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ABSTRACT

Some form of shelter, commonly referred to as "housing", has always been an important requirement of man. Today, the study of housing is a complex matter, as this topic can be approached from several viewpoints.

Since the characteristics of the family, as an institution, changes over time, it is important to periodically study the family's purpose, goals and functions. Changes in the family also influence their attitude towards, and needs for, housing. As a result, the architectural style of the family's housing has also changed over time.

The objectives of this paper are to provide the planner with: sociological information on the family; knowledge of the social beliefs which have influenced the physical form of North American domestic architecture; an outline of the major domestic architectural styles in North America, with reference to the relationship between house design and the characteristics of the family; knowledge of the expressed preferences of households for their housing, and the consumer's housing behavior.

From the sociologist's study of the family, discussed in Chapter II, it is found that the most characteristic contemporary North American family, as compared with the early North American one, is of a nuclear, urban, form. It is primarily a consumption unit, rather than a production one. In today's family, there is now an emphasis on individualism, rather
than familism. As a result the family is more oriented to the personal needs and desires of each member - in particular, to the child. Many aspects of the former functions of the family have been transferred, in varying degrees, to other institutions and agencies which are outside of the home. The home, however, remains important, particularly as a place to obtain security and happiness.

The contemporary house, as described in 'Chapter III, offers more privacy and opportunity for the individuality for each family member than in previous architectural styles. There are design features, such as two living areas, which also allow for the separation of the two generations and which reflect the family's goal of individualism. In today's house, too, convenience is important, as evidenced by a functional floor plan, and the provision of many mechanical devices.

From information about housing preferences, surveyed in Chapter IV, it is found that the majority of households desire the ownership of a single family detached house. Most contemporary families, however, live in several forms of housing during the family life cycle. In general, families move from one dwelling unit to another in order to bring their housing requirements more into line with their needs. A frequent reason for moving is the need for additional space. In selecting a new residence, factors such as the interior design,
the social character of the neighborhood and design features related to the requirements for children are considered important.

With the information provided in this paper, the planner has a broader background of knowledge from which to assess the requirements of the contemporary family for a more satisfactory housing environment.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Some form of shelter has always been an important requirement of man even though it has been provided in a variety of forms and for many different reasons. Today, in North America, shelter is commonly referred to as "housing." The contemporary house, however, serves other purposes in addition to providing a shelter for our physical comfort. To some households the interest in a house may be to secure a higher position of status and prestige among friends and in the community (Seeley et al, 1956, 46-49). To other households the ownership of a house may be for the purpose of securing an economic gain (Federal Task Force, 1969, 17). Ownership may also serve the purpose of providing a feeling of independence (United States Savings and Loan League, 1964, 29). Housing thus serves physiological necessities and psychocultural needs (Seeley et al, 1956, 42). Planners, as well as engineers, economists, sociologists, psychologists, lawyers, politicians, and others are therefore involved with aspects of housing.

In addition, housing is a complex matter since it is not only important to the resident household, but also is important to many major private businesses and to the federal, provincial and municipal governments of Canada. For instance,
with an economic aspect of housing such as mortgages, the federal government and private lending institutions are usually involved. Their roles are in formulating policies and establishing practices which result in the allocation of the mortgage to the mortgagor. The conditions of the mortgage in turn have an effect on the construction industry in the type, quantity, and quality of the dwelling units built. At the household level the economic problem is in selecting, from the dwelling units available, the most suitable one which can be afforded.

Over the years the general attitude and degree of concern towards the many aspects of housing has varied. The concern for housing may be expressed by, or directed toward, the population in general or only sub-groups. At different times the same aspect, such as the quantity of dwelling units and their availability to different income groups may be viewed as "good," "satisfactory," a "problem," or a "crisis."

