are they residing? Does their housing provide an adequate amount of space, a

study area, freedom from bothersome noise and other desirable features?

During fall quarter, 1967, 1,938 married students were registered at Oregon State University. Of these 1,938 married students, 1,002 were undergraduate students. The undergraduate married students included 682 men and 320 women. The researcher obtained this information on October 12, 1967, from the Oregon State University Registrar's office. The University owns and operates 151 married student rental units. Fall quarter, 1967, 141 graduate student families and ten undergraduate families occupied the University-owned rental units. This information was contributed by Dr. James Haun, Assistant Director of Housing.

The following are excerpts from an article in the September 22, 1967, Gazette-Times, Corvallis, Oregon:

Are you looking for an apartment or house to rent in Corvallis? Lots of luck!

The roof-over-the-head necessity in this area is fast becoming as scarce as cats in a rocking chair factory. The college students are here!

Last June there were 85 apartments and 26 houses listed for rent in one issue of the Gazette-Times. Today there are 9 apartments and 17 houses listed.

Price ranges on desirable apartments available run from \$90 to \$115 per month and for houses \$115 to \$169 per month.

Thomas Adams, department of housing director at Oregon State University, said today there is little available housing space left on campus.

There are no apartments available on campus and nothing for married students, he said.

The trend seems to be for two, three or four college students to rent an apartment or house for \$85 to \$150 per month. (p. 3).

A later issue, November 14, 1967, of the Gazette-Times, Corvallis, Oregon, also reported on the housing situation.

More and more Oregon State University students are living away from university controlled residential units in Corvallis, figures presented by City Manager, John Porter, showed today.

Over 39 percent of the 13,355 Oregon State University students now live in apartments and other private housing throughout the city, Porter said (p. 11).

The above mentioned information indicates that satisfactory housing for undergraduate married students may be limited and supports the need for study of non-university rental housing.

The objectives stated in order of importance to the study are as follows:

1. To determine if selected family-oriented factors influence student wives' housing satisfaction.
2. To determine which housing factors have the greatest influence on student wives' satisfaction with their housing.
3. To determine which housing factors are most influential in selection of married student housing.
4. To determine if married undergraduate students attending Oregon State University have difficulty finding satisfactory housing due to limited financial resources and a limited number and variety of rental units from which to choose.
5. To obtain a description of married student rental housing.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Housing and Housing Standards

The housing supply in any community is made up of a variety of housing types. Beyer (1967, p. 128) states, "This is, of course, a reflection of the fact that housing has, in a general way, been developed to meet the desires and needs of families of varying composition and with diversified social and economic characteristics." The large family requires a different type of housing than does the employed couple without children or the elderly family. Different types of housing are also necessary for families with different levels of income and engaged in different occupations (Beyer, 1967).

Housing units or dwelling units may be classified as detached or attached structures. The single-family dwelling or detached house is free-standing and has open space on all four sides. Some of the advantages of this type of dwelling are privacy, access on all four sides to sunlight and air, and, usually, space for a lawn, garden or play area. A duplex is a two-family attached house. In some sections of the country a duplex means a double house divided by a party wall and in other sections it means two families can be accommodated but each family lives on a separate floor. The row house is one unit in a series of at least three attached units standing side by side. Each row house has a party wall that is shared, its

own entrance, and can be only two rooms deep front to back. There is direct light exposure for each room but no cross ventilation except when the row houses are offset or form a court. In these instances, some rooms have cross ventilation. The row house may be a one-story dwelling or have two or more stories. An apartment is a unit in a multiunit structure. Arrangement of units and size varies (Agan, 1965).

Adequacy of space within dwellings is determined by two methods; square feet of floor space per person and room density (Foote, 1960).

Room density is described as persons per room (PPR). One or fewer persons per room is usually considered satisfactory (Agan, 1965). "The best measure available of the utilization of space in housing units is the persons per room ratio" (Beyer, 1967, p. 121).

Standards of living space, that is, minimum space allocations per person expressed in square feet of floor space, have been determined by the American Public Health Association. Minimum room sizes, based on the number of bedrooms, have also been delineated by the Federal Housing Administration. Rooms must be of at least a certain minimum size before a loan will be insured (Agan, 1965). Standards recommended by the American Public Health Association in the early 1950's are significantly higher than minimum Federal Housing Administration standards (Beyer, 1967).

"Typically, the consumer thinks of space in terms of number of rooms rather than in terms of square feet of floor space" (Meyerson, Terrett, and Wheaton, 1962, p. 86). Many consumers would be happier with a six-room house than with a five-room house of greater dimensions.

Two is usually the maximum number of persons who should occupy a bedroom. "If the family includes a boy and a girl, the number of bedrooms needed will be greater by one than that regarded necessary for two children of the same sex" (Agan, 1965, p. 96). Beyer (1967) specifies an extra bedroom as one of the first housing needs of a family when children arrive.

"Ideally, a true measure of space would take into account: (1) total floor area, (2) room count, (3) bedroom count, (4) total number of occupants, and (5) age, sex, and relationship of occupants" (Foote, 1960, p. 217).

Rental and Rental Housing

The decision to buy or rent is usually made on the basis of needs and wants. Some families, such as newly married couples, cannot afford home ownership. There are many other reasons for renting, however. Some advantages of renting are: the desirability of a location can be determined before buying; does not carry the responsibilities of property upkeep and management; often allows

taking advantage of occupation opportunities more readily; changing family needs can be met more readily; there is not the risk of loss of savings due to deteriorating neighborhood or depreciation of house value; and a location more convenient to work can sometimes be achieved (Agan, 1965, Beyer, 1967 and Kaufman, 1947). Selection of a rental dwelling, or any dwelling, is a series of compromises. The consumer strikes the best balance possible within his means, between what he likes and dislikes (Meyerson, Terrett and Wheaton, 1962).

The Federal Housing Administration (1947, p. 8) makes these recommendations for planning rental housing projects:

In general, all dwelling units should be planned so as to furnish rooms of a size and shape adequate for their designated use. Room arrangements should provide privacy and general convenience to the occupants, adequate light and ventilation, and a minimum of unusable space.

A Columbia University research study found that renters are more mobile than owners (Rossi, 1955). Foote (1960) contends that regardless of the data sources consulted, mobility rates for renters average two to three times higher than for owners. There are several obvious reasons for the higher mobility rates for renters. On the whole, renters are younger than homeowners and less likely to have chosen what they consider to be a permanent housing solution. Rental units are often considered a temporary solution to housing, and if more suitable housing becomes available, rental units

are quite likely to be exchanged. For the most part, consumers believe that the owned home is better suited to family needs than is rental housing. There is some basis of fact for this belief. "Owned housing is predominantly the single-family detached house with a yard, but two-thirds of all rental units are in multifamily structures" (Foote, 1960, p. 141). The higher mobility rates for renters seem to be associated with type of housing. Renters residing in apartments are more likely to move than renters residing in single-family houses, and renters residing in single family houses are more likely to move than single-family homeowners. "The typical mover is a young person (or family) with a comparatively low income, who is currently renting an apartment" (Foote, 1960, p. 152). An expected increase in salary, a desire to own a home rather than rent, young children in the household, or all three, increase the mobility potential (Foote, 1960).

"If data concerning rent levels and values can be used as criteria, it can be assumed that renters do not tend to upgrade themselves when they move as much as owners do" (Beyer, 1967, p. 69).

Rental rates are governed by supply and demand factors and these are completely local. National statistics may not apply to specific areas. The November, 1966, issue of *Changing Times* (1966, p. 36) reported, "As a statistical matter, there is no real shortage of places to live anywhere just now, although rentals are

more abundant in some places than in others." Even where vacancies are statistically plentiful, the kind of accommodation desired or rental units in preferred price ranges may be scarce.

The Changing Times (1966, p. 36) states, "...construction in the last five or six years has added over 2,500,000 apartment units to our national housing supply, not to mention duplexes and single-family houses." These housing units were built at today's construction prices and many include luxuries such as air conditioning and swimming pools. This, in addition to many older housing units being retired and replaced, has contributed to higher-priced rent. The percentage of rental housing available at rent under \$70 has decreased and the percentage of housing available over \$70 has increased considerably (The Changing Times, 1966).

"Rental housing is generally of poorer quality than owner-occupied housing" (Beyer, 1967, p. 123). Meyerson, Terret and Wheaton (1962, p. 49) report, "Consumers as a whole have downgraded housing in their hierarchy of values and expenditures..." Rental housing is in need of more intensive study. A formula, for financing that will bring about the construction of more low-cost and moderate-cost rental houses and apartments would make it possible for many families to obtain the type of housing they desire (Beyer, 1967).

Housing and Economics

The family will spend money on food first, but after calorie requirements have been met, money is spent for housing (Warren, 1961). As the family income increases, however, the proportion of income spent on housing decreases. "The allocation of the consumer dollar to housing varies substantially according to income, family size, age, occupation, education and race" (Meyerson, Terrett and Wheaton, 1962, p. 49). "Location also accounts for differences in the amounts families spend on housing" (Meyerson, Terrett and Wheaton, 1962, p. 57). Housing expenditures are likely to vary from community to community due to local conditions (Warren, 1961).

"There is, of course, no constant relation between economic status and housing requirements. Housing requirements do not continue to grow less as income grows less, for if that were true, a family with no income would need no house at all" (Davies, 1938, p. 15).

Housing Selection

"A housing choice usually requires balancing location, cost, tenure, and characteristics of the dwelling itself" (Foote, 1960, p. 215). The consumer making a housing selection has usually

established specifications concerning four major dwelling characteristics; space, design and layout, equipment and utilities, and condition and state of repair (Foote, 1960).

The participants in the Columbia University study (Rossi, 1955) considered the following in rank order when selecting their homes: space in dwelling, particular design features, dwelling location, and cost. However, when the actual choice was made, cost was the major consideration followed by space, location and neighborhood. "Costs are the 'clinching' factor in the choice point of housing selection" (Rossi, 1955, p. 9).

"Every survey indicates that almost all families prefer a single-family, detached house" (Meyerson, Terrett and Wheaton, 1962, p. 85). However, millions of families live in attached houses, two- or four-family houses, or apartments, perhaps because of the economic and locational advantages of these dwelling types (Meyerson, Terrett and Wheaton, 1962).

Satisfaction with Housing

Beyer (1960, p. 644) contends, "... 'good' housing can only be provided if there is an understanding of the people who are going to live in it." Housing should provide for the individual's physical health and comfort, his mental and emotional satisfactions, and satisfy his basic value orientations. It must contribute to the

development of the family, the community, and the nation (Beyer, 1960).

Research was conducted by Teitzel (1966) in relation to house design and homemaker's expressed satisfaction. All homemakers in this study were residing in detached houses between 1200 and 1800 square feet in size that had been purchased by the occupants. Homemakers with smaller families, two or three in size, were more satisfied with their houses than those with larger families. The homemakers whose families were in social position III as determined by Hollingshead's Two Factor Social Index indicated more satisfaction with their houses than those in positions I, II, IV, and V. Hollingshead's Two Factor Social Index is a scale based on the education and occupation of the head of the household. The five social positions are ranked with Class I the highest and Class V the lowest. Homemakers residing in their houses less than two years, in larger houses, and in more expensive houses expressed the greatest satisfaction in this study.

"The principal criteria for satisfaction with a dwelling unit are the amount and distribution of space, physical condition and equipment" (Meyerson, Terrett and Wheaton, 1962, p. 86). There is little concern about space if condition and equipment are substantially below the standards of the household. The family that lacks a bathtub is usually not concerned over a separate bedroom

for each child. Space is a concern primarily of the middle- and upper-class family and is a sophisticated preference (Meyerson, Terrett and Wheaton).

"The households' evaluations of their dwelling units and neighborhoods as satisfactory or not is strongly related to their desires to move" (Rossi, 1955, p. 87). However, many quite satisfied households prefer to move and many quite dissatisfied prefer to remain. "A housing shortage lowers mobility rates even when dissatisfaction is high" (Foote, 1960, p. 135). Also, the low-income consumer cannot afford to improve his housing when the better dwellings increase in cost.

Extreme mobility indicates consumer dissatisfaction. Foote, (1960, p. 136) states, "High rates of mobility may arise from rapidly changing consumer needs and standards which outstrip the ability of the housing market to provide appropriate dwellings."

