

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

NORMA SUSAN EVERS for the MASTER OF SCIENCE  
(Name) (Degree)

in HOME MANAGEMENT presented on May 7, 1967  
(Major) (Date)

Title: HOUSING EXPENDITURES AND FACTORS ASSOCIATED  
WITH HOUSING SELECTION AND SATISFACTION AS  
STATED BY A GROUP OF SINGLE CATHOLIC ADULTS

Abstract approved: Redacted for privacy  
Martha Plonk

The purpose of this study was to explore the housing expenditures and factors in housing selection and satisfaction of single adults. The population tested was guests and members of two single Catholic adult clubs in Portland, Oregon. Questionnaires designed for collecting the data for the study were mailed to the total population of 202 members and guests. A total of 105 questionnaires were returned and analyzed in the study.

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be no significant relationship between housing expenditures and income. This hypothesis was accepted.
2. There will be no significant relationship between housing expenditures and persons with whom they live. This hypothesis was rejected.

3. Overall housing satisfaction will not vary significantly with differences in (a) age, (b) sex, (c) education, (d) housing type, (e) persons with whom they live, (f) income, or (g) housing expenditures. This hypothesis was rejected for part (a) age, and accepted for the following parts: (b) sex, (c) education, (d) housing type, (e) persons with whom they live, (f) income, and (g) housing expenditures.

Of the respondents, 44 were males with an average age of 29.8 and 61 were females with an average age of 26.6. All except 12 of the respondents were educated beyond high school. Fifty-nine had earned a bachelor's degree and of this number 27 had done post-bachelor's work. In 1968, 60 respondents had incomes less than \$6000; however, 55 earned \$6000 and over. Males tended to have higher incomes than females.

Ninety-two respondents had private bedrooms; however, most of the other rooms were shared except by those respondents who lived alone. One hundred or more of the respondents had a kitchen, living room, bedroom and bathroom in their present housing. At least 87 respondents indicated that they had adequate privacy, daylight, and ventilation.

More than one-third of the respondents lived in their present housing less than one year, and more than one-third planned to move in the next few months.

Chi-square tests showed that housing type, with whom the

respondent lived, and housing cost were mutually dependent. The respondents who lived with their families tended to live in single family houses and had the lowest monthly housing expenditures. Many of the respondents who lived with their families had food included in the rent they paid, and many of them provided services in lieu of all or part of their housing costs. Respondents who lived alone or with friends tended to live in apartments. Those who lived alone tended to have the highest total monthly housing expenditures. Total monthly housing expenditures including utilities and rent or home ownership expenses averaged \$95.

Cost, privacy, and personal safety and protection were considered very important in selection of housing by at least half of the respondents. More than three-fourths of the respondents considered a swimming pool or fireplace not important in the selection of their present housing.

Of the 105 respondents, 82 expressed some degree of satisfaction with their present housing. Based on a nine-point scale the overall housing satisfaction average was 7.17 indicating a general feeling of satisfaction with housing. The average satisfaction expressed for specific housing factors was the highest for personal safety and protection. The two housing factors with the lowest satisfaction averages were outdoor area (yard or patio) and space for entertaining friends. Satisfaction with 19 of the 23 housing

factors rated was significantly correlated to overall housing satisfaction. Overall housing satisfaction varied significantly with age. The respondents in the lowest age group (22-25) were the most satisfied with their housing. Satisfaction did not vary significantly with differences in sex, education, housing type, persons with whom lived, income, or total monthly housing expenditures.

The educational level of the respondents was independent of their housing expenditures and with whom they lived. There was no significant relationship between income level and housing expenditures of the respondents.

Housing Expenditures and Factors Associated with  
Housing Selection and Satisfaction as Stated by  
a Group of Single Catholic Adults

by

Norma Susan Evers

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Master of Science

June 1969

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

---

Professor and Acting Head of Department of Home Management  
in charge of major

Redacted for privacy

Dean of Graduate School \_\_\_\_\_

Date thesis is presented May 7, 1964

Typed by Donna L. Olson for Norma Susan Evers

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses sincere appreciation to Dr. Martha Plonk, Acting Head of the Department of Home Management, Oregon State University for her valuable guidance and encouragement in preparation of the thesis.

Appreciation for helpful suggestions is extended to the following members of the Home Management faculty: Mrs. Harriet Sinnard, Mrs. Freda Vars, Mrs. Audrey Varseveld, Mrs. Elizabeth Reckendorf, and Dr. Priscilla Crabtree.

Valuable statistical advice was given by Dr. Kenneth Rowe, Assistant Professor of Statistics at Oregon State University.

Grateful acknowledgement is extended to the guests and members of the Chancellor Club and Catholic Alumni Club of Portland, Oregon, who so graciously cooperated in the study.

The author appreciates the encouragement and understanding of her family.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
METHODOLOGY	8
Sampling	8
Development of the Questionnaire	9
Data Collection	10
Treatment of Data	11
FINDINGS	13
Demographic Characteristics	13
Description of Housing	17
Housing Mobility	21
Housing Expenditures	23
Factors Associated with Housing Selection	28
Satisfaction in Relation to Housing Factors	30
Satisfaction in Relation to Demographic Factors	38
Relationship of Demographic Factors	42
SUMMARY	48
Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research	54
Conclusions	55
BIBLIOGRAPHY	57
APPENDIX	59



## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Sex and age of the respondents.	13
2. Club affiliation(s) of the respondents.	14
3. Education and persons with whom lived.	15
4. Income and sex of the respondents.	16
5. Housing type and persons with whom lived.	18
6. Description of present housing and persons who shared housing with the respondent.	19
7. Intangible features in present housing.	21
8. Number of places lived since age 21 and age.	22
9. Length of time lived in present housing.	22
10. Persons with whom lived, housing type, and housing expenditures.	25
11. Average total monthly housing expenditures.	27
12. Reasons stated as being the most important in selection of present housing.	29
13. Importance of housing factors in selection of present housing.	31
14. Factors stated as liked the most in present housing.	32
15. Factors stated as disliked the most in present housing.	32
16. Rating of overall housing satisfaction.	33
17. Satisfaction with selected housing factors.	35

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
18. Satisfaction with specific housing factors in relation to overall housing satisfaction.	37
19. Overall housing satisfaction and demographic factors.	39
20. Total monthly housing expenditures and housing type.	43
21. Total monthly housing expenditures and persons with whom lived.	45
22. Educational level and persons with whom lived.	45
23. Educational level and total monthly housing expenditures.	46
24. Income level and total monthly housing expenditures.	47

HOUSING EXPENDITURES AND FACTORS ASSOCIATED  
WITH HOUSING SELECTION AND SATISFACTION AS  
STATED BY A GROUP OF SINGLE CATHOLIC  
ADULTS

INTRODUCTION

What factors does a single person consider important in selecting housing? Are single people satisfied with their housing? What factors influence their satisfaction with housing? How much do single people spend for housing? These are the basic research questions raised in this study on housing for single adults.

Housing touches every individual at all periods of his life span. It may be theorized that, despite man's adaptability, housing may be a determining factor in his attitudes and his way of life (Beyer, 1967, p. 489).

Beyer stressed the importance of housing at every stage in the life span, yet housing for single people has not received much attention.

Arnold Rose (1966) stated that living arrangements are inadequate for a considerable portion of the single population in American cities. In discussing this inadequacy he stated:

This problem is not being given the degree of public or expert attention that would seem to be merited by its seriousness, although the closely related problem of housing for families is being given a large amount of public and expert attention (Rose, 1966, p. 217).

He suggested that although large numbers of single people have migrated to the cities as a consequence of the Industrial Revolution,

few suitable living arrangements have been developed for them in the last century. He posed this problem as one of cultural lag because society considers the single status as a temporary or unusual condition. Neither private capital nor government has shown much interest in remedying the situation, so few residences have been built to house single people (Rose, 1966). Along the same line came this statement from the American Public Health Association (1966, p. 228): "Except for high cost apartment buildings in large cities, the one- or two-person family has been almost completely ignored by the private builder. . . ."

This exploratory study was proposed to examine the housing expenditures and factors associated with housing selection and satisfaction of single adults.

The specific objectives were:

1. to relate demographic factors to overall housing satisfaction of single adults.
2. to relate satisfaction with selected housing factors to overall housing satisfaction of single adults.
3. to determine which factors were important in selecting present housing for single adults.
4. to relate demographic factors to housing expenditures of single adults.
5. to relate housing expenditures to living arrangements of

single adults.