In recent years there have been rapidly increasing costs of accommodation arising from the higher price of serviced land, materials and labor, and increased interest rates. Now the inadequacy of housing for lower income households has extended into the middle-income group (Wheeler, 1969, 13; Federal Task Force, 1969, 1, 14, 15). With this large segment of the population having a personal concern for the provision of housing, the subject is receiving more public
and political attention. As a result, the attitude, concepts and approaches toward housing are undergoing change. At the first Canadian Conference on Housing it was declared that "...all Canadians have the right to be adequately housed whether they can afford it or not" (Wheeler, 1969, 15). Also in the federal government Task Force report on housing in 1969, one of the declared principles was that "Every Canadian should be entitled to clean, warm shelter as a matter of basic human right" (Federal Task Force, 1969, 22). They say that "... the aim of government policies should be to generate sufficient housing stock so that all Canadians may exercise their own freedom of choice as to the style and tenure of housing in which they live" (Federal Task Force, 1969, 22).

The Task Force also states that housing is a "people problem" (Federal Task Force, 1969, 7). Although there are statistics dealing with various aspects of housing, such as the number, cost, and form, housing is "... tied every bit as much to human desires and prejudices as to scientific graphs and calculated logic" (Federal Task Force, 1969, 7). Thus, the housing problem cannot be explained or measured by only looking at statistics. Many of the problems in housing may also be perceived by people at the level of the individual, family or community (Wheeler, 1969, 14).

It is also at these levels that various changes are
brought about in our society. Included are changes in attitude toward 'home,' and thus toward the house (Seeley et al, 1956, 57). In recent times there has been an increased emphasis on science, technology, industry and urbanism. Accompanying these changes away from an agrarian society there have been socio-cultural changes of vast dimensions. These latter changes are rooted in the psychological and socio-logical needs, desires, and motives of man. The transition throughout our civilization from rural to urban, along with the varying attitudes of man, influence the habits of a population. These, in turn, modify the structure, function, and values of our social institutions and the physical components of our environment (Ericksen, 1954, 28-64).

**Need for Research**

As mentioned previously, there are changes within our society. They are usually gradual changes which are continuous. Because of this, it is necessary to assess the changes which have occurred by an examination of specific factors at a particular period in time.

Housing is a topic which can be viewed from various approaches. A study may be involved with aspects of the house itself, such as the quantity, physical quality, cost of construction, or purchase price. A study of housing may also be considered from the viewpoint of the government, the private business sector, or the household. In addition, housing need
not be restricted to the physical structure, the house, but may involve the psycho-cultural aspects of the household. Thus a study of housing may involve one or more disciplines such as planning and sociology.

Frequently, however, planners do not have the opportunity, perhaps because of the lack of time, resources or communication to become familiar with the contributions which disciplines, such as sociology, can contribute to their knowledge. The physical planner's concern is with the physical elements of our neighborhoods, urban areas and regions. He has knowledge about the human component of our society in terms of the physical aspects, such as water services, roads and schools which are required for the functioning of a household. Of further interest to him could be information of a sociological nature which deals with the ways in which people relate to one another, the needs which people have, including social-psychological ones, and the priority of their needs.

With this additional information the planner has the opportunity of making more accurate assumptions concerning the sociological and cultural characteristics of our society. To facilitate the acquisition of this knowledge, there is a need to synthesize the findings of selected sociological studies of relevance to the work of the physical planner. For an interdisciplinary relationship to be successful, it is also vital that the sociological analysis, often abstract in nature, be co-ordinated with the aims of the physical planner.
with his focus on the applied. This collaboration is important because both disciplines have an impact on the organization and functioning of many of the institutions of which our society is composed.

With respect to the residents of housing the sociologist has made a study of the individual and family. His analysis includes the purpose, goals and functions of families. From the sociologist, therefore, the planner can obtain information which would broaden his understanding of the residents of housing.

Since the physical form of housing is in part affected by the beliefs and aspirations of the families which make up a society, the planner can better understand the reasons for particular stylistic characteristics of housing by having knowledge of the social history of the different periods of the North American heritage. This information can be beneficial to the planner by providing him with an understanding of why a particular style, such as Colonial or Greek Revival, was a valid expression of the society's beliefs during a specific time, and why it is inappropriate or in disfavor at other times. Again, this information is provided by sociologists as well as architectural historians who have specialized in social history.