In the study conducted by Columbia University (Rossi, 1955), the most important factors impelling households to move voluntarily were, in order of their importance, dissatisfaction with the amount of space within the dwelling, the neighborhood around the dwelling, and cost of housing. Secondary sources of dissatisfaction were such factors as poor design of dwelling, difficulties with the landlord and others. Most complaints about space concerned too little space. Dissatisfaction with neighborhood was due primarily to social

composition and secondly to physical characteristics. The complaints made about the cost of housing were usually that the cost was too high or too high for the value received.

Dissatisfaction results as much from changing family needs as from changes in the quality of the dwelling or its environment, especially dissatisfaction with the amount of space. Addition of a new person to the household often creates feelings of overcrowding even when the amount of space is adequate. Dissatisfaction with neighborhood often results from a change in family status, a shift in job location and other changes. Also, satisfaction is somewhat subjective and varies from family to family (Foote, 1960).

Married Students and Married Student Housing

What do married students throughout the country have in common? Authorities have mentioned that most married students have limited finances.

Kate Hevner Mueller (1960) made the following comments based on research involving 11 state universities with a total of 160,000 students.

Only one out of ten college husbands keep their wives also in school; and only one in three of them, what with planning, shopping, cooking, and baby tending, take full time work. The happy ones are the lucky five or ten percent of married students who live comfortably on parental allowances plus the G.I. Bill.

In age and in academic grades the married students are

little if any ahead of the unmarried, but a much larger proportion of them are employed; and the typical married student, graduate or undergraduate (those less lucky 90 to 95 percent), lives under constant and withering financial stress (p. 155, 156).

A study conducted at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Festinger, Schachter and Back, 1950) also indicated that married students have limited financial resources. Forty percent of the 40 wives interviewed considered themselves financially pressed.

Most research that has been conducted in relation to married student housing has concerned university owned and operated housing. Many studies of this type were conducted in the years during and following World War II. The nation faced a housing shortage as did many colleges. College enrollments increased and created a severe shortage of living quarters for both married and single students (Teater, 1955).

Riker (1965) mentions that married student housing should meet the needs of a studying and working family with a low income. S. Earl Thompson (1953, p. 326), formerly Director of Housing at the University of Illinois, states, "No student can function as an efficient learner and a competent member of his society if he is living in surroundings which create for him problems of physical and mental health."

Research conducted by Teater (1955) disclosed that married student families, especially families with children, attending Ohio

State University had a difficult time finding desirable housing close to campus. Williamson, Hueber and Johnston (1956, p. 218) contend, "Experience has shown that students will accept great discomfort and many hazards to safety and health in order to live near the university..."

Teater (1955) reported that lack of storage space and inadequate study space were the most frequently cited housing problems. About 75 percent of the 600 respondents were satisfied with their housing.

GENERAL METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of the wives of forty undergraduate students attending Oregon State University during fall quarter of 1967. The researcher felt that the wives were the appropriate persons to interview. To be eligible for the sample the student wives had to be residing in non-university-owned rental housing and have a Corvallis address at the time of the interview. They did not necessarily have to reside within the city limits.

Information pertaining to the number of married undergraduate male students enrolled at Oregon State University fall quarter was supplied by the Registrar's office. The total numbered 682 of which 101 were freshmen, 120 sophomores, 178 juniors and 283 seniors. The sample was selected on a proportionate basis. The wives of six freshmen, seven sophomores, ten juniors and seventeen seniors participated in the study.

The sample was selected systematically from the Fusser's Guide, the Oregon State University Directory. The directory provided the following necessary information: name, address, telephone number, class and marital status.

A letter was mailed to those selected, explaining the study, and informing them that they would be contacted within a day or so concerning an appointment (Appendix A). The wives were then

telephoned, or if they did not have a telephone, were contacted personally by the researcher. If the student wife was eligible and consented to an interview, an appointment was made.

It was necessary to contact by letter and telephone approximately 80 student wives to locate 40 student wives living in non-university-owned rental housing. Of those contacted and eligible to be in the study, all but one wife agreed to an interview. All interviews were held in the homes of the participants between October 30, 1967, and December 7, 1967.

Development of the Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was decided upon by the researcher as the instrument to use for this study. It was felt this would insure more complete and accurate participant responses than a questionnaire (Appendix B).

The author developed the interview schedule based upon literature pertaining to housing and housing standards, renting and rental housing, housing and economics, housing selection, satisfaction with housing, married students and married student housing, and housing surveys.

The Home Management faculty and Mr. Herbert Sinnard, Head of the Department of Architecture, offered suggestions concerning content of the interview schedule and question formulation.

Questions were asked concerning the following general areas: family-oriented factors, student financial resources, cost of housing, satisfaction with housing, description of housing, housing factors consociated with selection of housing, and housing factors consociated with housing satisfaction.

Inquiries about family-oriented factors included questions pertaining to the following: composition of the family, such as number of children; characteristics of the wives, such as age; and characteristics that are related to the family or could influence the family life situation, such as employment of the wife outside the home.

The wives were questioned about the families' financial resources as to types of income, type of income providing the greatest financial assistance, and annual income.

Inquiries related to rent, the cost of utilities, and the cost of transportation to campus were included to determine the total cost of rental housing. Also included was the question, "What is the maximum amount of money that you think you and your husband can afford to pay per month for rent, (1) with utilities included in rent and (2) exclusive of utilities."

Participants were asked to check one statement that most accurately described their satisfaction with their present housing. They were given five choices: very satisfied, satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied with present housing.

A description of the rental unit was sought through questions pertaining to type of rental unit, amount of furnishings, total square footage, number and size of bedrooms and others. The wives were also asked to check the characteristics on a list which described their rental dwellings.

Various questions seeking information about housing selection were included. The participants were asked to rate a list of housing factors according to how important they considered the factors when selecting their present rental unit. Mentioned in the list were such housing factors as cost, location, amount of space within the dwelling, number of bedrooms and others. In an open-end question the wives were also asked for what reasons they had selected their rental units.

Satisfaction with housing was also approached in several ways. The wives were asked to rate the same list of housing factors as to whether satisfied, dissatisfied or if the factors did not influence their housing satisfaction. In addition, they were asked what they liked most and disliked most about their present housing.

The open-end questions pertaining to housing selection and satisfaction were placed before the questions in which participants were asked to rate the list of housing factors according to importance and satisfaction. This was done to avoid influencing replies to the open-end questions and in an attempt to insure adequate and unbiased

coverage of the topics.

Procedure

Permission was obtained from Dr. Morris L. LeMay, Assistant Dean of Students, to select the names of ten undergraduate students enrolled in summer school from the university files. Wives of five of these undergraduate students co-operated in pre-testing. All five families were residing in non-university-owned rental housing.

Each of the five wives completed two identical interview schedules administered approximately three weeks apart. The schedules were then compared to ascertain reliability. Other reasons for pre-testing were to determine if all pertinent information was asked and if all questions were comprehensible.

Some questions were deleted from the original schedule and others added. Two questions concerning family-oriented factors and housing selection and satisfaction were omitted because the pre-test participants did not respond with similar answers when the schedule was completed three weeks later. The researcher felt that responses would not be reliable, and, therefore, decided to compare the family-oriented factors to the wives' satisfaction with housing.

Questions concerning the education and occupation of the father or head of household of both the wife and husband were added and

used to determine social position. Also added were questions pertaining to mode and cost of transportation to campus, plans to move, number of rooms and bedrooms in the dwelling, size of bedrooms, when the present dwelling was selected, and persons, if any, residing with the immediate family. The schedule was revised for wording and order of questions.

The forty wives meeting the sample requirements and consenting to participate in the study were interviewed by the author. The wives completed the interview schedules beginning with questions pertaining to family oriented factors. These questions were followed by inquiries pertaining to plans to move, reasons for selecting the present rental units, financial resources, cost of rental housing, total housing satisfaction, description of the rental unit, and mode and cost of transportation in that order. The participants were then asked to check a list of characteristics which described their present rental unit. Three open-end questions concerning most liked and most disliked aspects of the present rental unit preceded the question asking the wives to rate selected housing factors as to importance when selecting their present dwellings. The schedule was concluded with a question pertaining to satisfaction with the selected housing factors.

Husbands were present during many interviews and contributed information such as approximate total square footage of the

dwelling and bedroom sizes. However, the wives completed the schedules and rated the questions concerning satisfaction and selection in all forty interviews. When the wife or husband, if present, did not know the approximate total square footage of the dwelling or the size of the bedroom(s), the interviewer supplied a steel tape and assisted in the measurement.

At the beginning of each interview, the interviewer mentioned that if any questions were not understood, the participant should ask for an explanation. The interviewer endeavored to answer questions consistently, giving the same answers to specific questions in all interviews. Interviews varied in duration from approximately 30 minutes to one hour.

Treatment of Data

The data on each interview schedule was coded and entered on coding forms. Tables were constructed and information was checked by the author in an effort to avoid errors. Percentages on all tables were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Only two participants checked dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with housing. Because of the small numbers involved and in an attempt to simplify and clarify information, the two categories were combined under the heading dissatisfied on all tables depicting information related to this topic.

Relationships between housing satisfaction and selected family-oriented factors, and relationships between housing satisfaction and satisfaction with selected housing factors were examined. The Chi-square test was used to test for independence of these factors. A probability of less than .05 was taken to indicate a lack of independence between the factors and housing satisfaction. A lack of independence indicates that significant relationships between the factors and housing satisfaction could exist. To aid in statistical analysis when using the Chi-square test, the categories very satisfied and satisfied were combined and the categories somewhat dissatisfied and dissatisfied were combined.

Relationships between two family-oriented factors and housing satisfaction were not examined using the Chi-square test because of the small numbers involved. That is, only two wives were enrolled in a university course and only two families had a person other than the immediate family residing with them.

FINDINGS

Family-Oriented Factors

Of the 40 student wives participating in this study, 52 percent were employed full-time, 35 or more hours per week and 15 percent were employed part-time, between five and 24 hours per week (Table 1). Of the 21 wives employed full-time, 16 did not have children. Eleven of the 13 wives not employed outside the home had one or more children.

Table 1. Employment of 40 student wives outside the home.

Employment outside home	No. of wives	Percent*
Not employed	13	32
Part-time (5-24 hours per week)	6	15
Full-time (35 or more hours per week)	<u>21</u>	<u>52</u>
Total	40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

Two wives were enrolled at the University as full-time students when interviewed. The remaining 95 percent were not enrolled in a University course.

Twelve or more years of schooling had been completed by all wives. Twenty percent of the 40 wives were college graduates and one also had a graduate degree (Table 2).

Table 2. Amount of schooling for 40 student wives.

Educational level	No. of wives	Percent*
High school graduate	15	38
Partial college (1 to 3 years)	17	42
College graduate	<u>8</u>	<u>20</u>
Total	40	100

*Percents have been rounded.

Seventy percent of the wives ranged between the ages of 20 and 24. The mode was 23 years and all wives were less than 30 years of age (Table 3).

Table 3. Age distribution of 40 student wives.

Age	No. of wives	Percent*
19 or younger	3	8
20 - 24	28	70
25 - 29	<u>9</u>	<u>22</u>
Total	40	100

*Percents have been rounded.

Nineteen couples, 48 percent, did not have children when interviewed. Thirty-five percent of the couples had one child (Table 4).

Table 4. Number of children for 40 student families.

No. of children	No. of families	Percent*
0	19	48
1	14	35
2	4	10
3	1	2
4	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	40	100

*Percents have been rounded.

Length of marriage varied from four months to 11 years. Sixty-five percent of the couples had been married two or more years (Table 5).

Table 5. Length of marriage for 40 student families.

Length of marriage	No. of families	Percent*
Less than 2 years	14	35
2 years up to 5 years	20	50
5 years and over	<u>6</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	40	100

*Percents have been rounded.

Sixty-three percent of the couples had moved three or more times since their marriage and eighteen percent had moved six or more times (Table 6). One family had moved 11 times.

Table 6. Number of dwellings resided in since marriage for 40 student families.

No. of dwellings	No. of families	Percent*
1-2	15	38
3-5	18	45
6 or more	<u>7</u>	<u>18</u>
Total	40	101

*Percents have been rounded.

The 40 student families had moved a total of 54 times within Corvallis. Seventy-six percent of the families had moved one or more times within the community. One-fourth of the families had not moved in Corvallis (Table 7).

Table 7. Number of moves in Corvallis, Oregon since marriage for 40 student families.

No. of moves	No. of families	Percent*
0	10	25
1	19	48
2 or more	<u>11</u>	<u>28</u>
Total	40	101

*Percents have been rounded.

Fifty-two percent of the families had resided in their present dwellings less than one year. The same address had been maintained for two or more years by 25 percent of the families (Table 8).