The hypotheses tested were:

1. There will be no significant relationship between housing expenditures and income.
2. There will be no significant relationship between housing expenditures and persons with whom they live.
3. Overall housing satisfaction will not vary significantly with differences in
  - (a) age
  - (b) sex
  - (c) education
  - (d) housing type
  - (e) persons with whom they live
  - (f) income
  - (g) housing expenditures

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This research investigated housing expenditures and factors influencing housing selection and satisfaction of single persons. Therefore, this chapter was limited to reviewing literature on the single population and housing factors related to single persons.

In March 1967 there were 10,054,000 one-person households in the United States (U.S.B.C., 1968a). Within the 20-34 age group there were 1,057,000 single people who were household heads, and of that number 670,000 were living alone (U.S.B.C., 1968c).

Between 1950 and 1960, there was a slight increase in the population per primary family for the nation as a whole (from 3.61 to 3.65), reflecting the increased number of children, but a decline in the population per household (from 3.42 to 3.29), reflecting more persons living alone or in small households of unrelated members (Beyer, 1967, p. 59).

Population projections show a sizable gain in the percent of unmarried persons with their own household increasing from 51 percent in 1965 to between 57 and 64 percent in 1985 (U.S.B.C., 1968d). The projected population in the United States for the 20-34 age group by 1980 is 57,453,000 of which from 13,055,000 to 16,739,000 are predicted to be single (U.S.B.C., 1968e).

The 1960 Oregon population census shows that in the 20-34 age group, 23.3 percent of the males and 10.8 percent of the females were single. In the Portland Metropolitan Statistical area for the

same age group, 23.7 percent of the males and 13.0 percent of the females were single (U.S.B.C., 1960).

The United States as a whole increased in population from 1950 to 1967 by 11.4 percent while Oregon increased by 13.4 percent. The Portland Statistical Area increased by 13.7 percent (Crouch, 1969).

In 1962 in the Portland Standard Statistical Area which encompasses Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties, there were 758,459 people of which 87,232 were members of the Roman Catholic Church. The population of the Portland Standard Statistical Area for 1967 was 825,700 (Crouch, 1969).

According to Rose (1966) the average income of a single person is half to two-thirds as large as that of the average whole family; however, if the indigent single people are eliminated this discrepancy is less. When the income of a single person is compared to the per person income of the average family, the family member has only a little over one-third as much income available to him as the average single person. Therefore the income of the average single person is not so relatively low that he cannot afford adequate housing. Rose (1966, p. 219) went on to state: "At any given income level, the average unattached person spends a greater proportion of his income for housing than does the average family."

The cost of housing is high, but the American consumer considers high quality housing an important luxury and social symbol

(Reid, 1962). As income increases the amount spent on housing increases. Warren (1961) reported that housing expenditures do not rise in direct proportion to income because housing or space needs do not increase in that proportion. Money is first spent on food, but when caloric need is met the percentage spent for food declines and is shifted to housing. Once a certain housing level is attained additional income is channeled to other areas such as recreation, transportation, or education (Warren, 1961; Foote, 1960). Beyer (1967) suggested that housing costs is an area needing exploration.

Cost is directly related to the characteristics of the dwelling and location. Housing selection usually involves balancing cost, location, tenure, and characteristics of the dwelling. Generally these are the major factors on which the selection is made (Foote, 1960). Due to mobility some people have to select housing frequently.

People age 20-24 are the most likely to move; however, singles are less likely to move than young families. Twenty percent of the United States civilian population moves annually, and of this number two-thirds move to adjust housing needs but stay within the area. Sixty percent of moves within a locality are due to dissatisfaction with space, neighborhood, or cost (Foote, 1960).

In discussing leisure time activities, Mortvedt (1967, p. 8) said, "A dwelling may facilitate group and private aspects of such



activities, or it may act as a rigid restraint upon them." The spatial environment provides the setting for social interaction in which self-actualizing needs may be met. The neighborhood and community may provide an environment in which people participate in interpersonal relationships and activities which help fulfill social and psychological needs (Mortvedt, 1967).

A taboo on casual interchange protects privacy but prevents single people from meeting their neighbors. Modern city life does not provide a place where people can get to know one another. As a result singles must depend on other means of meeting which are not always satisfactory. Abrams considers the need for people to meet one another as one of the most neglected areas of urban planning (Cities and the Single Girl, 1965). In an attempt to remedy this, apartments for singles only have been developed that are high cost but provide fringe benefits wherein singles can meet one another through recreational facilities, discussion groups, and parties. These apartments are a real estate gimmick that draw young adults (Anyone for Singles?, 1967).

It was not until recently when the real estate business started the apartments for singles only, that any attempt was made to satisfy their particular housing needs. As Rose (1966, p. 219) summed up: "All these facts suggest that there is a blind spot in the thinking of the experts as well as of the general public when it comes to the housing of the unattached."

## METHODOLOGY

This exploratory study examined housing expenditures and factors in housing selection and satisfaction of single adults. This chapter describes the selection of the sample, development of the questionnaire, collection of data, and treatment of data.

### Sampling

Since the objective of the study was to study the housing of single people, the researcher looked for a group of singles that could be used as a sample. Several large firms in Portland, and Albany, Oregon were contacted to obtain a list of employees who were single. Although some of the firms were willing to cooperate, they did not have their employees identified by marital status; therefore, it was not possible to obtain a sample of their employees. Two large social clubs open to all single people in the Portland area were contacted, but their officials would not permit their membership list to be used for the study. The researcher did find two other clubs in Portland whose officials were willing to allow their membership list to be used; however, the membership of both clubs was affiliated with one religion. The clubs were similar. In order to increase the sample size and to provide a broader range of possible responses, both clubs were included.

The population tested was members and potential members (guests) of the Chancellor Club and the Catholic Alumni Club of Portland, Oregon. Both clubs required that a member be a single practicing Catholic age 21 or over. The Catholic Alumni Club also required a bachelor's degree for membership, but permitted those who did not have a college degree to be included on the guest list for a three month period.

A list of members and guests of each club was obtained. Questionnaires were mailed to all members as of January, 1969 and all potential members on the guest list for either October, November, or December 1968, or January 1969. This consisted of 109 members and 21 guests for Chancellor Club and 47 members and 50 guests for Catholic Alumni Club. Twenty-five of the people were involved in both clubs, so the actual number of persons totaled 202.

#### Development of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire method was selected for collecting data for this research study. Since some of the people in the population tested were known by the researcher, an anonymous questionnaire was deemed the best method of data collection. The questionnaire designed for the study was based on information gained from the review of literature and the researcher's experience with housing problems of single persons.

The questionnaire was developed, then presented to the faculty of the Home Management Department of the School of Home Economics at Oregon State University for evaluation. Their suggestions were used to revise the questionnaire. The questionnaire was then sent to ten single adults not in the sample for pretesting. Their suggestions were used in making revisions for the final draft of the questionnaire.

The questions included requests for information about demographic characteristics, description of present housing, factors considered in selection of present housing, overall housing satisfaction, satisfaction with specific housing factors, housing costs, and general information related to housing. The types of questions asked required the respondents to check the appropriate square, fill in a blank, or write short answers to open-ended questions (see Appendix).

#### Data Collection

A questionnaire, cover letter, and stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed on February 13, 1969 to each person in the population described. The author attended the general meeting of the Chancellor Club on February 12, 1969, briefly explained the project, and requested co-operation in returning the questionnaires. Each club's newsletter for the first half of February carried a

statement requesting cooperation, and the newsletters for the last week of February thanked those who had returned the questionnaire and asked that the remainder be returned by March 8, 1969.

A total of 108 questionnaires were returned by March 20, 1969. Three were eliminated because of incomplete and inconsistent answers, so that 105 questionnaires or 52 percent of the total sent was analyzed in the study.

### Treatment of Data

Data from the questionnaire were categorized and coded for analysis. Computations of statistical tests were done with the aid of a computer. In addition to descriptive statistics, four types of statistical techniques were used in analyzing the data:

1. Correlations were used to compare the overall level of housing satisfaction with the level of satisfaction with each specific housing factor. Probability levels of .01 and .05 were used to indicate significant correlations.
2. The Chi-square test was used to test for relationships between selected demographic factors. A probability level of .005 was taken to indicate if the factors were independent.
3. The F-test was used to analyze the variance in satisfaction in relation to selected demographic characteristics.

A probability level of .05 was used to determine if the variance was significant.

4. Those factors which showed a significant variance on the F-test were analyzed using the t-test to ascertain how the variance occurred. A probability of .05 was considered significant.

Some respondents did not answer all questions. No value was computed for those who did not reply; therefore, the total number of responses on all tests and tables did not always equal 105.

## FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings on demographic characteristics, description of housing, housing mobility, housing expenditures, factors associated with housing selection, satisfaction in relation to housing and demographic factors, and relationships of demographic factors.