The housing behavior of contemporary households and their expressed preferences will also supply the planner with
information which he can use in providing more satisfactory housing for today's families. Over a period of time, too, the planner can perceive changing preferences for housing and housing trends which will be helpful in supplying housing for future years.

**Objectives of Research**

An objective of this study is to gather sociological information about the family which would broaden the planner's knowledge and thus be of benefit to him in providing suitable housing. Emphasis will be placed on the current purpose, goals and functions of the family in a society which has undergone change, and continues to do so. This objective is to enable the planner to assess more accurately the needs for housing, and therefore to help him provide a more applicable physical environment. A further objective is to present the analysis of the sociologist in a form which the planner can interpret.

Another objective is to provide the planner with knowledge of social beliefs which have influenced the physical form of North American domestic architecture. Included will be an outline of the various styles of housing that have been popular during various periods of North American history. An objective, also, is to relate the characteristics of the family to the design of the house. The planner can utilize this information in providing housing which is suited to the
A further objective is to survey the literature of studies concerning the family's housing behavior, their expressed preferences for housing, and their stated causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their residential environment. This information will provide the planner with further guidelines to determine the characteristics of houses suitable for the contemporary family.

Significance of Research

Due to the continual change taking place in our society it is necessary periodically to study the social and physical factors such as the family and their housing. Also, during different eras, there is emphasis on various aspects and approaches to a subject. Today, there is a growing trend toward interdisciplinary studies with the intent of providing more meaningful solutions to current problems. In the planning profession there is an increased awareness of the contributions which can be made by the social sciences. With respect to housing, the collaboration between the planner and sociologist should enable the planner to assess more adequately the needs for housing and, therefore, help him to provide a more applicable physical environment for the population.

A critical problem in many planning matters, including housing, is the relationship between the family's desires and
expectations, and the knowledge and values of the professional planner, who is expected to be an expert on some aspects of subjects such as housing (Lamanna, 1964, 317). He is usually involved with considering interrelationships and constraints in making decisions on feasible alternatives as possible answers to an issue. Input from various disciplines and sources may facilitate the planning process, particularly in defining, or clarifying discrete features of a problem, or in establishing where there is consensus or conflict. When evaluating the overall considerations and priorities, the planner may find that all information concerning a problem cannot be utilized to form the policy or plan. However, it may be useful for other purposes, such as giving the planner insight into the degree of success, the repercussions, or side effects of the policy or plan.

In his capacity as a professional planner, the responsibilities of the position may include the formulating and presentation of alternative proposals; the setting and enforcing of standards; the implementation of policies and programs; and the allocation of resources. To fulfill many of these functions, it may benefit the planner to be aware of changing trends, and various approaches to the subject.

In housing, it is often the planner who sets and applies standards and regulations pertaining to zoning by-laws, land use contracts, and sub-division regulations. Knowledge of the needs and values of households, both physical and psycho-cultural,
may be important for purposes of setting and approving dwelling unit types, tenure, size, quality and cost.

The planner is also frequently concerned with the pattern of land use within the urban area and the region. Information concerning the needs and desires of households for housing itself and other land uses, such as commercial and recreational, may be considered by the planner in land use allocation. This information may influence the kind, number, size and placement of housing developments and amenities. It may also influence a decision to zone areas as exclusively residential, or in combination with other uses.

Scope of Study

This study will focus on the North American family and their housing. Information on the family which influences their housing requirements and attitudes will be drawn from the sociologist's analysis of the family's purpose, goal and functions. In order to illustrate changes in our society a comparison between contemporary and earlier characteristics of families and their housing will be included. A literature review of the housing behavior and expressed preferences of the contemporary household will also be presented. It is recognized that the population is composed of individual households which differ in their composition, ethnic background, income, needs and preferences. For purposes of this study,
however, emphasis will be placed when possible on the urban nuclear family, particularly of the middle class.