Table 8. Length of residence in present dwelling for 40 student families.

Length of residence	No. of families	Percent*
Less than 1 year	21	52
1 year up to 2 years	10	25
2 years or more	<u>9</u>	<u>22</u>
Total	40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

Parents assisted six student families, 15 percent, with selection of their present rental units. In fact, the parents of three couples selected the rental units for them without the wives or husbands being present. One family was renting from the wife's parents (Table 9).

Table 9. Parents assisting in selection of rental units for 40 student families.

Parents assisting in selection	No. of families	Percent*
No	34	85
Yes	<u>6</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	40	100

*Percents have been rounded.

Only two families had a person other than immediate family residing with them. One family had the wife's sister staying with them and another had the wife's brother.

August B. Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position (1957) was used to estimate social position of the wives' and husbands' families. The two factors utilized by Hollingshead to determine the positions individuals occupy in the status structure of our society are occupation and education. Hollingshead (1957, p. 2) states, "Occupation is presumed to reflect the skill and power individuals possess as they perform the many maintenance functions in our society. Education is believed to reflect not only knowledge, but also cultural tastes."

The occupational and educational scales are each divided into seven positions and the head of the household is assigned a score for each factor. Occupation receives a factor weight of seven and education a factor weight of four. The scale value for occupation is multiplied by the factor weight for occupation and the scale value for education is multiplied by the factor weight for education. The two scores are then added and this is the index of social position score. Scores may range from a low of 11 to a high of 77 and are divided into five social classes. Those receiving the lowest scores are placed in Class I and those receiving the highest scores are placed in Class V. The lowest scores are assigned those individuals occupied in positions reflecting the highest skill and performance in maintenance functions in society and those individuals achieving the highest educational levels. Class I is considered the highest and

Class V the lowest of the five social positions.

Fifty-five percent of the husbands' families and 42 percent of the wives' families were placed in Class IV. Many families were also positioned in Class III, 22 percent of the wives' families and 18 percent of the husbands' families (Table 10).

Table 10. Social position of 40 student wives' families and their husbands' families as determined by Hollingshead's Two Factor Index.

Social position	No. of families	Percent*
<u>Wives' Families</u>		
I	5	12
II	4	10
III	9	22
IV	17	42
V	4	10
no data	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	40	98
<u>Husbands' Families</u>		
I	4	10
II	4	10
III	7	18
IV	22	55
V	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	40	101

*Percents have been rounded.

Satisfaction with Housing

The student wives were asked to rank their housing satisfaction on a five point scale: very satisfied, satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Because of the small numbers involved, the last two ratings were combined for analysis. Thirty-two percent of the wives indicated they were very satisfied with their present housing. Thirty percent of the wives checked satisfied and 32 percent checked somewhat dissatisfied.

Table 11. Satisfaction with housing as rated by 40 student wives.

Satisfaction with housing	No. of wives	Percent*
Very Satisfied	13	32
Satisfied	12	30
Somewhat Dissatisfied	13	32
Dissatisfied	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

Housing dissatisfaction is often a cause of mobility (Foote, 1960). The student wives were asked, "Have you any plans to move from your present dwelling within the next few months?" Eighteen wives, 45 percent, checked, "Yes". Ten of the 15 wives expressing dissatisfaction with their present housing were planning to move within the next few months. Eight wives who expressed satisfaction

were planning to move within the next few months. Seven of these wives were married to graduating seniors and, in one instance, the couple was planning to buy a home.

The 30 student wives who had moved since coming to Corvallis were asked to state why. "Needed more space," was the reason cited by 14 wives. Also mentioned by three or more participants were the following: rent too expensive, moved during summer for employment reasons and returned to a different rental unit, dissatisfied with quality of housing, and forced to move (Table 12).

Table 12. Reasons for moving in Corvallis, Oregon as stated by 30 student wives.

Reasons for moving	No.	Reasons for moving	No.
Needed more space	14	Heating problems	2
Expecting baby	4	Too noisy	2
Rent too expensive	5	Wanted a yard	2
Summer work (re-		Found better location	1
turned to a different	4	No animals allowed	1
dwelling)		Unit becomes infested	
Dissatisfied with	3	with ants	1
quality of housing		Wanted more privacy	1
Forced to move			
(rentals sold, land-			
lord moved in, lease			
up)	3		

Family-Oriented Factors Compared
with Housing Satisfaction

Ten family-oriented factors and the wives' satisfaction with housing were compared. The relationship between one family-oriented factor--the number of moves for student families in Corvallis, Oregon--and the wives' satisfaction with housing was examined by using the Chi-square test and a lack of independence was indicated (Table 13). Seventy-four percent of the student wives who had moved once within the community expressed satisfaction with their present housing. Only 30 percent of the student wives who had not moved within the community expressed satisfaction with their housing.

Table 13. Housing satisfaction compared with number of moves in Corvallis, Oregon since marriage for 40 student families.

No. of moves	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very		Satisfied		Somewhat		Dissatisfied		Total	
	<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Satisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>		<u>Dissatisfied</u>			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
0	2	20	1	10	7	70	0	0	10	100
1	7	37	7	37	3	16	2	10	19	100
2 or more	4	36	4	36	3	27	0	0	11	99

*Percents have been rounded.

$$X^2_2 = 6.13 (P > .05)$$

Independence was indicated when the relationships between the wives' satisfaction with housing and the nine other family-oriented factors were examined: employment of student wives outside the home, amount of schooling for the wives, age distribution of the wives, number of children, length of marriage, number of dwellings resided in since marriage, length of residence in present dwelling, parents assisting in selection of rental housing, and social position of the wives' families and their husbands' families as determined by Hollingshead's Two Factor Index. However, relationships that were not statistically significant did exist.

The wives not employed outside the home expressed more satisfaction with their housing than did the wives who were employed full-time or part-time outside the home. Seventy-two percent of the wives not employed outside the home expressed satisfaction with their housing whereas 57 percent of the wives employed full-time and 51 percent employed part-time expressed satisfaction with their housing (Table 14).

The wives who had completed one to three years of college indicated greater satisfaction with housing than did those wives who were either high-school graduates or college graduates. Of the wives who had completed one to three years of college, 47 percent were very satisfied with their present housing. One-fourth of the college graduates and one-fifth of the high school graduates were

very satisfied with their present housing (Table 15).

Table 14. Housing satisfaction compared with employment of 40 student wives outside the home.

Employment	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
Not employed	5	38	5	38	1	8	2	16	13	100
Part-time	1	17	2	34	3	49	0	0	6	100
Full-time	7	33	5	24	9	43	0	0	21	100

*Percents have been rounded.

$$\chi^2_2 = 1.437 (P < .05)$$

Table 15. Housing satisfaction compared with amount of schooling for 40 student wives.

Educational level	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
High school graduate	3	20	6	40	4	27	2	13	15	100
Partial college	8	47	3	18	6	35	0	0	17	100
College graduate	2	25	3	38	3	38	0	0	8	101

*Percents have been rounded.

$$\chi^2_2 = 0.760 (P < .05)$$

The wives between 20 and 24 years of age indicated greater satisfaction with housing than wives in other age groups. Forty-three percent of the wives between 20 and 24 years of age were very satisfied with their housing, whereas only 11 percent of those between 25 and 29 years of age were very satisfied. None of the three

wives 19 or younger were very satisfied with their housing (Table 16).

Table 16. Housing satisfaction compared with age distribution of 40 student wives.

Age	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied				Somewhat Dissatisfied				Total	
	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
19 or younger	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	3	99
20 - 24	12	43	6	21	9	32	1	4	28	100
25 - 29	1	11	5	56	3	33	0	0	9	100

*Percents have been rounded.

$$\chi^2_2 = 0.904 (P < .05)$$

The presence or absence of children in the home did not appear to influence the wives' satisfaction with housing. Of the wives who did not have children, 69 percent expressed satisfaction with housing. Housing satisfaction was indicated by fifty-six percent of the wives with one child and 75 percent with two children (Table 17).

Those wives who had been married less than two years expressed greater satisfaction with housing than the wives married two or more years. Forty-three percent of the wives married less than two years were very satisfied with housing. Thirty percent of those married between two and five years and 17 percent of those married five years or more, were very satisfied (Table 18).

Table 17. Housing satisfaction compared with number of children for 40 student families.

No. of children	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
0	7	37	6	32	6	32	0	0	19	101
1	4	28	4	28	5	36	1	7	14	101
2	2	50	1	25	1	25	0	0	4	100
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	100
4	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	2	100

*Percents have been rounded.

$$\chi^2_2 = 2.523 (P < .05)$$

Table 18. Housing satisfaction compared with length of marriage for 40 student families.

Length of marriage	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
Less than 2 yrs	6	43	3	21	5	36	0	0	14	100
2 yrs - 5 yrs	6	30	7	35	6	30	1	5	20	100
5 yrs & over	1	17	2	33	2	33	1	17	6	100

*Percents have been rounded.

$$\chi^2_2 = 0.784 (P < .05)$$

The wives' satisfaction with housing seemed to increase with the number of dwellings resided in since marriage. Fifty-three percent of the wives who had lived in one or two dwellings expressed satisfaction with housing. Sixty-six percent of the wives who had resided in three to five dwellings and 72 percent of the wives who had resided in six or more dwellings expressed

satisfaction with housing (Table 19).

Table 19. Housing satisfaction compared with number of dwellings resided in since marriage for 40 student families.

No. of dwellings	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
1-2	3	20	5	33	6	40	1	7	15	100
3-5	8	44	4	22	5	28	1	6	18	100
6 or more	2	29	3	43	2	29	0	0	7	101

*Percents have been rounded.

$$\chi^2_2 = 0.861 \text{ (P} < .05\text{)}$$

Those wives who had resided in their dwellings less than one year expressed more satisfaction with their housing than the wives who had resided in their dwellings one year or longer. Of the wives residing in their dwellings less than one year, 71 percent expressed housing satisfaction. One-half of the wives living in their dwellings between one and two years, and 55 percent of those living in their dwellings two or more years expressed satisfaction with their housing (Table 20).

The wives who had been assisted by parents in selection of their rental units expressed more satisfaction with their housing than did those wives who had not been assisted by parents. Eighty-four percent of the wives who were assisted by parents expressed satisfaction with housing, whereas 59 percent of the wives who were

not assisted by parents expressed satisfaction with their housing (Table 21).

Table 20. Housing satisfaction compared with length of residence in present dwelling for 40 student families.

Length of residence	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
Less than 1 yr	8	38	7	33	6	29	0	0	21	100
1 yr - 2 yrs	2	20	3	30	4	40	1	10	10	100
2 yrs or more	3	33	2	22	3	33	1	11	9	99

*Percents have been rounded.

$$\chi^2_2 = 1.28 \text{ (P < .05)}$$

Table 21. Housing satisfaction compared with parents assisting in selection of rental units for 40 student families.

Parents assist in selection	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
No	9	26	11	33	12	35	2	6	34	100
Yes	4	67	1	17	1	17	0	0	6	101

*Percents have been rounded.

$$\chi^2_1 = 1.283 \text{ (P < .05)}$$

The parental families of the wives and husbands were placed into social positions determined by Hollingshead's Two Factor Social Index. The wives whose families were positioned in Class III expressed more satisfaction with housing than those wives whose

families were positioned in Class I, II, IV, or V. Eighty-eight percent of the wives whose families were positioned in Class III expressed satisfaction with their housing. The wives whose families were positioned in Class I expressed the least satisfaction with housing. Only one-fifth of those wives expressed satisfaction with their present housing (Table 22).

Three-fourths of the wives whose husbands' families were positioned in Class I, and only 43 percent of those whose husbands' families were placed in Class III expressed satisfaction with their housing (Table 22).

Assessment of Financial Resources

Employment of the wife and husband were the most frequently cited types of income. Seventy-eight percent of the wives and 75 percent of the husbands were employed sometime during the year. Veteran's Administration benefits and savings were the next most frequently mentioned types of income (Table 23).

Employment of the wife outside the home provided the greatest financial assistance for one-half of the families interviewed. Employment of the husband provided the greatest assistance for one-fifth of the families, and parents and Veteran's Administration benefits each provided the most assistance for ten percent of the families (Table 24).

Table 22. Housing satisfaction, compared with 40 student wives' and their husbands' families social position as determined by Hollingshead's Two Factor Index.