Demographic Characteristics

Of the 105 respondents, 44 were males and 61 were females. One was divorced and 104 were single. The age of the respondents ranged from 22 to 52 with the median age 26 and the average age 27.9. For males the median age was 28, and the average age was 29.8; for females the median age was 26, and the average age was 26.6 (Table 1).

Table 1. Sex and age of the respondents.

Sex	Age			Total No.
	22-25 No.	26-30 No.	31 and over No.	
Male	14	13	17	44
Female	<u>29</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>61</u>
Total	43	35	27	105

Of the respondents, 51 were Chancellor Club members and 29 were Catholic Alumni Club members. Seventy-six were affiliated with the Chancellor Club as a guest, member, or former member, and 55 were affiliated with the Catholic Alumni Club. Twenty-eight were affiliated with both clubs. Two did not indicate their club affiliations (Table 2).

Table 2. Club affiliation(s) of the respondents.

Club	Membership status			Total No.
	Guest No.	Member No.	Former member No.	
Chancellor	14	51	11	76
Catholic Alumni	<u>20</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>55</u>
Total	34	80	17	131

The respondents classified their occupations as follows: professional, 58; clerical, 15; technical, 13; full-time student, 9; labor, 3; sales, 3; service, 2; and unemployed, 2.

The respondents were requested to indicate the highest level of education they had completed. All respondents completed high school, and 56.2 percent had finished college. For those people in the United States aged 25-29 in 1967, 72.5 percent had completed four years of high school or more, and 14.6 percent had completed four years of college or more (U.S.B.C., 1968f). In this study 12



respondents terminated their education at the high school level.

Thirty-two attended vocational school or college but did not complete a baccalaureate degree. Of those completing college, 32 received a bachelor's degree, and 29 had taken work beyond a bachelor's degree. Of these 29, nine had completed a master's degree, and one received a doctor's degree.

Fifty percent of the respondents with a high school education and 47.9 percent of those at the bachelor level lived with their family. One-fourth of the respondents with a bachelor's degree only lived with friends, and 28 percent lived alone. Half of the vocationally trained respondents, 44 percent of those who had taken post-bachelor's work, and 42 percent of those with only a high school education lived alone. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents in each of the vocational, bachelor, and post-bachelor classifications lived with friends. Education of the respondents was not significantly related to with whom the respondents chose to live (Table 3).

Table 3. Education and persons with whom lived.

Highest education level	With whom lived			Total No.
	Alone No.	Family No.	Friends No.	
High School	5	6	1	12
Vocational	16	9	7	32
Bachelor	9	15	8	32
Post-Bachelor	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>27</u>
Total	42	37	24	103

$$\chi^2_6 = 6.72 (P < .005)$$

The respondents were asked to indicate their income for 1968. In 1966 in the United States 58.9 percent of the unrelated individuals and 14.3 percent of the families earned less than \$3000 (U.S.B.C., 1968f). In this study, the 1968 income of 20.5 percent of the males and 19.7 percent of the females was less than \$3000. Males tended to have higher incomes than females in this study. In 1968, 64 percent of the males compared to 44 percent of the females earned \$6000 or more. Only one respondent, a male, earned over \$13,000. All except one of the females had incomes below \$9000 (Table 4). Some of the respondents were students in 1968 and did not have an income for the entire year. Only eight respondents had someone financially dependent on them.

Table 4. Income and sex of the respondents.

Income	Sex		Total No.
	Male No.	Female No.	
under \$3000	9	11	20
\$3000-\$5999	7	23	30
\$6000-\$8999	19	26	45
\$9000 and over	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	44	61	105

### Description of Housing

Of the 105 respondents, 71 lived in and 33 outside the Portland city limits. One respondent did not indicate if he lived in or outside the city limits. Nine owned and 96 rented their present housing. A total of 36 lived in single family houses, 52 in apartments, and 17 in other types of dwellings. Of the 17 in other dwellings, seven lived in duplexes, two each in boarding houses, mobile homes, and fraternities, and one each in resident hotel, basement of private home, cabin, and houseboat.

In answering the question with whom do you live, 42 indicated that they lived alone, 37 lived with their family, and 24 lived with friends. There was a significant relationship at the .005 level between the housing type and with whom lived. Of those who lived with their family, 73 percent resided in single family houses, 22 percent in apartments, and only five percent in other dwellings. Sixty-nine percent of those who lived alone and 63 percent of those who lived with friends resided in apartments. Of those who lived alone or with friends, less than one-eighth of the respondents lived in a single family house, and less than one-fourth lived in other dwellings (Table 5). Two who lived in single family houses did not indicate with whom they lived.

Table 5. Housing type and persons with whom lived.

With whom lived	With whom lived			Total No.
	Alone No.	Family No.	Friends No.	
Single family house	4	27	3	34
Apartment	29	8	15	52
Other	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	42	37	24	103

$$\chi^2_4 = 42.06 \quad (P > .005)$$

The respondents who lived alone had an average of 2.7 rooms in their dwellings. The average size of the household was 3.5 people for those respondents who lived with their family or friends. The dwellings of those respondents who lived with their family or friends averaged 6.4 rooms per dwelling and 1.8 rooms per person. Not counting bathrooms or hallways, 44 dwellings had one to three rooms, 43 dwellings had four to six rooms, and 16 dwellings had seven or more rooms. Two respondents did not indicate the total number of rooms in their dwellings.

The types of rooms, housing features available, and persons with whom they shared their housing is summarized in Table 6. Ninety-two respondents had a private bedroom; however, most of the other rooms were shared except for those people who lived alone.

Table 6. Description of present housing and persons who shared housing with the respondent.

Room or housing feature	With whom shared			Total No.
	Only person using No.	Shared with housemates No.	Shared with tenants No.	
kitchen	44	59	0	103
living room	40	59	1	100
dining room	25	49	1	75
family or recreation room	4	27	2	33
bedroom	92	9	0	101
bathroom	43	59	2	104
utility room or laundry	5	40	38	83
den or office	6	6	0	12
space for entertaining friends	21	47	2	70
entry hall	4	29	11	44
basement	4	33	18	55
fireplace	4	36	2	42
swimming pool	0	4	9	13
patio or deck	6	23	6	35
yard	7	41	20	68
garage or carport	9	31	8	48
off-street parking	14	35	25	74

Forty or more respondents indicated that they were the only ones using the kitchen, living room, and bathroom. Twenty-five people had a dining room for their private use, and 21 had space for entertaining friends in private.

Fifty-nine respondents shared the kitchen, living room, and bathroom with housemates. In 40 or more of the situations, housemates also shared the dining room, utility room or laundry, space for entertaining friends, and yard. The utility room or laundry was the one most frequently shared with tenants, having been so indicated 38 times.

The rooms which most respondents had available were bathroom, 104; kitchen, 103; bedroom, 101; and living room, 100. Eighty-five had a utility room or laundry. Two-thirds or more also had a dining room, space for entertaining friends, and off-street parking. Fewer than one-eighth of the respondents had a den, office, or swimming pool (Table 6).

The following room combinations were reported: kitchen-dining, 41; living-dining, 21; study-bedroom, 18; living-family, 17; kitchen-dining-living, 12; living-bedroom, 12; kitchen-laundry, 6; kitchen-breakfast room-den, 1; garage-laundry, 1; and dining-family, 1.

Adequate privacy, daylight, and ventilation were indicated by over 86 respondents. A pleasant view was indicated by 67, and

freedom from bothersome noise by 57 respondents (Table 7).

Table 7. Intangible features in present housing.

Intangible features	No. of respondents
Adequate privacy	90
Adequate daylight	88
Adequate ventilation	87
Pleasant view	67
Freedom from bothersome noise	57

#### Housing Mobility

Respondents indicated how many places they had lived since age 21. The average number of places lived by the respondents since age 21 was 4.2. Eleven respondents, of which nine were age 22-25, lived in only one place. Fifty-six respondents lived fewer than four places since age 21, and 52 percent of these were in the 22-25 age group. Nineteen respondents lived in 6-10 places, and 63 percent of these were age 31 and over (Table 8). One 35 year old male lived in 20 places since age 21.

Since age 21, 52 respondents moved an average of 1.8 times due to dissatisfaction with the housing they had. The average number of moves due to dissatisfaction was 1.4 for females and 2.5 for males. One 28 year old female had moved eight times because of

dissatisfaction with housing. Sixty-six respondents moved an average of 2.1 times within the Portland metropolitan area. Thirty-eight respondents had lived in their present housing less than one year, and a total of 64 had lived in their present housing less than two years (Table 9).

Table 8. Number of places lived since age 21 and age.

Number Places Lived	Age			Total No.
	22-25 No.	26-30 No.	31 and over No.	
1	9	1	1	11
2-3	20	17	8	45
4-5	13	9	4	26
6-10	1	6	12	19
11 and over	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	43	35	27	105

Table 9. Length of time lived in present housing.