This paper does not claim to be an exhaustive study of all the pertinent aspects of the family and their housing. Only selected factors of the sociologist's analysis of the North American family which are pertinent to housing, will be surveyed. The influences on the physical form of domestic architecture are also restricted to the social ones. The discussion of the family's housing is also limited to aspects of the design which reflect the family's attitude to housing and their functional requirements. An attempt has been made to refer to the most recent literature. In some instances, however, the most thorough investigations were undertaken several years ago and are now considered as "classic" studies. Often these earlier references are still pertinent as their results are confirmed in more recent studies of a smaller scale.

Many of the statistics quoted in this paper are from census information from the governments of the United States of America and Canada. In other cases the data are from individual research studies from independent organizations or institutions, primarily in the United States of America, as well as some from Canada.
Organization and Source of Information

The organization of the remainder of this paper will be as follows: Chapter II, "The Family," will describe the origin, structure, purpose, goal and functions of the early North American family, which will be compared with the structure, purpose, goal and functions of the contemporary North American family. A brief survey of the causes of change in the family will be included. The source of this sociological information is from recent books, written by leading authorities on the family, which are used either as texts or recommended books for university courses on this subject.

In Chapter III, "The Family's Housing," a brief outline of the social history of the major North American architectural periods, with emphasis on the society's attitude to nature and their immediate physical environment, is included. The physical attributes of the North American house, such as shape, plan, size, exterior and interior design, and equipment will be described for the early North American house, the three major transitional periods and the contemporary house. An attempt will be made to relate the characteristics of the family, noted in Chapter II, to the attributes of the house. Again, the source of information is textbooks or recommended books which are used in university courses dealing with the historical styles of domestic architecture from both a functional and aesthetic point of view.
Chapter IV, "The Family's Housing Behavior and Expressed Preferences," will describe the type of dwelling unit design and tenure found to be characteristic of contemporary families throughout the family life cycle. This chapter will focus on the physical and social qualities of the residential environment with which today's families have stated satisfaction or dissatisfaction, or for which they have expressed a preference. The literature concerned with the causes of residential mobility and the criteria sought in a dwelling unit, and the literature on the features desired in the ownership of a single family detached house will be reviewed. The sources of this information are from sociological and planning journals, research reports from public and private institutions, and books recommended in university planning and geography courses.

In the concluding Chapter V, "Implications for Planning," some implications for planning a more suitable residential environment for the contemporary family in an urban area will be noted, as well as certain subject matters for which research could be undertaken by planners. Attention will be given to the housing needs related to the sociological changes in the family which have occurred in recent years; the stated causes of housing satisfaction and dissatisfaction; and expressed preferences of the family for their dwelling unit.

**Definition of Terms**

**House**

This term refers to the physical structure and the
three-dimensional organization of the interior space in which a household carries out certain functions (Parsons, 1968a, 40). Facilities for activities such as eating, sleeping, sanitation, rest and recreation are provided (Moore, 1968, 48; Seeley et al, 1956, 43). In itself, it is an artifact and in addition serves as a repository of artifacts (Seeley et al, 1956, 43).

Home

The concept of home is formed through family experiences and memories that are related to a house (Blood, 1972, 241). The emotional environment associated with "home" provides individuals with many qualities required for their needs of both a private and public nature (Agan and Luchsinger, 1965, 4).

Household

The term household refers to all persons living in a common residence. It may include persons unrelated by blood, marriage or adoption (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 15).

Nuclear Family

This term refers to a kinship unit of two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption who occupy a common residence (Kirkpatrick 1955, 15). The North American nuclear family is usually composed of parents and children (Greenfield, 1969, 251).
Extended Family

An extended family is a kinship unit of persons from three or more generations who are related by blood, marriage or adoption, and who occupy a common residence (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 24).

Value or Value Orientations

These are rank-ordered principles, basic to an individual or group, which are guidelines for human behavior, and therefore tend to establish the direction in which action is taken (Beyer, 1959, 5; Kluckhohn and Strodbeck, 1961, 341; Michelson, 1970b, 131). They are based on such factors as an individual's ideals, motives and tastes which are determined by cultural background, education, habits and experiences (Beyer et al, 1955, 49).