Social position	Housing Satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissat.		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
<u>Wives' Families</u>										
I	1	20	0	0	3	60	1	20	5	100
II	1	25	1	25	2	50	0	0	4	100
III	4	44	4	44	1	12	0	0	9	100
IV	6	35	5	29	5	29	1	6	17	99
V	0	0	2	50	2	50	0	0	4	100
no data	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
<u>Husbands' Families</u>										
I	1	25	2	50	1	25	0	0	4	100
II	1	25	1	25	2	50	0	0	4	100
III	2	29	1	14	3	43	1	14	7	100
IV	8	36	7	32	7	32	0	0	22	100
V	1	33	1	33	0	0	1	33	3	99

*Percents have been rounded.

Wives' families $X^2_4 = 7.011$ ($P < .05$)

Husbands' families $X^2_4 = 2.011$ ($P < .05$)

Table 23. Types of income for 40 student families.

Types of income	No. of families		Percent*
	Total		Total
<u>Employment (wife)</u>			
Outside the home	27	68	
Babysitting in home	1	2	
Typing in home	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	
	31		78
<u>Employment (husband)</u>	30		75
Veteran's Administration Benefits	15		38
Savings	14		35
Parents	8		20
Loans	6		15
Grants	2		5
Scholarships	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	
	108		271

*Number and percent do not total to 40 and 100 because most families had more than one type of income. Percents have been rounded.

Table 24. Types of income providing the greatest assistance for 40 student families.

Types of income	No. of families	Percent*
Employment (wife)		
Outside the home	20	50
Employment (husband)	8	20
Parents	4	10
Veteran's Administration benefits	4	10
Grants	1	2
Loans	1	2
Savings	1	2
Scholarships	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	40	98

*Percents have been rounded.

The most frequently cited yearly income range was \$3,000 to \$3,999. Twenty-eight percent of the wives checked this income bracket. Thirty-five percent of the families were grossing less than \$4,000 per year (Table 25).

On the whole, the families without children indicated the largest yearly incomes. This probably can be attributed to the wives being able to work outside the home. Of the 14 families citing incomes of less than \$4,000, 13 were families of three or four in size. Twenty-six wives checked yearly incomes of \$4,000 or more per year. Eighteen of the 26 couples did not have children (Table 26).

Table 25. Annual income for 40 student families.

Annual income	No. of families	Percent *
\$1,000 - 1,999	1	2
2,000 - 2,999	2	5
3,000 - 3,999	11	28
4,000 - 4,999	6	15
5,000 - 5,999	5	12
6,000 - 6,999	8	20
7,000 - 9,999	<u>7</u>	<u>18</u>
Total	40	100

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 26. Annual income for 40 student families compared with size of family.

Annual income	Size of Family											
	Two		Three		Four		Five		Six		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
\$1,000 - 1,999	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2
2,000 - 2,999	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
3,000 - 3,999	1	2	9	22	1	2	0	0	0	0	11	26
4,000 - 4,999	4	10	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	15
5,000 - 5,999	4	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	5	12
6,000 - 6,999	4	10	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	20
7,000 - 9,999	<u>6</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	19	47	14	34	4	8	1	2	2	5	40	96

*Percents have been rounded.

Housing Costs

Included in total housing costs were rent, utilities, and cost of transportation to campus. This method of calculating housing costs was patterned after the study conducted by Teather (1954).

The 40 student families were paying between \$40 and \$125 rent per month. The median rent was \$85. Forty-five percent of the families were paying between \$75 and \$94 per month for rent (Table 27).

Table 27. Monthly cost of rent for 40 student families.

Monthly rent	No. of families	Percent *
\$64 and less	3	8
65 - 74	6	15
75 - 84	9	22
85 - 94	9	22
95 - 104	7	18
105 - 114	2	5
115 and more	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	40	100

*Percents have been rounded.

The estimated average monthly cost of utilities (exclusive of telephone) paid by the renters varied between \$6 and \$38.25. One-half of the wives estimated that utilities (exclusive of telephone) averaged \$20 or more monthly. Eighteen dollars was the median.

Ten percent of the wives estimated that the monthly cost of utilities (exclusive of telephone) averaged \$9 or less per month (Table 28).

Table 28. Average monthly cost of utilities for 40 student families.

Cost of utilities	No. of families	Percent*
\$ 5 - 9	4	10
10 - 14	8	20
15 - 19	8	20
20 - 24	9	22
25 - 29	5	12
30 - 34	3	8
35 - 39	2	5
Unknown**	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

**Had resided in unit less than one month.

Thirteen families paid for all of their utilities in addition to rent. All 40 families paid the cost of their own electricity, and 92 percent of the families paid the cost of heating their rental units (Table 29).

The cost of transportation to campus was included in total housing costs. Thirty-nine of the 40 families owned or were buying at least one car. Seven families were two-car families. Even though all but one family owned a car, one-half of the husbands walked or rode bicycles to campus and the cost of transportation was

noted by the wives in these instances to be zero. Ten wives estimated that the cost of transportation averaged \$10 or more per month (Table 30).

Table 29. Utilities paid for in addition to rent for 40 student families.

Utilities paid for in addition to rent	No. of families	Percent*
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
Electricity	40	100
Heat		
Electric	21	52
Gas	14	35
Other	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
	37	92
Garbage disposal	22	55
Gas	16	40
Water	11	28
Television cable or antenna	11	28
Sewer	10	25

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 30. Average monthly cost of transportation to campus for 40 student families.

Cost of transportation	No. of families	Percent*
Negligible**	20	50
\$ 1 - 4	4	10
5 - 9	6	15
10 - 14	7	18
15 - 19	1	2
20 - 25	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	40	100

*Percents have been rounded.

**Walked or rode bicycle.

Monthly total housing costs included rent, the estimated average cost of utilities (exclusive of telephone) and the estimated cost of transportation to campus. These costs differed as much as \$91.75 per month. The minimum estimated total cost of housing for any couple interviewed was \$71.75 per month; the maximum, \$163.50. Estimated housing costs totaled \$110 or more per month for 40 percent of the families (Table 31).

Table 31. Average monthly total cost of housing for 40 student families.

Total cost of housing	No. of families	Percent*
\$ 70 - 79	5	12
80 - 89	2	5
90 - 99	6	15
100 - 109	11	28
110 - 119	4	10
120 - 129	5	12
130 - 139	2	5
140 and more	<u>5</u>	<u>12</u>
Total	40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

Participants were asked to state the maximum amount of money they thought they could afford to pay for rent per month with utilities included. Estimated gross rent per month was determined for each family. Gross rent includes the cost of rent plus the cost

of utilities. Sixty-five percent of the families were paying an estimated gross rent of \$109 or less per month. Forty-five percent of the wives felt the maximum they could afford to pay for gross rent per month was between \$80 and \$109 (Table 32). Eleven wives estimated they were paying more for gross rent than they felt they could afford.

Table 32. Comparison of gross rent paid and maximum gross rent 40 student wives felt they could afford.

Gross rent paid	No. of families	Percent*	Maximum Gross rent	No. of families	Percent*
\$ 79 and less	4	10	\$ 79 and less	0	0
80 - 89	3	8	80 - 89	4	10
90 - 99	6	15	90 - 99	6	15
100 - 109	13	32	100 - 109	8	20
110 - 119	5	12	110 - 119	4	10
120 - 129	2	5	120 - 129	8	20
130 - 139	3	8	130 - 139	5	12
140 & more	3	8	140 & more	4	10
unknown	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	no response	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	40	100		40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

Description of Rental Housing

Houses and duplexes appeared to be the most popular types of rental units. Thirty percent of the families were renting houses and 25 percent were renting duplexes. Participants were also residing in apartments, old houses converted into apartments, row

houses and four-plexes. Several families living in mobile homes were contacted, but they were buying, not renting, mobile homes.. Therefore, mobile homes as a type of housing were not included in the study (Table 33).

Table 33. Classification of housing types resided in by 40 student families.

Type of housing	No. of families	Percent*
House	12	30
Duplex	10	25
Apartment	7	18
Old house converted into apartments	5	12
Row house	3	8
Other		
Four-plex	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	40	101

*Percents have been rounded.

In this study, 70 percent of the rental units were partially furnished, 20 percent fully furnished and 10 percent completely unfurnished. Ranges and refrigerators were the items most frequently provided in partially furnished rental units (Table 34).

Table 34. Rental housing classified as to furnished or unfurnished for 40 student families.

Furnished-Unfurnished	No. of families	Percent
	Total	Total
Partially furnished		
Range	26	
Refrigerator	25	
Draperies	9	
Dryer	9	
Washer	9	
Carpeting	7	
Dishwasher	6	
Food waste disposer	<u>4</u>	
	28	70
Fully furnished	8	20
Unfurnished	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	40	100

All dwellings consisted of three or more rooms, not including bathrooms or hallways. Bathrooms, halls, or any room not suitable for living quarters should not be included in room count (University of Denver, 1954). One-half of the units consisted of four rooms (Table 35).

Table 35. Number of rooms per dwelling for 40 student families.

No. of rooms	No. of families	Percent*
Three	5	12
Four	20	50
Five	10	25
Six	4	10
Seven	0	0
Eight	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

"The coefficient of room density is expressed as persons per room, or the number of individuals in the home divided by the number of rooms they occupy (PPR ratio)" (Agan, 1965, p. 45). Table 36 compares the number of rooms with size of family. This information was used to determine the persons per room ratio reported in Table 37. A smaller number means the family has ample room and is not overcrowded (Beyer, 1967). "As many persons as rooms may generally be accepted as suitable" (Agan, 1965, p. 45).

One family had a PPR ratio of 0.33, the lowest in this study. The family consisted of a wife and husband residing in a six room dwelling. Thirteen families had a PPR of 0.50. According to Agan (1965) the PPR ratio, 1.00 or less, was suitable for 95 percent of the families interviewed. Two PPR ratios exceeded one. One family of six was renting a five room unit and one family of five was renting a four room unit (Table 37).

Table 36. Number of rooms per dwelling compared with size of family for 40 student families.

No. of rooms	Size of families											
	Two		Three		Four		Five		Six		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Three	3	8	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13
Four	12	30	5	12	2	5	1	2	0	0	20	49
Five	3	8	6	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	25
Six	1	2	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	4	9
Seven	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eight	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2
Total	19	48	14	35	4	10	1	2	2	4	40	98

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 37. Persons per room ratio for 40 student families.

Persons per room ratio	Number of families	Percent*
0.33	1	2
0.40	3	8
0.50	13	32
0.60	6	15
0.67	5	12
0.75	6	15
1.00	4	10
1.20	1	2
1.25	1	2
Total	40	98

*Percents have been rounded.

The smallest dwelling in this study was approximately 448 square feet in size; the largest, 1,820. Forty-eight percent of the units were estimated to be between 400 and 749 square feet in size. Only two dwellings were estimated to be over 1550 square feet in size (Table 38).

Table 38. Size of dwellings in square feet for 40 student families.

Approximate total square footage	No. of families	Percent*
400 - 749	19	48
750 - 999	10	25
1000 - 1149	5	12
1150 - 1399	2	5
1400 - 1549	2	5
1550 and more	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	40	100

*Percents have been rounded.

Sixty-five percent of the wives felt that their present dwellings were adequate in size for their families. Twenty-two percent of the wives felt that their rental units were too small and 12 percent felt that their rental units were spacious.

The American Public Health Association has set minimum standards of living space that are stated as minimum space allotments per person in terms of square feet of floor space. The following are the delineated minimum space requirements:

1 person - 400 square feet
 2 persons - 750 square feet
 3 persons - 1000 square feet
 4 persons - 1150 square feet
 5 persons - 1400 square feet
 6 persons - 1550 square feet (American Public Health Association, 1950, p. 36).

Nineteen families, 46 percent, were residing in dwellings estimated to be less than 750 square feet in size. Only two families, five percent, were residing in dwellings estimated to be 1550 square feet or more in size. Seventy percent of the families in this study were residing in dwellings not meeting the minimum space requirements recommended by the American Public Health Association (Table 39).

Table 39. Size of dwellings in square feet compared with size of family for 40 student families.

Approximate total square footage	Size of family											
	Two		Three		Four		Five		Six		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
400 - 749	12	30	5	12	1	2	1	2	0	0	19	46
750 - 999	3	8	5	12	2	5	0	0	0	0	10	25
1000 - 1149	2	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13
1150 - 1399	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4
1400 - 1549	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4
1550 and more	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	19	47	14	34	4	9	1	2	2	4	40	96

*Percents have been rounded.

The majority of rental units in this study, 55 percent, numbered two bedrooms. Only one unit, two percent, had four bedrooms.