Length of time	No. of respondents
Up to 1 year	38
1 to 2 years	26
2 to 5 years	20
5 or more years	<u>21</u>
Total	105



More than one-third (37) of the respondents planned to move in the next few months. Reasons for moving were given as a job change by 12, planned marriage by eight, and a desire for a place to entertain by six. Other factors mentioned twice each were planned move by parents, and a desire for lower cost housing, for more privacy, for more freedom, and for more space. Four other responses were listed once each.

### Housing Expenditures

Respondents who owned their present housing were asked to fill in the amounts paid for housing and utilities. Respondents who rented were asked to fill in the amount paid for rent and utilities. Renters were also asked if the rent they paid included other expenses such as food and if they provided services in lieu of money for all or part of their housing costs. The value of other expenses such as food and the value of services provided was not requested. Monthly housing expenditure figures were a total of all the housing costs that the respondents indicated they paid.

Of the 42 respondents who lived alone, 57 percent paid more than \$100 in monthly housing costs. Forty-eight percent of them paid between \$101-\$150 per month for their housing, and 80 percent of these respondents lived in an apartment. Thirty-three percent paid between \$51-\$100 for monthly housing expenditures, and 79

percent of these lived in apartments (Table 10).

Sixty-eight percent of the 37 respondents who lived with their family paid \$100 or less in total housing costs, and 88 percent of them lived in a single family house. Thirty-eight percent of those who lived with their family paid \$50 or less in total housing costs per month. Of these, 79 percent had food included, and 43 percent paid \$10 or less per month in total housing costs.

Thirty-eight percent of the respondents who lived with their friends had housing expenditures over \$100 per month. Fifty percent of those who lived with friends paid \$51-\$100 in total monthly housing costs, and 75 percent of them lived in apartments.

Forty-four percent of the respondents who lived in a single family house paid \$50 or less for their housing, and 44 percent of those who lived in an apartment paid between \$51-\$100 monthly for housing (Table 10).

The average total monthly housing costs were \$108 for those who lived alone, \$77 for those who lived with their family, and \$103 for those who lived with friends. Those respondents who lived with their family tended to pay the least for housing, and for many the rent included other expenses such as food. The 28 respondents who had food included in their rent paid an average monthly rate of \$66. The 25 respondents who provided services in lieu of all or part of their housing costs paid an average of \$60 per month. Fourteen of

Table 10. Persons with whom lived, housing type, and housing expenditures.

Total monthly housing expenditures	Housing type			
	Single family house No.	Apartment No.	Other No.	Total No.
<u>Lived alone:</u>				
\$0-\$50	0	0	3	3
\$51-\$100	1	11	2	14
\$101-\$150	2	16	2	20
\$150 and over	0	2	2	4
No reply	1			1
Total	4	29	9	42
<u>Lived with family:</u>				
\$0-\$50	13	1	0	14
\$51-\$100	9	1	1	11
\$101-\$150	0	4	1	5
\$150 and over	3	1	0	4
No reply	2	1	0	3
Total	27	8	2	37
<u>Lived with friends:</u>				
\$0-\$50	1	1	1	3
\$51-\$100	0	9	3	12
\$101-\$150	1	3	1	5
\$150 and over	1	2	1	4
Total	3	15	6	24
No reply to with whom lived				
\$0-\$50	2	-	-	2
GRAND TOTALS	36	52	17	105

the respondents indicated that they both provided services and had other expenses such as food provided, and 13 of these paid \$100 or less per month in total housing costs. Respondents who did not have other expenses such as food included in the rent paid an average total monthly housing cost of \$107.

The average total housing expenditure of the eight respondents who owned their present housing was \$141 per month, and the average for 93 who rented was \$91. The average total monthly housing cost for the entire sample was \$95 (Table 11).

Relationships between housing expenditures and income, education, housing type, and the person with whom the respondent lived are summarized in the relationships of the demographic factors section (see Tables 20, 21, 23, 24).

Twenty respondents indicated that they kept records of all housing expenditures, and 36 kept records of some housing expenditures. Forty-nine kept no records of housing costs. Of the 96 respondents who rented, only five had signed a lease. The number of respondents who rented and indicated the utilities included in the rental charge were: water, 84; garbage collection, 82; sewer, 75; heat, 49; electricity, 29; television cable or antenna, 24; telephone monthly rate, 21; and gas, 15. The rental units were fully furnished for 52, partially furnished for 32, and unfurnished for six respondents. Fifteen respondents did not indicate if their rental unit

Table 11. Average total monthly housing expenditures.

Category	Number respondents	Average expenditures
All who lived alone	41	\$108
Female alone	21	111
Male alone	20	106
All who lived with family	34	77
Female with family	21	75
Male with family	13	82
All who lived with friends	24	103
Female with friends	17	97
Male with friends	7	117
All who rented present housing	93	91
All who owned present housing	8	141
Provided services in lieu of all or part of rent	25	60
Other expenses such as food included in rent paid	28	66
No other expenses such as food included in rent paid	76	107
Total of all respondents	101	95

was furnished or not.

### Factors Associated with Housing Selection

When selecting their present housing, 58 respondents felt that there was an adequate number and variety of dwellings from which to choose; however, 30 had trouble locating a dwelling which they considered within their financial means. Specific comments made by seven respondents each were that the prices were too high or few dwellings were available in their price range. Ten respondents said that there was a limited variety of suitable dwellings available. Nine respondents commented that there was an adequate number or variety of dwellings from which to choose. Ten respondents reported that others, such as their parents, had chosen their housing for them.

Sixty respondents reported that transportation influenced their housing selection. Ninety respondents owned automobiles. Analysis of an open-ended question showed that 34 respondents chose housing because it was close to their work, and ten of these chose to live within walking distance of their jobs. Five preferred their housing because it was near the downtown area, and 17 selected housing because bus connections were available nearby. Nine other responses were given once each. One respondent preferred to live in the city and travel to work outside the city limits against rush hour traffic.

In an open-ended question requesting the most important

reason for selecting their present housing, 32 wrote in cost and 29 said distance to work. Other reasons stated 12 or more times were location, convenience, and the opportunity to live with their family (Table 12). Fourteen other reasons for selecting present housing were stated once each. Three examples were social possibilities, care of elderly parent, and location in a wooded area.

Table 12. Reasons stated as being the most important in selection of present housing.

Reason	No. of re- spondents	Reason	No. of re- spondents
cost	32	close to bus	4
close to work	29	availability	4
location	14	comfort	3
convenience	12	close to church	3
live with family	12	investment	3
appearance	8	close to friends	2
size of dwelling	7	close to parents	2
close to downtown	7	furnishings	2
close to shopping	7	privacy	2
neighborhood	7		

Respondents were asked to rate twenty-three housing factors as very important, somewhat important, or not important in selecting their present housing. Cost was considered very important in selecting present housing by 61 respondents. Half of the respondents indicated privacy and personal safety and protection as very important in their selection. More than three-fourths of the respondents

considered a swimming pool or fireplace not important in selecting present housing. Also considered not important by the respondents were distance from parents, 72; distance from friends, 63; and garage or carport, 59. Half of the respondents indicated that distance from social activities, furniture provided, carpeting provided, and an outdoor area were not important in selecting their present housing (Table 13). Comparatively, in a study by Peterson (1968) three-fourths of the undergraduate student 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.

#### Satisfaction in Relation to Housing Factors

The respondents were asked open-ended questions to learn what they liked and disliked about their present housing. The cost was mentioned by 16 respondents; however, five indicated cost as the most disliked factor about their housing. Listed as liked the most by 15 respondents were closeness to work, location, and convenience (Table 14). Sixteen other factors were listed once each. Examples of these were the free use of the family car, workshop areas available as part of parent's farm buildings, and maid service.



Table 13. Importance of housing factors in selection of present housing.

Housing factors	Importance			
	Very important No.	Somewhat important No.	Not important No.	No reply No.
cost	61	37	5	2
distance from work	37	55	12	1
distance from parents	8	19	72	6
distance from friends	4	36	63	2
distance from social activities	5	46	53	1
amount of storage space	16	55	33	1
amount of space within dwelling	31	62	11	1
space for entertaining friends	19	51	34	1
laundry facilities provided	13	52	36	4
kitchen appliances provided	48	34	20	3
furniture provided	25	26	52	2
carpeting provided	13	39	52	1
outdoor area (yard or patio)	18	34	52	1
garage or carport	12	33	59	1
swimming pool	2	9	90	4
fireplace	4	17	83	1
privacy	52	47	4	2
freedom from bothersome noise	36	54	13	2
adequate daylight	42	50	12	1
adequate ventilation	46	45	13	1
view from window	18	48	37	2
character of neighborhood	48	48	8	1
personal safety and protection	52	41	11	1

Table 14. Factors stated as liked the most in present housing.