Attitude

An attitude may be defined as "...an idea charged with emotion which predisposes a class of actions to a particular class of social situations" (Triandis, 1971, 2). They are learned or implicit predispositions to respond in an evaluative manner, which tend to change over time (Beyer, 1959, 5; Osgood, 1957, 189).

Preference

A preference is an aspect of behavior which, although
based on an individual's range of experience, may not be justified on the basis of any commonly accepted standards or moral judgments. They also tend to change over time (Beyer, 1959, 5).

**Behavior or Action**

An individual's behavior or action is usually a compromise between values, attitudes and other aspects of a real-life situation in which one kind of activity is stressed as opposed to another (Beyer, 1959, 5; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, 29; Osgood, 1957, 199).
CHAPTER II

THE FAMILY

Introduction

Changes within our society have resulted in noteworthy changes in family structure, the purpose, goals and functions of the family and the roles of family members (Parsons, 1968a, 36; Klemer, 1970, 19). Because the family unit as an institution is small and flexible, it can shift as society changes, and can adapt to new conditions with remarkable rapidity. The family from its beginnings has undergone change, but the rate of change has increased in modern times (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 447). Duvall notes that families have changed more in recent generations than in any previous century in recorded history (Duvall, 1967, 53).

Changes in the family as an institution are associated with changes in their housing requirements, and also in the attitude of the family to the dwelling unit. Due to the fact that these changes are usually gradual and continuous, it has been noted in Chapter I that it is necessary periodically to study these changes so that the planner may more accurately assess the family's needs for housing.

In North America, the representative family has changed from a rural one, to an urban one, as documented later in this
chapter. There has thus been a change, during transitional years, from the control of the mores of a predominantly rural society, with the influence of Puritan values, to an urban, industrial society, with a different way of life. The representative house for the family has also changed from the rural farmhouse to the urban dwelling (Foote et al, 1960, 83).

Some changes, due to industrialization during the twentieth century, are as follows: There has been: a drastic reduction in the family's self-sufficiency as a producing and consuming entity (Parsons, 1968a, 36); a decline in the authority of husbands and fathers; an increase in the number of wives and mothers working for pay outside of the home; an increase in individualism and freedom of family members (Klemer, 1970, 20); a reallocation of family roles; an increase in leisure time; an improvement in education; an increase in family financial resources; and demographic changes such as a younger age at marriage (Duvall, 1967, 67).

In addition, some functions of early families have remained, while most of these functions have been weakened or lost. The loss of functions from the family, however, does not mean that they have been lost to society. Over the years there have been changes in which functions have been transferred, in varying degrees, to other institutions. One function that has remained with the family is that of supplying or replacing members of society (Martinson, 1970, 110). Another
function which is still primarily one of the family's is that of preparing children socially to take their place in society (Martinson, 1970, 110). An example of a function that has been almost entirely lost is that of protection and security. A large part of the educational function has also been transferred from the home to public and private institutions from the nursery school to the university level (Ogburn, 1968, 60).

For the purpose of illustrating changes in the family in this paper, the rural North American family of the 1800's, and the urban family of the mid-twentieth century will be discussed. Although the changes in the family are continuous, and usually occur by small increments over a period of time, for the purpose of clarity it is often more pertinent to view change which is in greater contrast.

It is felt that the discussion of today's family with the family of previous generations is valid in North America because vestiges of the earlier periods still remain in certain geographical areas. Many North Americans are also only one or two generations removed from rural and transitional families, and so have knowledge of this way of life. Moreover, many North Americans have romanticized our rural heritage, and now value and idealize many aspects of the rural way of life of their ancestors (Foote et al, 1960, 84). It is common for each generation to look back with nostalgia at the past generations and idealize the family life of their predecessors.
Sociologist William Goode calls the rural North American family "the classical family of Western nostalgia," since, when studying the family historically, few examples of the "classical" stereotype can be found (Schlesinger, 1964, 4, 5). Other myths are the ideal of the self-sufficient yeoman farmer and the agrarian village (Donaldson, 1969, 110, 113).