In only one rental unit were bedrooms less than 80 square feet in size. Fifty-one percent of the bedrooms were between 80 and 119 square feet in size (Table 40).

The maximum number of persons occupying a bedroom should usually not exceed two. If the family includes a boy and a girl, the number of bedrooms needed will be greater by one than that regarded as necessary for two children of the same sex (Agan, 1965, p. 96).

Five families exceeded the maximum number of persons per bedroom ratio suggested by Agan (Table 41). One wife told the researcher that the husband and wife slept on a hide-a-bed in the living room and their 18-month-old son slept in the one large bedroom. In two other instances, the parents and one child less than two months old were residing in a one-bedroom unit. One family of four including the parents, a boy four years old, and a girl five years old, was renting a unit with one large bedroom. In four other situations bedrooms very likely had to be shared by brothers and sisters or with parents.

Table 40. Number of bedrooms per dwelling and size of bedrooms for 40 student families.

No. of bedrooms	No. of families	Percent*	Size of bedrooms	No. of bedrooms	Percent*
One	15	38	less than 80 square ft.	2	3
Two	22	55	small (80-119 sq. ft.)	35	51
Three	2	5	medium (120-159 sq. ft.)	26	38
Four	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	large (160 & more sq. ft.)	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	40	100		69	101

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 41. Number of bedrooms per dwelling compared with size of family for 40 student families.

No. of bedrooms	Size of family											
	Two		Three		Four		Five		Six		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
One	11	28	3	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	15	38
Two	8	20	10	25	3	8	1	2	0	0	22	55
Three	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4
Four	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	19	48	14	35	4	10	1	2	2	4	40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

Thirteen wives indicated that the bedrooms were the only rooms that could be used as sleeping areas. A hide-a-bed or couch in the living room was mentioned as a possible other sleeping area by 24 of the participants. Two wives stated that a study could be used as a sleeping area and one wife stated that the dining room could be used as a sleeping area if needed.

Participants were asked to check the characteristics on a list which described their present rental situations. Eighty-five percent of the wives in this study felt that their dwellings furnished adequate daylight, and 80 percent had laundry facilities provided or nearby. Adequate ventilation was checked by 78 percent of the wives and adequate privacy by 72 percent. Only 38 percent of the wives indicated they were residing close to friends and 38 percent had a garage or carport included in the rental situation. One family was renting a unit with a swimming pool provided on the grounds (Table 42).

Table 42. Description of rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.

Housing factor	Describes rental housing		Not present in rental situation		Total	
	No. of families	Percent*	No. of families	Percent*	No. of families	Percent*
Adequate daylight	34	85	6	15	40	100
Laundry facilities						
provided or nearby	32	80	8	20	40	100
Adequate ventilation	31	78	9	22	40	100
Adequate privacy	29	72	11	28	40	100
Desirable circulation						
(movement between rooms)	28	70	12	30	40	100
Location (within walking distance to university or school)	28	70	12	30	40	100
Area well-kept and cared- for (neighborhood)	26	65	14	35	40	100
Near shopping facilities	24	60	16	40	40	100
Study area for husband (and self, if needed)	22	55	18	45	40	100
Adequate amount of storage space	21	52	19	48	40	100
Freedom from bother- some noise	20	50	20	50	40	100
Outdoor living area	20	50	20	50	40	100
Playground nearby or play area for the children	18	45	22	55	40	100
Pleasant view from window	16	40	24	60	40	100
Close to friends	15	38	25	62	40	100
Garage or carport	15	38	25	62	40	100
Swimming pool	1	2	39	98	40	100
Other:						
Full basement	1	2			1	2
Front porch	1	2			1	2
Room for hobbies	1	2			1	2

*Percentages have been rounded.

Selection of Rental Housing

Various methods were employed by the 40 families to locate the rental units they were residing in when interviewed (Table 43). Newspapers and direct search were the most popular methods. Each of these were used to locate 14 rental units. Of those employing direct search, 11 drove around in an automobile, one couple walked by the rental unit and noticed it was empty, one couple walked by and saw the "For Rent" sign, and another couple stopped and inquired when they saw the previous renters moving. Nine families located their present dwelling through personal contacts. Managers provided the information for four families, sisters-in-law for two families, a friend for one family and the buyer of the previously lived-in rental unit for one family. The OSU Housing Department provided the information necessary to locate two units, five percent. One family put an ad in the paper and found a dwelling in this way.

Table 43. Methods employed to locate rental housing by 40 student families.

Methods employed	No. of families	Percent*
Newspaper	14	35
Direct search	14	35
Personal contacts	9	22
OSU Housing Department	2	5
Other:		
Advertized in newspaper	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

Wives were asked if, when selecting their present rental unit, they felt there was an adequate number and variety of rental units from which to choose. Two-thirds of the wives indicated that they felt there was not.

The following are some of the wives' comments about the number and variety of rental units:

"There were adequate apartments, but not many houses. Housing for married students is inadequate but for single students is fine."

"There are very few apartments or houses in Corvallis for rent at a price married students can afford."

"Do not see why the school doesn't have more married student housing."

"Very few in area I wanted. Many were in poor locations, far from campus."

"Not enough available apartments that are clean and yet at a reasonable rent."

"They were too dirty."

"Rent too high, children not allowed."

"We had a dog so needed a house with a yard."

Three-fifths of the wives interviewed said they had difficulty locating a dwelling within their financial means. Thirty-eight percent of the wives checked, "Available rental units were too expensive,"

and 58 percent checked, "Rental units that were not too expensive were of poor quality." Some participants checked both of the above-mentioned problems.

The seasons in which rental units were selected were compared with the wives' feelings concerning availability of rental housing. The wives selecting rental units during the spring months felt there was a greater number and variety of rental units from which to choose than those selecting units during other seasons (Table 44).

Table 44. 40 student wives' feelings concerning adequate choice of rental housing compared with when housing was selected.

When selected	Not an adequate choice		Adequate choice		Total	
	No. of families	Percent*	No. of families	Percent*	No. of families	Percent*
Winter months	2	5	1	2	3	7
January 0						
February 0						
March 3						
Spring months	8	20	6	15	14	35
April 2						
May 2						
June 10						
Summer months	10	25	5	12	15	37
July 2						
August 11						
September 2						
Fall months	6	15	2	5	8	20
October 2						
November 1						
December 5						
Total	26	65	14	34	40	99

*Percents have been rounded

Participants were asked in an open end question, "For what reasons did you select your present rental unit?" For 65 percent of the families cost was an important consideration. One-half of the wives said that location was a reason for selecting the unit they had chosen. Eight of the 20 wives who cited location, specifically mentioned, "close to campus." Thirty-five percent of the wives said that the amount of space within the dwelling was a reason for selecting their present housing. One-fifth of the wives gave answers related to the quality of the dwelling, such as soundly built (Table 45).

Table 45. Reasons for selecting rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.

Reasons	No. of wives *	Percent*
Cost	26	65
Location	20	50
Amount of space within the dwelling	14	35
Quality of the dwelling	8	20
Yard	4	10
Number of bedrooms	3	8
Clean	3	8
House, not apartment	3	8
Available	2	5
Children allowed	2	5
Dwelling new or modern	2	5
Good landlord	2	5
Privacy	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	91	229

*Number of wives and percent do not total to 40 and 100 because more than one reason was mentioned by most participants. Percents have been rounded.

Only those reasons mentioned by two or more participants are listed in this table.

Three-fourths of the wives said there was nothing they felt they should have looked for and did not when selecting their present dwellings. Two wives who felt they should have been more selective mentioned a need for more study room. The following factors (mentioned only once each) were ones wives felt they should have looked for and did not: house where condensation does not form on windows, better quality of building and management, more utilities paid, more cupboard space in the kitchen, more storage space, a shower, a larger bathroom, a yard, a fenced-in yard, off-street parking, a garage, and a location less dangerous for children. One wife mentioned, "We didn't realize there was a train that goes by in front of the apartment."

The student wives gave many and varied answers to the open-end question, "What did you like most about your present dwelling when you selected it?" Amount of space within the dwelling was mentioned by 32 percent of the wives, location by 25 percent and dwelling is modern or new by 12 percent (Table 46).

The 40 wives participating in this study were asked to rate a list of 22 selected housing factors as important, not important, or not considered when selecting their present rental units (Table 47).

Table 46. Housing factors liked most when selecting rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.

Housing factors liked most	No. of wives*	Percent*
Amount of space within the dwelling	13	32
Location	10	25
Dwelling modern or new	5	12
Privacy	4	10
Carpeting	3	8
Clean	3	8
Yard (fenced-in, large)	3	8
Conveniences, Flood waste disposer	2	5
Fireplace	2	5
Total	45	113

*Number of wives and percents do not total to 40 and 100 because more than one housing factor was mentioned by most participants. Percents have been rounded.

Only those housing factors mentioned by two or more participants are listed in this table.

Housing factors considered important by at least three-fourths of the 40 wives were: cost, amount of space within the dwelling, amount of storage space, and whether the unit was furnished or unfurnished.

Housing factors considered not important by 30 percent or more of the wives were: size of the bedrooms, residing near shopping facilities, an outdoor living area, view from the window, a garage or carport, and laundry facilities provided or nearby.

All 40 wives had considered cost and the amount of space within the dwelling when selecting their present rental units. One-half or more of the wives did not consider a swimming pool, residing

Table 47. Importance of specific housing factors when selecting rental housing as rated by 40 student wives.

Housing factors	Important		Not Important		Not Considered		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Cost	39	98	1	2	0	0	40	100
Amount of space								
within the dwelling	37	92	3	8	0	0	40	100
Amount of storage space	31	78	3	8	6	15	40	101
Furnished or unfurnished	30	75	5	12	5	12	40	99
Location (within walking distance to university or schools)	29	72	6	15	5	12	40	99
Study area	29	72	3	8	8	20	40	100
Number of bedrooms	28	70	10	25	2	5	40	100
Privacy	25	62	9	22	6	15	40	99
Laundry facilities								
provided or nearby	24	60	12	30	4	10	40	100
Adequate ventilation	20	50	9	22	11	28	40	100
Adequate daylight	17	42	10	25	13	32	40	99
Freedom from bothersome noise	17	42	10	25	13	32	40	99
Care and upkeep of area (neighborhood)	16	40	11	28	13	32	40	100
Circulation (movement pattern between rooms)	15	38	10	25	15	38	40	101
Garage or carport	13	32	13	32	14	35	40	99
Outdoor living area	13	32	13	32	14	35	40	99
Size of bedrooms	13	32	19	48	8	20	40	100
Playground nearby or play area for children	11	28	9	22	20	50	40	100
Near shopping facilities	10	25	14	35	16	40	40	100
Close to friends	7	18	9	22	24	60	40	100
View from the window	7	18	13	32	20	50	40	100
Swimming pool	0	0	11	28	29	72	40	100
Other:								
Clean	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5
Shower or tub	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5

*Percents have been rounded.

close to friends, the view from the window and a playground nearby or play area for the children. Forty-eight percent of the couples did not have children and this, very likely, was why many wives showed a lack of concern for a playground nearby or a play area.

Satisfaction with Selected Housing Factors

Location and amount of space within the dwelling were the two most frequently given answers to the question, "What do you like most about your present dwelling?" Each of these factors was mentioned by 35 percent of the wives participating in the study. Dwelling well-kept by the landlord or management was cited by 12 percent of the wives and privacy and rent were each cited by ten percent as most-liked factors (Table 48).

Participants were asked, "What do you dislike most about your present housing?" One-fourth of the wives stated that they disliked most the heating or heating systems in their dwellings. Factors most disliked by one-fifth of the wives were inadequate amount of storage space and the inferior quality of dwelling. Twelve percent of the wives mentioned that their dwellings were too small and this is one of the factors they disliked most (Table 49).

Table 48. Housing factors liked most in rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.

Housing factors liked most	No. of wives*	Percent*
Location	14	35
Amount of space within the dwelling	14	35
Dwelling well-kept by landlord or management	5	12
Privacy	4	10
Rent	4	10
Kitchen	3	8
Dwelling modern or new	3	8
Yard	2	5
Garage	2	5
Homey, cozy	2	5
Modern conveniences (dishwasher, garbage disposal)	2	5
Freedom from bothersome noise	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	57	143

*Number of wives and percents do not total to 40 and 100 because more than one housing factor was mentioned by many participants. Percents have been rounded.

Only those housing factors mentioned by two or more participants are listed in this table.

Table 49. Housing factors disliked most in rental housing as stated by 40 student wives.