Factor stated	No. of respondents	Factor stated	No. of respondents
cost	16	furnishings	5
close to work	15	view	5
location	15	quiet	5
convenience	15	atmosphere	4
size	12	management	4
neighborhood	10	yard available	4
appearance	10	country living	3
privacy	9	comfort	3
modern	7	meals prepared	3
layout of plan	5	access to highways	2

Fifty respondents indicated that there was something they disliked about their housing. The factor mentioned most often was the lack of space (Table 15). Twenty other factors were stated once each. Some of these were the lack of freedom to entertain, difficulty in meeting people, and parental difficulties.

Table 15. Factors stated as disliked the most in present housing.

Factor stated	No. of respondents	Factor stated	No. of respondents
lack of space	12	neighborhood	5
heat inadequate or expensive	7	lack of recreation facilities	4
lack of privacy	6	lack of storage	3
cost	5	lack of parking space	3
management	5	laundry facilities	3
noisy	5		

Respondents were asked to check the statement which most accurately described their feelings about their present housing. Of the 105 respondents, 86 indicated no overall dissatisfaction with their housing; however, 17 were somewhat dissatisfied with their housing (Table 16).

Table 16. Rating of overall housing satisfaction.

Degree of satisfaction	No. of respondents
Satisfied	56
Partially satisfied	26
Neutral	4
Partially dissatisfied	14
Dissatisfied	3
No reply	<u>2</u>
Total	105

The housing factor which most of the respondents indicated satisfaction with was personal safety and protection. Eighty-four were satisfied and 12 were partially satisfied. Two-thirds to three-fourths of the respondents expressed satisfaction with cost, distance from work, kitchen appliances provided, daylight, ventilation, and the character of the neighborhood. Twenty-nine of the respondents were dissatisfied or partially dissatisfied with the housing factor, space for entertaining friends. Between 14 and 20

percent expressed some degree of dissatisfaction with the freedom from bothersome noise, view from the window, amount of space within the dwelling, and outdoor area (yard or patio). No respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the kitchen appliances provided or personal safety and protection. Many of the 31 respondents who said that distance from parents was not applicable in rating satisfaction, lived with their parents (Table 17).

The satisfaction categories were weighted on a scale of +4, +1, 0, -1, and -4 with the number, +4, expressing the highest degree of satisfaction. To facilitate computer analysis, five was added to each number, so the values computed were as follows: satisfied, 9; partially satisfied, 6; neutral, 5; partially dissatisfied, 4; and dissatisfied, 1. When calculated on this scale, the overall satisfaction average was 7.17, and the standard deviation was 2.21. This indicated that the general feeling of the respondents regarding their present housing was one of satisfaction.

Satisfaction with specific housing factors was rated on the same scale, and averages were calculated to find with which factors the respondents expressed the most satisfaction. The average with the highest value was for personal safety and protection at 8.48 and was closely followed by kitchen appliances provided at 8.37. An average of 9.0 would indicate that all respondents were very satisfied. An average of 5.0 would indicate neutrality. All the

Table 17. Satisfaction with selected housing factors.

Factors	Satisfaction					
	Satisfied	Partially satisfied	Neutral	Partially dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Not applicable
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Cost	78	13	4	4	2	4
Distance from work	75	10	7	5	6	2
Distance from parents	54	4	14	1	1	31
Distance from friends	53	15	18	4	4	11
Distance from social activities	58	12	18	3	8	6
Amount of storage space	53	27	8	9	3	5
Amount of space within dwelling	66	16	6	9	6	2
Space for entertaining friends	45	18	6	15	14	7
Laundry facilities	61	8	11	5	8	12
Kitchen appliances	75	10	7	0	0	13
Furniture provided	51	8	6	3	0	37
Carpeting provided	57	6	10	6	0	26
Outdoor area	36	13	15	9	12	20
Garage or carport	36	8	12	4	8	37
Swimming pool	13	3	14	0	2	73
Fireplace	29	5	15	1	1	54
Privacy	64	22	3	10	3	3
Freedom from bothersome noise	55	21	8	13	5	3
Adequate daylight	78	14	2	7	1	3
Adequate ventilation	78	12	4	7	0	4
View from window	51	19	11	6	10	8
Character of neighborhood	72	18	6	3	2	4
Personal safety and protection	84	12	4	0	0	5

satisfaction averages calculated were above 5.0, which indicates that the respondents were quite satisfied with specific housing factors in their present housing. The housing factor with the lowest satisfaction average was outdoor area (yard or patio) at 6.18. The second lowest satisfaction average was 6.30 for space for entertaining friends; however, two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they had space for entertaining friends.

The overall housing satisfaction expressed was positively correlated with satisfaction with each specific housing factor. The averages and correlations are summarized in Table 18. For some factors, not applicable was checked frequently but was not included in the analysis. Therefore, the number of respondents varies with each factor.

Overall housing satisfaction was significantly correlated at the .01 probability level to satisfaction with the following housing factors: distance from work, distance from friends, amount of storage space, amount of space within the dwelling, space for entertaining friends, laundry facilities provided, kitchen appliances provided, furniture provided, carpeting provided, outdoor area (yard or patio), privacy, freedom from bothersome noise, adequate daylight, view from window, and character of neighborhood. At the .05 probability level, overall housing satisfaction was significantly related to satisfaction with cost, distance from social activities, garage or carport,

Table 18. Satisfaction with specific housing factors in relation to overall housing satisfaction.

Specific housing factor	Avg.	Correlation to overall satis.	No. responses correlated	Sig.
cost	8.09	.24	100	**
distance from work	7.73	.29	102	*
distance from parents	7.91	.23	73	n. s.
distance from friends	7.20	.28	93	†
distance from social activities	7.11	.26	98	**
amount of storage space	7.18	.28	99	*
amount of space within dwelling	7.40	.26	102	*
space for entertaining friends	6.30	.43	97	†
laundry facilities provided	7.31	.34	93	†
kitchen appliances provided	8.37	.40	92	†
furniture provided	8.07	.41	68	*
carpeting provided	7.89	.37	79	*
outdoor area (yard or patio)	6.18	.36	84	*
garage or carport	6.71	.29	67	**
swimming pool	6.47	.44	32	**
fireplace	7.27	.04	51	n. s.
privacy	7.51	.38	101	†
freedom from bothersome noise	7.04	.33	101	*
adequate daylight	8.09	.27	101	*
adequate ventilation	8.14	.17	100	n. s.
view from window	6.82	.29	96	*
character of neighborhood	7.92	.27	100	*
personal safety and protection	8.48	.19	99	n. s.

\*significant at .01 level

\*\*significant at .05 level

n. s. not significant

and swimming pool. Distance from parents, fireplace, adequate ventilation, and personal safety and protection were the only factors rated that were not significantly related to overall housing satisfaction (Table 18).

### Satisfaction in Relation to Demographic Factors

Selected demographic factors of age, sex, educational level, housing type, persons with whom lived, income, and housing expenditures, were related to overall housing satisfaction using the F-test. Hypothesis three was tested and the parts significant at the .05 probability level were rejected. Hypothesis three stated that overall housing satisfaction will not vary significantly with differences in (a) age, (b) sex, (c) education, (d) housing type, (e) persons with whom they live, (f) income, or (g) housing expenditures. The null hypothesis was accepted for all parts except (a) age. The number of responses in each demographic category, average satisfaction values, and F-test values are summarized in Table 19.

The only demographic factor which had a significant variance in satisfaction was age. The respondents age 22-25 were the most satisfied with their present housing as indicated by a mean satisfaction value of 7.86. Satisfaction values for ages 26-30 and 31 and over were 6.65 and 6.73 respectively, indicating means below the overall housing satisfaction average of 7.17. The t-test was used to



Table 19. Overall housing satisfaction and demographic factors.

Demographic factors	Number of responses	Average satisfaction	F-test values
<u>Age</u>			3.77*
22-25	43	7.86**	
26-30	34	6.65	
30 and over	26	6.73	
	103		
<u>Sex</u>			0.33
Male	42	7.02	
Female	61	7.28	
	103		
<u>Education</u>			1.16
High school	12	7.83	
Vocational	32	6.66	
Bachelor	32	7.16	
Post-bachelor	27	7.52	
	103		
<u>Housing type</u>			0.01
Single family house	34	7.15	
Apartment	52	7.17	
Other	17	7.24	
	103		
<u>Person with whom lived</u>			2.13
Alone	42	6.76	
Family	37	7.16	
Friends	24	7.92	
	103		
<u>Income</u>			2.55
Under \$3000	20	7.60	
\$3000-\$5999	30	7.63	
\$6000-\$8999	43	7.02	
\$9000 and over	10	5.60	
	103		

Continued on next page

Table 19 Continued.