One of today's images of the past rural life which has been idealized may be described as follows:

"There are lots of happy children, and many kinfolk live together in a large, rambling house. Everyone works hard. Most of the food to be eaten during the winter is grown, preserved, and stored on the farm. The family members repair their own equipment, and in general the household is economically self-sufficient....Father is stern and reserved, and has the final decision in all important matters. Life is difficult, but harmonious because everyone knows his task and carries it out.... Though the parents do not arrange their children's marriages, the elders do have the right to reject a suitor and have a strong hand in the final decision. After marriage, the couple lives harmoniously, either near the boy's parents or with them, for the couple is slated to inherit the farm...." (Schlesinger, 1964, 5).

It is noted that, although some of the above characteristics were typical of most families, there were very few families which would fulfill this image described by Schlesinger (Schlesinger, 1964, 5).

In order to illustrate some changes which have taken place in families, a brief survey of the early North American family will be undertaken. This family will then be used as
a reference to discuss changes in the contemporary family. Emphasis will be placed on the changing structure, purpose, goals and functions of families which have pertinence to housing attitudes, needs and desires.

Early North American Family

A. Origin

The exploration and early settling of North America was undertaken by the peoples of Western Europe. Along the eastern coast of what is now the United States of America and Canada, these activities were undertaken predominantly by the French, English and Dutch. Although their national cultures were diverse, there was a common medieval tradition which they all shared. As the majority of the settlers were from the middle, and lower classes, they were more familiar with the feudal world of the serfs, rather than that of the lords. The settlers, therefore, brought with them a much simpler, more direct and more elementary response to their human condition (Gowans, 1964, 3).

B. Purpose of the Family

The typical early North American family was a rural one, with a predominantly agricultural economic base. It was nearly always a self-sufficient and extremely co-operative unit which operated within a materialistic and practical setting. This family was self-sufficient in that such basic
needs as those for food, clothing, shelter, recreation, education, religion, medical care, socialization and protection of family members were fulfilled largely within the home (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 38). At a later time, when some agencies and institutions, such as schools, which today are included in municipal plans by planners, were a part of the rural community, the family still raised, processed and made much of what they needed in the home (Duval, 1967, 58).

For the early North American family, the materialistic needs referred to above were those required for survival. This materialistic setting, therefore, necessitated the production of goods and the provision of services by the family itself, as well as the subsequent consumption (Duval, 1967, 58).

In order to fulfill these needs adequately, the active participation and full co-operation of all family members was required. The dependence of the early North American family on itself for survival required, in addition, a setting in which materialism and practicality were highly valued. These values were reflected in the basis of a marriage which was primarily economic. As a result, mate selection was usually concerned with such practical considerations of the men and women as whether or not they had a sturdy constitution and good working habits. The ability of the woman to perform household duties such as preserving and cooking foods, and making clothes was of prime importance (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 35, 37-39).
The birth of many children was characteristic and was viewed as an economic asset. The high birth rate resulted in part from inadequate knowledge of birth control. However, a high birth rate was desirable to offset a high death rate and also to provide an adequate labor supply. This last reason for producing children was of prime importance because of the necessity of survival in an economy where there was little mechanization (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 44).

Because of the economic basis for marriage and child raising, family members were treated somewhat as commodities. Their worth was based on how much they could produce, and, therefore, their ability to contribute to the family's economic well-being (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 44).

Another characteristic of the early rural family that is related to the economic aspect of their survival is the extended family nature of the household. This form of household is comprised of three or more generations of relatives (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 24). Although the practical reason for enlarging the number of household members in this way was to supply labor, the younger generations also felt a duty to support aging, infirm and unmarried members of their kin (Kephart, 1966, 251). Even if these additional members of the family were unable to supply labor for farm or home production activities, they were frequently capable of tending young children, or performing less rigorous tasks (Kephart, 1966, 251). With respect to planning, the decreasing size of today's
family, which is infrequently an extended form, has implications for a decreasing size of house (Winnick, 1957, 72, 80).

Thus, the primary purpose of the family was an economic one as members supplied labor for the operation of the farm and household activities from which were produced the resources for their own survival.