Housing factors disliked most	No. of wives*	Percent*
Heating and heating systems	10	25
Inadequate amount of storage space	8	20
Quality of dwelling	8	20
Size (too small)	5	12
Bothered by noise	4	10
Do not have garage or carport	3	8
Do not have a yard or yard too small	3	8
Laundry facilities not provided	2	5
Busy street too close	2	5
Kitchen (too small, not modern)	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	47	118

*Number of wives and percents do not total to 40 and 100 because more than one housing factor was mentioned by many participants. Percents have been rounded.

Only those housing factors mentioned by two or more participants are listed in this table.

The wives were asked to rate the list of 22 selected housing factors indicating whether satisfied, dissatisfied, or if the factors did not influence their housing satisfaction (Table 50).

At least three-fourths of the 40 wives expressed satisfaction with the following housing factors: location, cost, adequacy of daylight, unit furnished or unfurnished, laundry facilities provided or nearby, number of bedrooms, size of bedrooms and adequacy of ventilation.

More than one-fourth of the wives noted dissatisfaction with the following housing factors: amount of storage space, bothersome noise, study area, amount of space within the dwelling, lack of privacy, and the absence of a garage or carport.

All 40 wives felt that cost, the amount of space within the dwelling, the number of bedrooms, privacy, and a study area influenced their satisfaction with housing. Over 90 percent of the wives stated that a swimming pool did not influence satisfaction with their present housing. Housing factors which did not influence satisfaction with housing for over 30 percent of the wives were: a playground nearby or play area for the children, residing close to friends, and view from the window.

Table 50. Satisfaction with selected housing factors as rated by 40 student wives.

Housing factors	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		No Influence		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Location	35	88	4	10	1	2	40	100
Cost	33	82	7	18	0	0	40	100
Adequate daylight	32	80	2	5	6	15	40	100
Furnished or unfurnished	32	80	1	2	7	18	40	100
Laundry facilities								
provided or nearby	32	80	6	15	2	5	40	100
Number of bedrooms	32	80	8	20	0	0	40	100
Size of bedrooms	32	80	4	10	4	10	40	100
Adequate ventilation	30	75	5	12	5	12	40	99
Amount of space								
within dwelling	29	72	11	28	0	0	40	100
Care & upkeep of area	29	72	1	2	10	25	40	99
Privacy	29	72	11	28	0	0	40	100
Circulation (movement								
pattern between rooms)	28	70	5	12	7	18	40	100
Near shopping facilities	26	65	4	10	10	25	40	100
Study area	25	62	15	38	0	0	40	100
Amount of storage space	22	55	17	42	1	2	40	99
Outdoor living area	22	55	8	20	10	25	40	100
Freedom from bother-								
some noise	21	52	16	40	3	8	40	100
Close to friends	19	48	2	5	19	48	40	101
Garage or carport	19	48	11	28	10	25	40	101
View from window	18	45	6	15	16	40	40	100
Playground nearby or								
play area for children	16	40	3	8	21	52	40	100
Swimming pool	1	2	2	5	37	92	40	99

*Percents have been rounded.

Satisfaction with Selected Housing Factors
Compared with Housing Satisfaction

The relationships between housing satisfaction and satisfaction with the housing factors: freedom from bothersome noise, privacy, amount of space within the dwelling, and number of bedrooms, were examined using the Chi-square test and a lack of independence was indicated. The majority of wives who expressed satisfaction with these housing factors also expressed satisfaction with their housing. The majority of wives who expressed dissatisfaction with these factors also expressed dissatisfaction with their housing (Tables 51-54).

Eighty-five percent of the wives satisfied with the housing factor, freedom from bothersome noise, expressed satisfaction with their housing. Three-fourths of the wives who were dissatisfied with bothersome noise also expressed dissatisfaction with their housing (Table 51).

All participants thought that the housing factor, privacy, influenced their housing satisfaction. Seventy-nine percent of the wives satisfied with this factor expressed satisfaction with their housing. Eighty-two percent of the wives dissatisfied with the factor, privacy, also expressed dissatisfaction with their housing (Table 52).

Table 51. Satisfaction with the housing factor, freedom from bothersome noise, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Freedom from bothersome noise										
Satisfied	11	52	7	33	3	15	0	0	21	100
Dissatisfied	1	6	3	19	10	63	2	12	16	100
No Influence	1	33	2	67	0	0	0	0	3	100

$$X^2_2 = 16.237 (P > .01)$$

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 52. Satisfaction with the housing factor, privacy, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Privacy										
Satisfied	12	41	11	38	6	21	0	0	29	100
Dissatisfied	1	9	1	9	7	64	2	18	11	100
No Influence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

$$X^2_1 = 12.71 (P > .01)$$

*Percents have been rounded.

All participants considered that the housing factor, amount of space within the dwelling, was influential in housing satisfaction. Seventy-six percent of the wives satisfied with the amount of space within the dwelling also expressed satisfaction with their housing. Seventy-three percent of the wives dissatisfied with this factor expressed dissatisfaction with their housing (Table 53).

Table 53. Satisfaction with the housing factor, amount of space within the dwelling, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Amount of space within dwelling										
Satisfied	11	38	11	38	6	21	1	3	29	100
Dissatisfied	2	18	1	9	7	64	1	9	11	100
No Influence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

$\chi^2_2 = 8.032$ ($P > .01$) *Percents have been rounded.

All the participants thought that the number of bedrooms in the dwelling influenced their housing satisfaction. Seventy-nine percent of the wives satisfied with the number of bedrooms also indicated satisfaction with housing. Three-fourths of the wives dissatisfied with this factor indicated dissatisfaction with their housing (Table 54).

Table 54. Satisfaction with the housing factor, number of bedrooms, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
No. of bedrooms										
Satisfied	13	41	12	38	8	25	1	3	32	100
Dissatisfied	0	0	2	25	5	63	1	12	8	100
No Influence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

$\chi^2_1 = 6.00$ ($P > .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

Relationships between the wives' housing satisfaction and the wives' satisfaction with the other selected housing factors were examined and independence was indicated. Significant relationships between housing satisfaction and satisfaction with these housing factors did not occur (Tables 55-72). Relationships between satisfaction with the following selected housing factors and the wives' satisfaction with housing were examined and independence was indicated: size of the bedrooms, location, an outdoor living area, residing close to friends, care and upkeep of the area (neighborhood), a playground nearby or a play area for the children, study area, circulation (movement pattern between the rooms), whether the unit was furnished or unfurnished, the amount of storage space, adequate daylight, a garage or carport, adequate ventilation, swimming pool, view from the window, residing near shopping facilities, cost, and laundry facilities provided or nearby.

Table 55. Satisfaction with the housing factor, size of the bedrooms, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Size of bedrooms	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	10	31	10	31	11	34	1	3	32	99
Dissatisfied	0	0	1	25	2	50	1	25	4	100
No Influence	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0	4	100

$X^2_1 = 4.80$ ($P < .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

Table 56. Satisfaction with the housing factor, location, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor location	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	12	34	11	31	11	31	1	3	35	99
Dissatisfied	0	0	1	25	2	50	1	25	4	100
No Influence	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

$X^2_2 = 3.15$ ($P < .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

Table 57. Satisfaction with the housing factor, outdoor living area, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Outdoor living area	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	7	32	9	36	6	27	0	0	22	99
Dissatisfied	2	25	1	13	5	62	0	0	8	100
No Influence	4	40	2	20	2	20	2	20	10	100

$X^2_2 = 3.14$ ($P < .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

Table 61. Satisfaction with the housing factor, study area, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
Study area	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Satisfied	11	44	7	28	7	28	0	0	25	100
Dissatisfied	2	13	5	33	6	40	2	13	15	99
No Influence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

$$X^2_1 = 2.57 (P < .05)$$

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 62. Satisfaction with the housing factor, circulation (movement pattern between the rooms), compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Circulation (movement pattern between rooms)	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Satisfied	8	29	8	29	11	39	1	4	28	101
Dissatisfied	0	0	3	60	1	20	1	20	5	100
No Influence	5	71	1	14	1	14	0	0	7	99

$$X^2_2 = 1.97 (P < .05)$$

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 63. Satisfaction with the housing factor, unit furnished or unfurnished, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Unit furnished or unfurnished	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Satisfied	12	38	9	28	9	28	2	6	32	100
Dissatisfied	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100
No Influence	1	14	3	43	3	43	0	0	7	100

$$X^2_2 = 1.89 (P < .05)$$

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 64. Satisfaction with the housing factor, amount of storage space, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Amount of storage space	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	8	36	7	32	7	32	0	0	22	100
Dissatisfied	4	24	5	29	6	35	2	12	17	100
No Influence	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100

$$X^2_2 = 1.57 (P < .05)$$

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 65. Satisfaction with the housing factor, adequate daylight, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Adequate daylight	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	10	31	9	28	11	34	2	6	32	99
Dissatisfied	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	2	100
No Influence	2	33	2	33	2	33	0	0	6	99

$$X^2_2 = 1.38 (P < .05)$$

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 66. Satisfaction with the housing factor, garage or carport, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Garage or carport	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	6	30	8	40	6	30	0	0	20	100
Dissatisfied	2	18	4	36	4	36	1	9	11	99
No Influence	5	56	3	31	0	0	1	13	9	100

$$X^2_2 = 0.96 (P < .05)$$

*Percents have been rounded.

Table 67. Satisfaction with the housing factor, adequate ventilation, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Adequate ventilation	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	9	30	9	30	10	33	2	7	30	100
Dissatisfied	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	5	100
No Influence	3	60	1	20	1	20	0	0	5	100

$X^2_2 = 0.79$ ($P < .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

Table 68. Satisfaction with the housing factor, swimming pool, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Swimming pool	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Dissatisfied	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	2	100
No Influence	12	32	11	30	13	35	1	3	37	100

$X^2_2 = 0.74$ ($P < .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

Table 69. Satisfaction with the housing factor, view from the window, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor View from the window	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	6	33	6	33	4	22	2	11	18	99
Dissatisfied	2	33	2	33	2	33	0	0	6	99
No Influence	5	31	4	25	7	44	0	0	16	100

$X^2_2 = 0.45$ ($P < .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

Table 70. Satisfaction with the housing factor, residing near shopping facilities, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Residing near shopping facilities	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	% *	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	% *	No.	%*
Satisfied	10	38	7	27	8	31	1	4	26	100
Dissatisfied	0	0	3	75	0	0	1	25	4	100
No Influence	3	30	2	20	5	50	0	0	10	100

$\chi^2_2 = 0.37$ ($P < .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

Table 71. Satisfaction with the housing factor, cost, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Cost	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	% *	No.	% *
Satisfied	11	33	10	30	12	36	0	0	33	99
Dissatisfied	2	29	2	29	1	14	2	29	7	101
No Influence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

$\chi^2_1 = 0.104$ ($P < .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

Table 72. Satisfaction with the housing factor, laundry facilities provided or nearby, compared with housing satisfaction.

Housing factor Laundry facilities provided or nearby	Housing satisfaction									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*	No.	%*
Satisfied	10	31	10	31	10	31	2	7	32	100
Dissatisfied	3	50	1	17	2	33	0	0	6	100
No Influence	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	2	100

$\chi^2_2 = 0.02$ ($P < .05$) *Percents have been rounded.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Purpose

This exploratory study was designed to ascertain if selected family-oriented factors influence student wives' housing satisfaction and to ascertain which housing factors have the greatest influence on student wives' housing satisfaction and selection. It was also the purpose of this study to determine if married undergraduate students attending Oregon State University had difficulty finding satisfactory rental housing and to obtain a description of their rental housing.

Method and Procedure

The sample in this study consisted of the wives of 40 undergraduate students attending Oregon State University during fall quarter of 1967. To be eligible to participate in the study all the student wives had to be residing in non-university-owned rental housing with a Corvallis, Oregon address.

Names were selected systematically from the Fusser's Guide, the Oregon State University directory. The student wives were contacted by letter and telephone or in person. If the wives were eligible, and willing to participate in the study, an appointment for an

interview was made.

The instrument for this research, an interview schedule, was designed by the author. The student wives completed the interview schedule and answered questions pertaining to family-oriented factors, financial resources, cost of housing, satisfaction with housing, description of housing, housing factors consociated with selection of housing, and housing factors consociated with housing satisfaction.