Demographic factors	Number of responses	Average satisfaction	F-test values
<u>Housing expenditures</u>			1.41
Less than \$50	20	7.80	
\$51-\$100	37	7.03	
\$101-\$150	30	7.20	
\$151 and over	12	6.17	
	99		
<u>Overall housing satisfaction</u>	103	7.17	

\*F-test significant at .05 level.

\*\*t-test significant at .05 level.

determine if the respondents in the lowest age group were significantly more satisfied with their present housing. The t value was significant at the .05 level indicating that the variance was due to a significantly higher level of satisfaction for the respondents age 22-25 than in the higher age groups.

Overall housing satisfaction did not vary significantly with the other demographic factors tested; however, some variance was apparent. The respondents in the highest income classification expressed an overall housing satisfaction average of 5.60. This indicated that those respondents with the highest incomes were the least satisfied with their housing. The satisfaction averages for the \$6000-\$8999 income group was 7.02, and for the two lowest income groups it was 7.60 and 7.63.

Overall housing satisfaction varied somewhat according to with whom the respondent lived. Respondents who lived with friends had an average satisfaction value of 7.92, and they tended to be the most satisfied with their present housing. Respondents who lived alone tended to be the least satisfied as they expressed a mean satisfaction value of 6.76. The respondents who lived with their family indicated an average value of 7.16.

Satisfaction varied only slightly with housing expenditures. The respondents who paid \$151 and over a month in total housing expenditures tended to be the least satisfied, and those who paid

less than \$50 in housing expenditures tended to be the most satisfied.

Education did not cause satisfaction to vary significantly; however, respondents with a high school education only tended to be more satisfied than the respondents with more education. Respondents with vocational training expressed a lower satisfaction average than the respondents with either a high school education only or a college degree.

There was very little variance in satisfaction between males and females. The satisfaction averages according to housing type were very similar indicating that satisfaction did not vary with the type of housing in which the respondent resided (Table 19).

#### Relationship of Demographic Factors

Chi-square tests were made to determine if relationships existed between the following demographic factors: housing type and persons with whom lived, housing expenditures and housing type, housing expenditures and persons with whom lived, education and persons with whom lived, education and housing expenditures, and income and total monthly housing expenditures. A probability of less than .005 was taken to indicate a lack of independence between the factors. The three factors, housing type, with whom lived, and cost were found to be mutually dependent.

Based on the Chi-square test, housing type and persons with

whom lived were considered dependent on one another. Of 37 respondents who lived with their families, 73 percent lived in single family houses. Sixty-nine percent of the 42 respondents who lived alone and 63 percent of the 24 respondents who lived with friends resided in apartments (see Table 5).

Chi-square tests also indicated that housing type was significantly related to housing costs. Of the 33 respondents who lived in a single family house, 48 percent paid \$50 or less per month in total housing costs and 30 percent paid \$51-\$100 for housing. Forty-five percent of the respondents who lived in apartments paid from \$100 to \$150 per month for housing. Twelve percent of the respondents paid over \$150 per month in housing expenditures, but 22 percent paid \$50 or less for housing (Table 20).

Table 20. Total monthly housing expenditures and housing type.

Housing expenditures	Housing Type			Total No.
	Single family house No.	Apartment No.	Other No.	
\$0-\$50	16	2	4	22
\$51-\$100	10	21	6	37
\$101-\$150	3	23	4	30
\$150 and over	4	5	3	12
Total	33	51	17	101

$$\chi^2_6 = 28.62 \quad (P > .005)$$

Cost and with whom a person lived were dependent factors. A definite relationship was shown wherein those who lived alone tended to pay the most, and those who lived with their family tended to pay the least for housing. Of the respondents who lived alone one-third paid \$51-\$100 in monthly housing costs and one-half paid \$100-\$150 for housing. Of the respondents who lived with their family, 41 percent paid \$50 or less, and 32 percent paid \$51-\$100. Half of the respondents who lived with their family and paid \$100 or less for housing provided services in lieu of all or part of their rent and had food included in the amount paid. Half of the respondents who lived with friends paid \$51-\$100 per month for housing. Seventy percent of the respondents who paid \$50 or less lived with their family. Two-thirds of the respondents who paid \$101-\$150 per month for housing lived alone (Table 21). Based on the Chi-square test the following null hypothesis was rejected: there will be no significant relationship between housing expenditures and persons with whom they live.

The educational level of the respondents was found to be independent of the persons with whom they lived. Half of the respondents who were vocationally trained lived alone. Nearly half of those at the bachelor's degree level lived with their families. Half of the respondents who lived alone were at the bachelor or post-bachelor level of education and they represented 36 percent of the college

educated respondents (Table 22).

Table 21. Total monthly housing expenditures and persons with whom lived.

Housing expenditures	With whom lived			Total No.
	Alone No.	Family No.	Friends No.	
\$0-\$50	3	14	3	20
\$51-\$100	14	11	12	37
\$101-\$150	20	5	5	30
\$150 and over	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>12</u>
Total	41	34	24	99

$$\chi^2_6 = 21.51 (P > .005)$$

Table 22. Educational level and persons with whom lived.

Highest educational level	With whom lived			Total No.
	Alone No.	Family No.	Friends No.	
High school	5	6	1	12
Vocational	16	9	7	32
Bachelor	9	15	8	32
Post-Bachelor	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>27</u>
Total	42	37	24	103

$$\chi^2_6 = 6.72 (P < .005)$$

Footnote (1960) stated that high educational attainment appeared to be associated with relatively high housing expenditures. However,

in this study no significant relationship was established between educational level and housing expenditures. Fifty percent of the respondents who were vocationally trained and 32 percent of those at the bachelor's degree level paid \$51-\$100 in total monthly housing costs. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents who had taken post-bachelor's work paid \$100-\$150 for housing (Table 23).

Table 23. Educational level and total monthly housing expenditures.

Highest educational level	Housing expenditures				Totals No.
	\$0-\$50 No.	\$51-\$100 No.	\$101-\$150 No.	\$150 & over No.	
High school	6	3	2	1	12
Vocational	3	16	9	3	31
Bachelor	9	10	9	3	31
Post-Bachelor	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>27</u>
Total	22	37	30	12	101

$$\chi^2_9 = 13.25 (P < .005)$$

Housing expenditures were compared to income, and the two factors were independent, yet one-third of the respondents with incomes under \$3000 paid \$50 or less for housing. Half of the respondents in this income group paid \$51-\$100 in total monthly housing costs. Forty-three percent of the respondents in the \$3000-\$5999 income group paid \$51-\$100 for housing. Housing expenditures were



between \$101-\$150 for 33 percent of the respondents in the \$6000-\$8999 income group. Fifty-five percent of the respondents with incomes over \$9000 paid \$101-\$150 per month for housing (Table 24). Based on the Chi-square test the following null hypothesis was accepted: there will be no significant relationship between housing expenditures and income.

Table 24. Income level and total monthly housing expenditures.

Income	Housing expenditures				Total over No.
	\$0-\$50 No.	\$51-\$100 No.	\$101-\$150 No.	\$150 & over No.	
Under \$3000	6	9	3	0	18
\$3000-\$5999	7	13	7	3	30
\$6000-\$8999	8	13	14	7	42
\$9000 and over	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	22	37	30	12	101

$$\chi^2_9 = 12.05 (P < .005)$$

## SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to explore the housing expenditures and factors in housing selection and satisfaction of single adults. The population tested was guests and members during October 1968 through January 1969 of two single Catholic adult clubs in Portland, Oregon. Questionnaires were mailed to the total population of 202 members and guests in February 1969. Fifty-two percent (105) of the questionnaires was returned and analyzed in the study.

The questionnaire developed for collecting data for this study requested information about demographic characteristics, description of present housing, factors considered in selection of present housing, overall housing satisfaction, satisfaction with specific housing factors, housing costs, and general information related to housing. Statistical techniques used in analyzing the data included correlations, chi-square tests, F-tests, and the t-test.

The following hypotheses were tested: 1. There will be no significant relationship between housing expenditures and income. This hypothesis was accepted. 2. There will be no significant relationship between housing expenditures and persons with whom they live. This hypothesis was rejected. 3. Overall housing satisfaction will not vary significantly with differences in

(a) age, (b) sex, (c) education, (d) housing type, (e) persons with whom they live, (f) income, or (g) housing expenditures. This hypothesis was rejected for part (a) age, and accepted for the following parts: (b) sex, (c) education, (d) housing type, (e) persons with whom they live, (f) income, and (g) housing expenditures.