C. Goal of the Family

In the traditional early North American family, there was an orientation toward familistic values and goals, rather than individualistic ones. This pattern required the subordination of the individual to the welfare of the family unit. In other words, the individual's interests were secondary to the interests of the family as a whole. To ensure that the goals of the family as a whole were fulfilled, it was necessary for the family to assign well-defined goals to each family member. As a result, the roles of family members were also clearly defined (Kephart, 1966, 474, 477, 478; Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 37, 39, 40).

Even though the early North American family emphasized family aspirations, and a feeling of unity often developed which was based on economic ties (Winch, 1952, 474) and personal loyalties, the family was usually not a democratic institution. Most often the power to make decisions and pass judgment, i.e., the power to rule, was in the hands of one person who demanded immediate obedience and allowed little
freedom. This power to rule was usually given to the eldest male who was then looked upon as the head of the household (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 40).

D. Functions of the Family

The family varies from most other functioning institutions in that it carries out a great variety of activities which are characterized by diffuseness rather than specificity (Martinson, 1970, 110). Another difference is that the family carries on activities and functions for several groups since the family serves its own members, other persons, and society as a whole (Martinson, 1970, 110).

1. Economic Function

During the early history of North America, when both countries were largely agricultural, the farm family came close to being a self-sufficient economic unit (Winch, 1952, 474). As an economic unit, they were a producing unit (Kephart 1966, 231), with the family consuming what they produced (Ogburn, 1960, 59). Thus, in this rural family, where the labor for production was supplied by the family, all the members were economically interdependent (Winch, 1952, 474).

2. Status - Conferring Function

Since a member of a family was less an individual and more a member of a family, and due to the fact that family
members were usually economically interdependent, the family became the center of prestige and, therefore, gave status to its members (Ogburn, 1968, 59). Of considerable importance was the perpetuation of the family name, lineage and property rights (Kephart, 1966, 474, 477; Ogburn, 1968, 59). Most families also stayed for generations on the same piece of land and hence had an opportunity to establish a reputation in the community based on the family's property accumulation. The family was also integrated by the bond of common interest in tangible property. The transmission of the property was an important aspect of the status-conferring function as there was pride in the possessions accumulated by generations (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 133). During this period in which property inheritance was important, there was little residential mobility since members of a younger generation remained with their parents as an extended family, rather than establishing a household of their own, which is characteristic of the contemporary family (Glick, 1957, 31). This change in attitude and behavior thus has implications for the planner in the provision of an adequate number of dwelling units and suitable design features.

3. Educational Function

In the early North American family, education was considered to be a function of the home (Kephart, 1966, 249). Because of the economic function of home production of the
necessities of life and their consumption, the educational emphasis was vocational (Ogburn, 1966, 59). A boy was expected to follow his father's footsteps in agricultural endeavors, and a girl her mother's duties in domestic science (Kephart, 1966, 249; Ogburn, 1968, 59). In addition to teaching the secular aspects of education, the family assumed almost total responsibility for the moral education of the children (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 466). For the early North American family, therefore, the provision of schools, for which planners are now involved, was not particularly important compared to their significance by today's parents (Duvall, 1967, 60).

4. Religious Function

Religious training and observance was also a family function, many aspects of which usually took place in the home. The home thus often served as a kind of adjunct to the church, with family prayers, Bible reading, teaching of the catechism, hymn-singing, and grace before meals (Kephart, 1966, 250; Ogburn, 1968, 59). Attendance at church was also a family activity (Kephart, 1966, 250). It was thus important for husbands, wives and other family members to belong to the same church (Ogburn, 1968, 59). Since church attendance and religious observations were particularly important to the early North American society, the church in the community or town was usually given a prominent location by the townspeople (Gowans, 1964, 96; Gowans, 1966, 36).
5. **Recreational Function**

The home was also the center of recreational activities since few outside diversions were available (Kephart, 1966, 250). Moreover, there was often little time for any recreational pursuits since work took up most of the daylight hours. What entertainment there was usually took place in the home, to be enjoyed by the family as a whole (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 468). Family members were usually the only available participants (Kephart, 1966, 250). Recreational pursuits were usually of an active nature, and included such activities as singing, dancing and games of various kinds (Kephart, 1966, 250). What community recreation there was usually was home centered as it took place at the residence of some other family (Ogburn, 1968, 59). Besides having little discretionary time, community recreation was restricted further due to the fact that transportation was poor and time consuming (Kephart, 1966, 250).