Family-Oriented Factors

Of the wives participating in the study, 52 percent were employed full-time outside the home. Only two wives were enrolled in a university course and both were full-time students. All 40 wives were high-school graduates and 20 percent of the wives were also college graduates. The ages of 70 percent of the wives ranged between 20 and 24 years. Twenty-one couples, 52 percent, had one or more children. Sixty-five percent of the couples had been married two or more years. The number of dwellings resided in since marriage varied from one to 11. Three-fourths of the couples had moved one or more times in Corvallis. Fifty-two percent of the families had resided in their present dwelling less than one year. Parents assisted six couples, 15 percent, in the selection of their rental units. Only two families had a person residing with them, other than the immediate family. The parental families of the wives'

and husbands' were placed into social positions as determined by Hollingshead's Two Factor Index, a scale based on the education and occupation of the head of the household. Fifty-five percent of the husbands' families and 42 percent of the wives' families were positioned in Class IV.

Satisfaction with Housing

Sixty-two percent of the student wives in this study expressed satisfaction with their present housing. Two-thirds of the 15 wives indicating dissatisfaction with their present housing planned to move within the next few months.

When the wives were asked why they had moved previously in the community, "need for more space" and "rent too expensive" were the reasons mentioned most frequently.

Family Oriented Factors Compared with Housing Satisfaction

A larger percentage of the student wives who had moved one or more times within the community expressed satisfaction with their present housing than those wives who had not moved. When the relationship between the number of moves in Corvallis and the wives' satisfaction with housing was examined, a lack of independence was indicated.

Relationships between the wives' satisfaction with housing and the remaining nine family-oriented factors included in this study were examined and independence was indicated.

Assessment of Financial Resources and Housing Costs

Types of income most frequently cited by the wives were employment of the wife and employment of the husband. Wives employed outside the home provided the greatest financial assistance for one-half of the families. Thirty-five percent of the families had an income of less than \$4,000 per year. On the whole the couples without children had larger yearly incomes than did couples with children.

Forty percent of the wives interviewed estimated their housing costs totaled \$110 or more per month. Included in total monthly housing costs were rent, the estimated average cost of utilities, and the estimated cost of transportation to campus.

Rental fees varied between \$40 and \$125 per month, with 45 percent of the families paying between \$75 and \$94 per month. The average monthly cost of utilities (excluding telephone) was estimated to be \$20 or more by one-half of the wives. All families interviewed paid the cost of electricity, and 92 percent paid the cost of heating their rental units. The cost of transportation to campus was

negligible for one-half of the student families because the husbands walked or rode a bicycle to campus. One-fourth of the wives estimated the cost of transportation to campus as \$10 or more per month.

Forty-five percent of the wives estimated that the maximum amount they could afford to pay for gross rent (rent with utilities included) was between \$80 and \$109 per month. Sixty-five percent of the wives estimated they were actually paying less than \$110 gross rent per month.

Description of Rental Housing

Fifty-five percent of the student families were residing in houses and duplexes. Partially furnished rental units were being rented by 70 percent of the families. The number of rooms per dwelling varied between three to eight, with one-half of the units numbering four rooms. Forty-eight percent of the dwellings were estimated to be less than 750 total square feet in size. Two-bedroom units constituted 55 percent of the dwellings in the study. There were areas, other than bedrooms, which could be used for sleeping in nearly 70 percent of the dwellings.

Five percent of the families exceeded the recommended persons per room ratio of one. Seventy percent of the families were residing in dwellings not meeting the minimum space requirements

recommended by the American Public Health Association for their family size. The maximum number of persons per bedroom specified by Agan was exceeded by 12 percent of the families.

The wives were asked to check on a list those characteristics that described their present rental units. At least three-fourths of the 40 wives participating in the study checked the following: adequate daylight, laundry facilities provided or nearby, and adequate ventilation.

Selection of Rental Housing

Seventy percent of the families located their present dwellings through the newspaper or by direct search. Two-thirds of the wives in this study felt that, when selecting their present rental units, there was not an adequate number and variety of rental units from which to choose. Locating a dwelling within the family's financial means was reported as difficult by three-fifths of the wives interviewed.

Cost and location were the replies most frequently given to the open-end question, "For what reasons did you select your present rental unit?" The wives were also asked to rate a list of 22 selected housing factors as important, not important or not considered when selecting their present rental units. Checked as important by three-fourths or more of the wives were the following housing

factors: cost, amount of space within the dwelling, amount of storage space, and whether the unit was furnished or unfurnished. Location was checked as important by 72 percent of the wives.

Housing factors mentioned by more than 30 percent of the wives as not important were: size of the bedrooms, residing near shopping facilities, an outdoor living area, view from the window, and a garage or carport.

Not considered when selecting their present housing by one-half or more of the wives were the following: a swimming pool, residing close to friends, view from the window, and a playground nearby or a play area for the children.

Three-fourths of the wives felt there was nothing they should have looked for and did not when selecting their present rental units. The participants most frequently mentioned amount of space within the unit and location as factors they liked most when selecting their present housing.

Satisfaction with Selected Housing Factors

Wives were asked what they liked most about their present dwellings. Location and the amount of space within the dwelling were the housing factors most frequently cited by the participants. Each factor was mentioned by 35 percent of the wives.

The wives were also asked what they disliked most about

their present housing. Heating or heating systems was specified by one-fourth of the participants. One-fifth of the wives cited an inadequate amount of storage space and the inferior quality of the dwelling as what they disliked most about their present housing.

The wives rated the same list of 22 selected housing factors for satisfaction as they had for importance when selecting their units. At least three-fourths of the 40 wives were satisfied with the following housing factors: location, cost, adequacy of daylight, unit furnished or unfurnished, laundry facilities provided or nearby, number of bedrooms, size of bedrooms and adequacy of ventilation.

More than one-fourth of the wives noted dissatisfaction with the factors: amount of storage space, bothersome noise, study area, amount of space within the dwelling, lack of privacy, and the absence of a garage or carport.

More than 30 percent of the wives felt that a swimming pool, a playground nearby or a play area for the children, residing close to friends, and view from the window had no influence on their housing satisfaction.

Satisfaction with Selected Housing Factors Compared with Housing Satisfaction

A lack of independence was indicated when the relationships between the wives' satisfaction with housing and satisfaction with

the housing factors--freedom from bothersome noise, privacy, amount of space within the dwelling, and number of bedrooms--were examined. Most participants who were satisfied with these factors indicated satisfaction with their housing and most participants dissatisfied with the factors indicated dissatisfaction with their housing.

When the wives' satisfaction with housing and satisfaction with the other selected housing factors were compared and examined, independence was indicated.

Conclusions

In this study, 62 percent of the student wives interviewed expressed satisfaction with their housing. Two-thirds of those wives indicating dissatisfaction with their housing were planning to move within the next few months.

The family-oriented factor, mobility of student families in Corvallis, appeared to influence the wives' satisfaction with housing. The participants who had moved one or more times in Corvallis were decidedly more satisfied with their present dwellings than those who had not moved.

Most wives of families without children reported larger annual incomes than did the wives of families with children. This information suggests that student families with children, due to limited financial resources, may have more difficulty finding satisfactory

housing than student families without children.

The recommended persons per room ratio of one was exceeded by five percent of the families interviewed. Seventy percent of the families were residing in dwellings that were too small for their family size if compared with minimum space requirements recommended by the American Public Health Association.

Two-thirds of the wives felt that there was not an adequate number and variety of rental units from which to choose when selecting their rental units. Three-fifths of the wives interviewed stated that locating a dwelling within their financial means was difficult for their families.

The housing factors--cost, location and amount of space within the dwelling--were indicated by the participants in the study as the most influential factors in selection of rental housing.

The wives were asked several questions about what they considered important when selecting their present rental units. They were also asked why they had moved within the community previously. The three housing factors cited above--cost, location and amount of space within the dwelling--were the replies most frequently given by the wives.

The housing factors: freedom from bothersome noise, privacy, amount of space within the dwelling, and number of bedrooms, appeared to influence the wives' satisfaction with housing.

The majority of wives who expressed satisfaction with the above mentioned factors, expressed satisfaction with their housing. The majority of wives who expressed dissatisfaction with the above mentioned factors, expressed dissatisfaction with their present housing.

Although the majority of student wives considered cost (98 percent) and location (72 percent) important when selecting their rental housing, significant relationships between satisfaction with these factors and housing satisfaction were not indicated in this study. It may be possible that these housing factors are so important in the selection of rental housing that the student family overlooks or relinquishes other factors influencing housing satisfaction.

Limitations

On the whole, the interview schedule proved satisfactory for this study, and the women interviewed seemed able to interpret the questions with little difficulty. Improvements could be made in the instrument in relation to arrangement and wording of some of the questions. Categories describing housing satisfaction were combined to facilitate statistical analysis and a small loss of detail resulted. Sample size was limited because of the instrument used and the time involved in data collection.

Total square footage of the dwellings involved in this study and average monthly cost of utilities and cost of transportation to campus

were estimated by the wives.

Expressed satisfaction with housing is somewhat subjective and will vary with individuals and families, depending upon their temperaments and backgrounds. This should be kept in mind when interpreting the findings.

Recommendations for Future Research

A study similar to this research concerning housing satisfaction and selection could be conducted with a larger sample or with graduate student wives to establish validity. Similar studies could also be conducted in different geographical locations and with a variety of samples, such as single students or non-student families. Husbands could also be interviewed or husbands and wives.

Family-oriented factors and housing satisfaction could be compared in studies involving students and wives or husbands residing in a variety of housing types such as university housing, rental housing, or owner-occupied housing.

Further investigation of the factors related to consumer satisfaction with housing could provide information of worth to the housing industry and could result in production of dwellings, especially rental dwellings, that would increase consumer satisfaction with housing.

Research concerning satisfaction as a phenomenon could give insight into satisfaction with housing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agan, Tessie and Elaine Luchsinger. 1965. The house. Rev. ed. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott. 357 p.
- American Public Health Association. 1950. Planning the home for occupancy. Chicago, R. R. Donnelley and Sons. 56 p.
- Beyer, Glenn H. 1960. Future explorations in home economics. *Journal of Home Economics* 52: 643-646.
- Beyer, Glenn H. 1967. Housing and society. Rev. ed. New York, Macmillan. 595 p.
- Brewster, Maurice R., William A. Flinn and Ernest H. Jurkat. 1955. How to make and interpret location studies of the housing market. Washington D. C., U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. 66 p.
- Christensen, Harold T. and Robert E. Philbrick. 1952. Family size as a factor in the marital adjustment of college couples. *American Sociological Review* 17: 306-312.
- City housing becomes more difficult to find. 1967. *Gazette-Times* (Corvallis, Oregon) p. 3, col. 6-7-8-9. Sept. 22.
- Davies, Joseph Earl. 1938. Fundamentals of housing study. New York, Columbia University. 355 p.
- Eichelberg, Donna Marilyn. 1968. Housing satisfaction of a selected group of older women in Corvallis, Oregon. Master's thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State University. 73 numb. leaves.
- Festinger, Leon, Stanley Schachter and Kurt Black. 1950. Social pressures in informal groups: a study of human factors in housing. New York, Harper and Brothers. 240 p.
- Foote, Nelson N. et al. 1960. Housing choices and housing constraints. New York, McGraw-Hill. 450 p.
- Hepler, Donald E. and Paul I. Wallach. 1965. Housing today. St. Louis, McGraw-Hill. 112 p.

- Hollingshead, August B. 1957. Two factor index of social position. New Haven, August B. Hollingshead. 11 p.
- Kaufman, Gerald Lynton. 1947. Homeseeker's handbook. New York, George W. Stewart. 160 p.
- Lewis, Dora S., Jean O. Burns and Esther F. Segner. 1953. Housing and home management. New York, Macmillan. 312 p.
- Looking for a place to rent? 1966. Changing Times 20:35-37. Nov.
- Meyerson, Martin, Barbara Terrett and William L. C. Wheaton. 1962. Housing, people and cities. New York, McGraw-Hill. 386 p.
- Mueller, Kate Hevner. 1960. The married student on the campus. College and University 35:155-163.
- Oppenheim, Beatrice. 1940. Look before you lease! New York, Vanguard Press. 86 p.
- Rafkind, Israel. 1966. The federal government's college housing loan program. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education. 83 p.
- Regnier, Linda Moore. 1960. Age and nationality as factors related to housing preferences and attitudes expressed by single graduate students at Oklahoma State University. Master's thesis. Peru, Nebraska, Peru State College. 94 numb. leaves.
- Riker, Harold C. 1956. Planning functional college housing. New York, Columbia University. 240 p.
- Riker, Harold C. 1965. College housing as learning centers. Washington, D. C., American College Personnel Association. 56 p. (Student Personnel Series no. 3)
- Riker, Harold C. and Frank G. Lopez. 1961. College students live here. New York, Educational Facilities Laboratories. 152 p.
- Rossi, Peter. 1955. Why families move. Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press. 220 p.