Of the 105 respondents, 44 were males with an average age of 29.8, and 61 were females with an average age of 26.6. The ages ranged from 22 through 51 with a median of 26. Seventy-six respondents were affiliated with Chancellor Club and 55 were affiliated with Catholic Alumni Club. Twenty-eight were involved in both groups.

All except 12 respondents were educated beyond high school, and 59 earned at least a bachelor's degree. Of this number 27 had done post-bachelor's work. Almost 60 percent classified their job as professional. The income and educational level of the respondents was above the national average for unrelated individuals. Income in 1968 for 55 respondents was \$6000 and over; however, 60 respondents earned less than \$6000. Males tended to have higher incomes than females.

Seventy-one of the respondents lived within the Portland city limits. Nine owned and 96 rented their present housing. Fifty-two respondents lived in apartments and 36 in single family houses. Statistically there was a significant relationship between housing

type and with whom the respondent lived. Thirty-seven lived with their family and 73 percent of those who lived with their family resided in single family houses. Forty-two respondents lived alone, and 24 lived with friends. Two did not indicate if they lived alone or with someone. Over 60 percent of the respondents who lived alone or with friends lived in apartments.

Respondents who lived alone had an average of 2.7 rooms in their dwellings. Respondents who lived with their family or friends had an average of 3.5 people with an average of 1.8 rooms per person.

Ninety-two respondents had private bedrooms; however, most of the other rooms were shared except by those respondents who lived alone. One hundred or more had a kitchen, living room, bedroom and bathroom in their present housing. The most common room combination was a kitchen-dining room which was indicated by 41 respondents. In this study at least 87 respondents indicated that they had adequate privacy, daylight, and ventilation.

Sixty-four of the respondents lived in their present housing less than two years. More than one-third planned to move in the next few months. The respondents had lived an average of 4.2 places since age 21. Sixty-six respondents had moved an average of 2.1 times within the Portland Metropolitan area. Since age 21, 52 respondents had moved an average of 1.8 times due to

dissatisfaction with housing.

Total monthly housing expenditures including utilities and rent or home ownership expenses averaged \$95 for 101 respondents. Other expenses such as food were included in the rent paid by 28 respondents. Twenty-five provided services in lieu of all or part of their housing costs. More than one-third of the respondents who lived with their family paid less than \$50 a month in total housing costs, whereas half of the respondents who lived with friends paid \$51-\$100 per month, and nearly half of those who lived alone paid \$101-\$150 monthly for housing. There was a significant relationship between housing costs and with whom the person lived. Respondents who lived alone paid the most and averaged \$108 in monthly housing costs.

Respondents who lived with their friends had an average housing expenditure of \$103 per month. Respondents who lived with their family paid an average of \$77 in total monthly housing expenditures. Of the respondents who lived with their family, 68 percent paid \$100 or less for housing, and half of these provided services in lieu of all or part of their rent and had food included in the rent paid. The respondents who lived with their families tended to pay less, yet had more benefits. Forty-nine of the 105 respondents kept no records of housing costs.

When selecting their present housing, 58 respondents felt

there was an adequate number and variety of dwellings from which to choose; however 30 had trouble locating a dwelling which they considered within their financial means. Sixty reported that transportation influenced their housing selection. Ninety respondents owned automobiles.

In an open-ended question, cost and distance to work were listed the most often as reasons for selecting present housing. Cost, privacy, and personal safety and protection were considered very important in selecting housing by at least half of the respondents. More than three-fourths of the respondents considered a swimming pool or fireplace not important in selecting present housing.

Fifty respondents indicated that there was something they disliked about their present housing. In rating overall housing satisfaction, 56 were satisfied, 26 partially satisfied, four neutral, 14 partially dissatisfied, and three dissatisfied. When evaluated on a nine-point scale, the average overall housing satisfaction expressed was 7.17 indicating a general feeling of satisfaction with present housing.

The average satisfaction expressed for specific housing factors was the highest for personal safety and protection and kitchen appliances provided. No respondents indicated dissatisfaction with these two factors. Ninety to 94 of the respondents

expressed satisfaction or partial satisfaction with personal safety and protection, adequate daylight, cost, adequate ventilation, and the character of the neighborhood. The two housing factors with the lowest satisfaction averages were outdoor area (yard or patio) and space for entertaining friends. Of the 23 housing factors rated for satisfaction then related to overall housing satisfaction, 15 were significantly correlated at the .01 probability level and four at the .05 probability level.

The variance in overall housing satisfaction was analyzed with the following demographic factors: age, sex, education, housing type, persons with whom lived, income, and total monthly housing expenditures. The only factor that showed a significant variance in satisfaction was age. The respondents in the lowest age group (22-25) were significantly more satisfied with their present housing. Although the variance was not significant, the average satisfaction was highest for those who lived with friends and lowest for those who lived alone. The respondents in the highest income group expressed a considerably lower mean satisfaction with housing than those in the lower income groups. The respondents who paid the least for housing tended to be the most satisfied with their housing, and those who paid the most in monthly housing expenditures tended to be the least satisfied with their housing.

The educational level of the respondents was independent of

their housing expenditures and with whom they lived. There was no significant relationship between income level and housing expenditures of the respondents.

#### Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research

All of the population tested were members of the Catholic Church, and all were affiliated in some way with a social club for single adults. Further studies with other groups could reveal biases that may have occurred. A similar study could also be conducted testing a group of single people in another geographic area or who represent different age, income, or educational levels. Single people who are divorced or widowed may present different data than those who have never married.

Satisfaction is subjective and may vary from person to person and from time to time. Housing satisfaction expressed may be influenced by other factors not tested in this study. Analysis of satisfaction must be interpreted in this light.

Housing expenditures were expressed as actual or estimated amounts, and in analysis these were grouped together. In a repeat of the study, housing costs should be divided into three categories wherein those who live with their family could indicate their housing costs separately from those who rent or own. Those who live with their family usually have food and other expenses included in their



"rent" paid, and these costs were not analyzed separately in this study.

### Conclusions

The single people in this study tended to be satisfied with their housing. Of the 105 respondents, 82 expressed some degree of satisfaction with their present housing. Satisfaction varied with age. Those in the lowest age group were significantly more satisfied with their present housing. There was no significant variation in housing satisfaction due to differences in sex, education, income, persons with whom lived, housing type, or total monthly housing expenditures.

The respondents who lived alone tended to live in apartments and pay the highest total monthly housing costs. Those who lived with friends tended to reside in apartments and pay less per month for housing than those who lived alone. Respondents who lived with their families tended to live in single family houses, have the lowest housing expenditures, and have other expenses included in the rent paid. Few of the respondents owned their housing, but those who did had higher housing expenditures than those who rented. Many of the respondents did not keep records of their housing expenditures.

The respondents tended to be quite mobile. One-third had

lived in their present housing less than one year and one-third planned to move in the next few months. Cost, privacy, and personal safety were the factors the respondents most often considered very important in selecting their present housing. Interestingly, space within the dwelling was very important in selecting housing for less than one-third of the respondents. Most of the respondents had a bathroom, kitchen, bedroom, and living room in their present dwelling.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Public Health Association. Committee on Hygiene of Housing. 1966. Guiding policies. In: Urban housing, ed. by William L. C. Wheaton, Grace Milgram and Margy Ellin Meyerson. New York, The Free Press. p. 226-230. (Reprinted from: American Public Health Association. Committee on the Hygiene of Housing. 1953. Housing an aging population. p. 54-56, 59-63)
- Anyone for singles? 1967. Newsweek 69:70. May 8.
- Beyer, Glenn H. 1967. Housing and society. Rev. ed. New York, Macmillan. 595p.
- Cities and the single girl: C. Abrams view. 1965. Newsweek 66:120. November.
- Crouch, Arthur E., Jr. 1969. Associate Director, Oregon Council of Churches. Personal communication. Portland, Oregon. April 14.
- Foote, Nelson N. et al. 1960. Housing choices and housing constraints. New York, McGraw-Hill. 447p.
- Mortvedt, Marjory Marvin. 1967. Resource variables associated with the housing situations of welfare recipient families. Master's thesis. Ames, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 228 numb. leaves.
- Peterson, Shirley Holwegner. 1968. Factors consociated with selection and satisfaction of non-university rental housing as stated by the wives of undergraduate students attending Oregon State University. Master's thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State University. 104 numb. leaves.
- Reid, Margaret Gilpin. 1962. Housing and income. Chicago, Illinois, University of Chicago. 415p.
- Rose, Arnold M. 1966. Living arrangements of unattached persons. In: Urban housing, ed. by William L. C. Wheaton, Grace Milgram and Margy Ellin Meyerson. New York, The Free Press. p. 217-222. (Reprinted from: American Sociological Review 12:429-435. 1947)

- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1960. Census of population. Vol. 1. Characteristics of the population. Part 39, Oregon. Washington, D. C. 332p.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1968a. Current population reports: Population characteristics. Household and family characteristics: March 1967. Washington, D. C. June 25. 28p. (Series P-20, no. 173)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1968b. Current population reports: Population characteristics. Households and families by type: 1968. Washington, D. C. Nov. 5. 4p. (Series P-20, no. 176)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1968c. Current population reports: Population characteristics. Marital status and family status: March 1967. Washington, D. C. Feb. 23. 16p. (Series P-20, no. 170)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1968d. Current population reports: Population estimates. Projections of the number of households and families: 1967 to 1985. Washington, D. C. June 6. 20p. (Series P-25, no. 394)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1968e. Current population reports: Population estimates. Summary of demographic projections. Washington, D. C. March 14. 73p. (Series P-25, no. 388)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1968f. Statistical abstract of the United States: 1968. 89th ed. Washington, D. C. 1034p.
- Warren, Jean. 1961. Income and housing expenditures. *Journal of Home Economics* 53:349-351.