- Smith, Ruth H., Laura D. Kivlin and Cecile P. Sinder. 1963. Housing choices and selections as evidenced by residential mobility. University Park. 51 p. (Pennsylvania State University. College of Home Economics. Research Publication 204)
- Teater, Dorothy Seath. 1954. Housing for married students at the Ohio State University. Master's thesis. Columbus, Ohio State University. 94 numb. leaves.
- Teitzel, Freda Anne. 1966. House design scores of forty Corvallis, Oregon, residences related to homemaker's expressed satisfaction and ranking of values. Master's thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State University. 92 numb. leaves.
- 39 percent of OSU students now live in off-campus facilities in Corvallis, Porter reveals. 1967. Gazette-Times (Corvallis, Oregon) p. 11, col. 2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9. Nov. 14.
- Thompson, S. Earl. 1953. Trends in housing college students. Journal of Higher Education 24:323-338.
- University of Denver. Bureau of Business and Social Research. 1954. How to make and use local house surveys. Washington, D. C., U. S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. 106 p.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1965. Statistical abstract of the United States. 86th ed. Washington, D. C. 1047 p.
- U. S. Federal Housing Administration. 1947. Planning rental housing projects. Washington 25, D. C. 56 p.
- Warren Jean. 1961. Income and housing expenditures. Journal of Home Economics 53:349-351.
- Watkins, A. M. 1962. Building or buying the high-quality house at lowest cost. Garden City, New York, Doubleday. 270 p.
- Williamson, E. G., John Huebner and Willard Johnston. 1956. Students live off campus. Educational Record 37:216-223.

APPENDIX A

Presently I am enrolled as a graduate student in Home Economics at Oregon State University. The study I am doing to fulfill the requirements for my Master of Science degree in Home Management concerns married student housing. Your name has been selected to participate in the study and you could contribute to research in this area by consenting to an interview and answering some questions. The interview should take only about 45 minutes of your time.

Very little research concerning married students and their housing has been undertaken in the past. This study will deal with student housing selection and housing satisfaction. You can participate in this study if the following criteria are met: (1) you are the wife of an undergraduate student attending Oregon State University, (2) you and your husband are living in rental housing at present, and (3) the rental housing you and your husband are living in at present is not University owned.

Within a day or so I will contact you to make an appointment. Your cooperation and assistance will be greatly appreciated. All information obtained in the interview will be confidential

Sincerely,



(Mrs.) Shirley Peterson

Shirley Peterson is an authorized interviewer gathering information for a research project under the auspices of Oregon State University. Oregon State will appreciate your willingness to answer some questions for this interviewer. What you say will not be connected with your name in any way and your answers will be held in the strictest confidence.



Freda Teitzel, Major Professor
Department of Home Management

APPENDIX B

Record No. _____

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
 School of Home Economics
 Department of Home Management
 Interview Schedule
 Shirley Peterson

Name _____

Street Address _____

In what class is your husband presently enrolled? (Please check)

- ☐ Freshman
☐ Sophomore
☐ Junior
☐ Senior

Instructions: In filling out this interview schedule please check (✓) the appropriate response or fill in the blanks where necessary.

1. Are you presently employed outside the home?

- ☐ No
☐ Yes

If yes, how many hours do you work per week?

2. Are you presently enrolled as a University student?

- ☐ No
☐ Yes

If yes, are you enrolled

- ☐ Full-time, _____no. of credits?
☐ Part-time, _____no. of credits?
☐ In night school
☐ In correspondence courses

3. What is the last grade in school you have completed?

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Grade 9 | <u>College</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 9 | <input type="checkbox"/> Freshman |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> Sophomore |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 11 | <input type="checkbox"/> Junior |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 12 | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate |

4. How old are you? _____

Your husband? _____

5. Do you have children? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If yes, how many? _____

What ages,

_____boys?

_____girls?

6. How long have you and your husband been married?

_____Years _____Months

7. Since your marriage, in how many different dwellings have you lived?

8. How long have you lived in your present dwelling?

_____Months _____Years

9. Did your parents or your husband's parents help in selection of the rental unit in which you are living now? ☐ No ☐ Yes
 (Explain) _____

10. Does anyone reside with you other than your immediate family (husband, children)? ☐ No ☐ Yes
 If yes, who? _____

11. Circle the number of the highest grade in school completed by your father or the head of household.

Grade School 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

High School 9 10 11 12

College 1 2 3 4

Post Graduate College 1 or more

Record No. _____

12. What kind of work does your father or head of household do? Be specific.

13. Circle the number of the highest grade in school completed by your husband's father or the head of household.

Grade School 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
High School 9 10 11 12
College 1 2 3 4
Post Graduate College 1 or more years
14. What kind of work does your husband's father or head of household do? Be specific.

15. Have you, as the wife of a student, moved since coming to Corvallis? ☐ No ☐ Yes
If yes, how many times? _____
For what reasons did you move? _____

16. Have you any plans to move from your present dwelling within the next few months?
☐ No ☐ Yes
17. If a change is made where would you likely move? _____
Why? _____

18. For what reasons did you select your present rental unit? _____

19. By what means is your husband financing his education?
☐ scholarships
☐ parents
☐ savings
☐ employment (husband)
☐ other (specify) _____

20. Which one of these means provides the greatest financial help?
☐ scholarships
☐ parents
☐ savings
☐ employment (husband)
☐ other (specify) _____

☐ employment (wife)
☐ babysitting in home
☐ typing in home
☐ outside the home
☐ other (specify) _____

21. Approximately what will be your (you and your husband's) total yearly income? This will include the items mentioned in questions number 19 and 20.
☐ Less than \$1,000
☐ \$1,000 - \$1,999
☐ \$2,000 - \$2,999
☐ \$3,000 - \$3,999
☐ \$4,000 - \$4,999
☐ \$5,000 - \$5,999
☐ \$6,000 - \$6,999
☐ \$7,000 - \$9,999
☐ \$10,000 and over.
22. How much do you pay for rent per month? _____
23. Does your monthly rent include utilities?
☐ none ☐ all ☐ some

Check those utilities not included in the rental charge.
☐ heat ☐ garbage disposal
☐ electricity ☐ sewer
☐ water ☐ gas
☐ TV cable or antenna ☐ other (specify) _____

24. ☐ employment (wife)
☐ babysitting in home
☐ typing in home
☐ outside the home
☐ other (specify) _____

Record No. _____

23. (Continued) If some or none, approximately how much per month do you pay for utilities?

☐ heat ☐ garbage disposal
☐ electricity ☐ sewer
☐ water ☐ gas
☐ TV cable or ☐ other (specify)
 antenna _____
☐ Total per Month _____

24. What is the maximum amount of money that you think you and your husband can afford to pay per month for rent?

_____ with utilities (included in rent)
 _____ exclusive of utilities

25. Which of the statements below most accurately describes your feelings concerning your present housing?

- ☐ 1. I am very satisfied with my present housing.
☐ 2. I am satisfied with my present housing.
☐ 3. I am somewhat dissatisfied with my present housing.
☐ 4. I am dissatisfied with my present housing.
☐ 5. I am very dissatisfied with my present housing.

26. Which of the following describes your present rental unit?

- ☐ house ☐ mobile home
☐ duplex ☐ apartment
☐ row house ☐ old house converted into
☐ other (specify) apartments

27. Is the rental unit you now reside in

- ☐ fully furnished
☐ unfurnished (no appliances, draperies, or carpeting)
☐ partially furnished?

If partially furnished, please specify items included

- ☐ range ☐ drapery
☐ refrigerator ☐ carpeting
☐ dishwasher ☐ garbage disposal

	<u>In Unit</u>	<u>In Building</u>	<u>In Compound</u>
Freezer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Washer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dryer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

28. How many rooms are there in your present dwelling (excluding baths and hallways)? _____

29. What is the approximate total square footage of your present dwelling? _____

Do you feel this is, for your family

☐ too small
☐ adequate
☐ spacious?

30. How many bedrooms are there in your present dwelling? _____
- How many are:

_____ less than 80 sq. ft.
 _____ small (80-119 sq. ft.)
 _____ medium (120-159 sq. ft.)
 _____ large (160 and more sq. ft.)

Can other rooms be used as sleeping areas?

- ☐ No ☐ Yes

Explain _____

31. When (approximately what date) did you select your present dwelling? _____

32. How did you locate your present dwelling?

- ☐ newspaper
☐ OSU housing department
☐ real estate agent
☐ personal contacts (please state if friend, relative, etc.) _____
☐ direct search (how?) _____

- ☐ other (specify) _____

33. When selecting your present rental unit did you feel there was an adequate number and variety of rental units from which to choose?

- ☐ No ☐ Yes

Please comment _____

Record No. _____

34. Did you have difficulty locating a dwelling within your financial means?
☐ No ☐ Yes

If yes, what were the problems involved?

- ☐ Available rental units were too expensive
☐ Rental units that were not too expensive were of poor quality
☐ Other (specify) _____

35. Are you looking for a better place to live?
☐ No ☐ Yes

36. Was there anything you felt you should have looked for and did not when selecting your present dwelling?
☐ No ☐ Yes
 If yes, explain _____

37. Do you or a member of your family living here own an automobile?
☐ No ☐ Yes
 If yes, how many automobiles do you have? _____

38. Approximately how much a month does your husband spend for transportation to the University? _____
 What is his means of transportation to campus? _____

39. Check the following characteristics which describes your present rental unit.

- ☐ Location (within walking distance to University or schools)
☐ Adequate privacy
☐ Close to friends
☐ Near shopping facilities
☐ Area well kept and cared for (neighborhood)
☐ Freedom from bothersome noise
☐ Outdoor living area
☐ Pleasant view from window
☐ Garage or carport
☐ Adequate daylight
☐ Adequate ventilation
☐ Desirable circulation (movement between the rooms)
☐ Adequate amount of storage space
☐ Laundry facilities provided or nearby
 (Continued Next Column)

39. (Continued)

- ☐ Playground nearby or play area for the children
☐ Study area for husband (and self, if needed)
☐ Swimming pool
☐ Other (specify) _____

40. What did you like most about your present dwelling when you selected it?

41. What do you like most about your present dwelling? _____

42. What do you dislike most about your present housing? _____

43. Rate each of the following according to how important you considered them to be when selecting your present residence. Place the number 1, 2, or 3 before each factor, depending upon its importance, or if considered.

- 1 -- Important
 2 -- Not Important
 3 -- Not Considered

Factors in Selecting Rental Unit

Numbers

- ___ Cost
 ___ Location (within walking distance to the University or schools)
 ___ Amount of space within the dwelling
 ___ Number of bedrooms
 ___ Size of bedrooms
 ___ Privacy
 ___ Close to friends
 ___ Near shopping facilities
 ___ Care and upkeep of area (neighborhood)
 ___ Freedom from bothersome noise
 ___ Outdoor living area
 ___ View from window
 ___ Garage or carport
 ___ Adequate daylight
 ___ Adequate ventilation
 ___ Circulation (movement pattern between the rooms) --Continued

Record No. _____

43. Factors in Selecting Rental Unit (Continued)

Numbers

- _____ Amount of storage space
 _____ Laundry facilities provided or nearby
 _____ Playground nearby or play area for the children
 _____ Study area for husband (and self, if needed)
 _____ Furnished or unfurnished
 _____ Swimming pool
 _____ Other (specify) _____

44. Place the number 1, 2, or 3 before each factor, depending upon your feelings of satisfaction, dissatisfaction, or if the factors do not influence satisfaction.

- 1 -- Satisfied
 2 -- Dissatisfied
 3 -- No Influence

Satisfaction With FactorsNumbers

- _____ Cost
 _____ Location
 _____ Amount of space within the dwelling
 _____ Number of bedrooms
 _____ Size of bedrooms
 _____ Privacy
 _____ Close to friends
 _____ Near shopping facilities
 _____ Care and upkeep of area (neighborhood)
 _____ Freedom from bothersome noise
 _____ Outdoor living area
 _____ View from window
 _____ Garage or carport
 _____ Adequate daylight
 _____ Adequate ventilation
 _____ Circulation (movement pattern between the rooms)
 _____ Amount of storage space
 _____ Laundry facilities provided or nearby
 _____ Playground nearby or play area for the children
 _____ Study area for husband (and self, if needed)
 _____ Furnished or unfurnished
 _____ Swimming pool
 _____ Other (specify) _____