APPENDIX

INTRODUCTORY LETTER  
RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Hi!

Will you please take a few minutes to help a fellow member on a research project? This questionnaire is being sent to members and guests of the Catholic Alumni and Chancellor Clubs in Portland. The purpose is to further knowledge of housing factors important to young single adults.

You can help by filling out and returning the questionnaire as the more returned the more valuable the research will be. The project is strictly anonymous; all analysis will be done collectively and there is no way that you can be identified. I sincerely hope you will cooperate.

I am a graduate student at Oregon State University and the results of this study will be used for a thesis leading to a master's degree in Home Management. This information may be used to increase knowledge in teaching students about housing for single people.

The questions can be answered quickly; in pretesting the entire questionnaire took less than twenty minutes to complete. Please be sure to fill in both sides of each page. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire.

I will certainly appreciate your cooperation. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Norma Evers.

Norma Evers



9. Do you live alone?  Yes  No

62

If not, number of people living with you? \_\_\_\_\_ (number)

What is their relationship to you:

- family members (parents, brothers, sisters)  friends  
 other relatives (aunt, uncle, cousin)  other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 householder from whom you rent \_\_\_\_\_

10. Your present housing is located:

- Within the Portland city limits  
 Outside the Portland city limits

11. What was the most important reason for selecting your present housing?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. What do you like the most about your present housing now?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

13. Is there anything you dislike about your present housing?  Yes  No

If yes, what do you dislike the most? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

- I am satisfied with my present housing  
 I am partially satisfied  
 I am neutral  
 I am partially dissatisfied  
 I am dissatisfied

15. When selecting your present housing did you feel there was an adequate number and variety of dwellings from which to choose?

Yes  No Please comment \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

16. Did you have trouble locating a dwelling within your financial means?

- Yes  No

(Please go on to the next page)



17. Check the appropriate square to indicate for your present housing which of the following:

- A. You are the only person using  
 B. You share with others in your dwelling (house, apartment, etc.)  
 C. You share with other tenants in a multiple unit building  
 or D. You do not have

	A Only Person Using	B Shared with Housemates	C Shared with Tenants	D Do Not Have
Kitchen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Living room	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dining room	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Family or recreation room	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----				
Bedroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bathroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utility room or laundry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Den or office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Space for entertaining friends	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----				
Entry hall	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Basement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fireplace	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Swimming pool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Patio or deck	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----				
Yard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Garage or carport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Off-street parking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(Please go on to the other side of this page)

18. Check the following that you have in your present housing:

- Adequate privacy
- Adequate daylight
- Adequate ventilation
- Freedom from bothersome noise
- Pleasant view from window

19. Check which areas, if any, are combined into one room:

- kitchen-dining
- kitchen-dining-living
- kitchen-dining-family
- kitchen-laundry
- living-dining
- living-family
- living-bedroom
- study-bedroom
- other \_\_\_\_\_

20. What is the total number of livable rooms in your dwelling unit, not counting hallways or bath-rooms? \_\_\_\_\_(number)

21. How long have you lived in your present housing? \_\_\_\_\_years \_\_\_\_\_months

22. How many places have you lived since reaching age 21? \_\_\_\_\_(number)

How many of these moves were made because you were dissatisfied with the housing you had? \_\_\_\_\_(number)

How many of these represent moves within the Portland metropolitan area? \_\_\_\_\_(number)

23. Do you anticipate changing housing within the next few months?

- Yes     No    If yes, why? \_\_\_\_\_

24. Did transportation influence your housing selections?     Yes     No

If yes, how? \_\_\_\_\_

25. Do you own an automobile? (includes buying)     Yes     No

26. Your total yearly income in 1968 was:

- less than \$3000
- \$3000 to \$5999
- \$6000 to \$8999
- \$9000 to \$12,999
- \$13,000 and over

27. Is there anyone financially dependent on you?     Yes     No

28. Do you keep records of your housing expenditures?

- all housing expenditures
- some housing expenditures
- no records

29. Check how important the following factors were in selecting your present housing.

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>Not Important</u>
Cost	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from parents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance from friends	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----			
Distance from social activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Amount of storage space	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Amount of space within dwelling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Space for entertaining friends	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Laundry facilities provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----			
Kitchen appliances provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Furniture provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carpeting provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outdoor area (yard or patio)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Garage or carport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----			
Swimming pool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fireplace	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Privacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Freedom from bothersome noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adequate daylight	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----			
Adequate ventilation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
View from window	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Character of neighborhood	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personal safety and protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(Please go on to the other side of this page)

30. Check your satisfaction with the following factors for your present housing.

FACTORS	Satisfied	Partially Satisfied	Neutral	Partially Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Not Applicable
Cost						
Distance from work						
Distance from parents						
Distance from friends						
Distance from social activities						
Amount of storage space						
Amount of space within dwelling						
Space for entertaining friends						
Laundry facilities provided						
Kitchen appliances provided						
Furniture provided						
Carpeting provided						
Outdoor area (yard or patio)						
Garage or carport						
Swimming pool						
Fireplace						
Privacy						
Freedom from bothersome noise						
Adequate daylight						
Adequate ventilation						
View from window						
Character of neighborhood						
Personal safety and protection						
Other (specify) _____						

(Please go on to the next page)

IF YOU RENT, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTION 31. (Renting includes apartments, living with family, etc)

IF YOU OWN, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 32. (Owning includes buying)

31. Renting of all types:

A. Did you sign a lease?  Yes  No

If yes, what is the length of time of the lease? \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

B. How much rent do you pay per month? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

C. Does the rent you pay include expenses other than housing, such as food?

Yes  No

D. Do you provide services in place of rent for all or part of your housing costs?

Yes  No

E. Check those utilities that are included in the rental charge:

- |                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> electricity | <input type="checkbox"/> garbage collection     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> heat        | <input type="checkbox"/> TV cable or antenna    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water       | <input type="checkbox"/> telephone monthly rate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sewer       | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please specify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> gas         | _____   |

F. For those expenses not included in the rent charge indicate the amount per month that you pay for them. If you share these expenses with someone else, indicate only the amount you pay.

Estimated	Actual		Estimated	Actual	
\$ _____	\$ _____	electricity	\$ _____	\$ _____	garbage collection
\$ _____	\$ _____	heat (if not electric)	\$ _____	\$ _____	TV cable or antenna
\$ _____	\$ _____	water	\$ _____	\$ _____	telephone monthly rate
\$ _____	\$ _____	sewer (if not with water)	\$ _____	\$ _____	furniture payments
\$ _____	\$ _____	gas	\$ _____	\$ _____	other _____

G. Is the rental unit you now reside in

- fully furnished?  
 partially furnished?  
 unfurnished? (no appliances, draperies, furniture, etc.)

If you rent, this completes the questionnaire. THANK YOU!

If you own, please go on to the other side of this page.

32. Own or buying:

Fill in the amounts of your housing costs in 1968. You may do this either monthly or yearly, whichever is most convenient for you.

Estimated Monthly	Actual Monthly		Estimated Yearly	Actual Yearly
\$ _____	\$ _____	Mortgage payments	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	Taxes	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	Insurance on housing	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	Upkeep and repairs	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	Furniture payments or rent	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	Assessments on property	\$ _____	\$ _____
		Utilities:		
\$ _____	\$ _____	electricity	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	heat (if not electric)	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	water	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	sewer (if not with water)	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	gas	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	garbage collection	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	TV cable or antenna	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	telephone monthly rate	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	other utilities (specify)	\$ _____	\$ _____
\$ _____	\$ _____	Other housing costs (specify) _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

THANK YOU!