6. **Protective and Security Function**

In the early family, individuals relied on family members for their physical protection, security for the infirm and care in times of sickness and old age (Kephart, 1966, 251). It was usually the responsibility of the father to protect the family from intruders, either human or animal (Klemer, 1970, 27, 28). The home was also the source of medical services (Kephart, 1966, 251) as it was customarily the responsibility
of the mother to prepare and administer remedies for the ill, and to protect the family against disease (Klemer, 1970, 28). It was also in the home of their mature children that parents, in their older years, found comfort and care (Ogburn, 1968, 59). Public services such as police and fire protection and hospitals, therefore, were seldom considered by a community, as they are now by planners of municipalities and regional districts (Lynch, 1962, 143).

Causes of Change in the Family

As an explanation for the changes which have taken place in the family, Kirkpatrick has suggested that the family has been affected by, and has responded to scientific, technological and economic changes (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 136). Ogburn notes that the changes in the family may be traced largely to inventions using steam as power, since steam power made possible the cities, factories, improved transportation, mass production and specialization (Ogburn, 1968, 60). Lantz and Snyder also cite the spread of democracy as an influence on change in the family (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 49).

With industrialization, the production of goods was transferred from the home environment to that of the factory. This differentiation of work from the family has been recognized as one of the fundamental influences on the evolution of the contemporary family (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1968, 55). For example, the industrial family, in comparison to the rural
family, seldom is the work unit, since family members independently seek employment outside the home. As a result, the power over the work lives of family members has been almost totally transferred from the family authoritarian to such persons outside the family as a foreman or manager. Furthermore, the authoritarian frequently lost control over his own work situation, since unless he established his own business, he was employed by other persons who gave directions. Of importance to planners has been the separation of work from the home, since areas of the municipality are zoned for special uses, such as residential, commercial, and industrial. The need for transportation routes between land uses has also involved planners (Lynch, 1962, 37-48).

Attitudes towards families also tended to be challenged and often changed when members were exposed to new and different social patterns in their work environment (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 46, 47). William Goode feels that crucial points of pressure on the traditional family structure from industrialization are as follows: First, industrialization usually necessitates the physical movement from one locality to another, thus decreasing the frequency and intimacy of contact among family members. In addition, industrialization creates class-differential mobility by which one or more family members move rapidly upward while the others do not. As a result, there are usually discrepancies in style of life which make family contacts less easy and pleasant. Thirdly,
industrialization creates a value structure that recognizes achievement more than birth. Because of this, each family member must make his own way (Goode, 1968, 115). The above class-differential mobility which may occur within families often results in certain family members living in a different residential environment. The various qualities of a residential area may be influenced by planning by-laws regulating the size of lot, set-backs for the dwelling unit, and dwelling unit size and height. In some instances, the value of the dwelling unit and materials may also be set by by-laws (Lynch, 1962, 20). The ownership of a single family dwelling by a nuclear family is also considered as a source and indicator of prestige by many households, as noted in Chapter IV of this paper.

With improved technology and mechanization, many of the duties performed by the family, such as cooking and cleaning, have been simplified. As a result, the family, when freed from performing many chores, could apply the extra time and energy to other aspects of family living. One result is the development of an interest in the needs of the individual (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 46, 47). As will be noted later in this chapter, there has been an increase in the amount of discretionary time for individual family members, which is often spent in the pursuit of recreational activities, particularly ones outside of the house. The planner is thus involved with the allocation of recreational areas and resources
within a municipality and also at the regional level.

The increased urbanization of North America has also influenced changes in the family. Beyer points out that in a period of one hundred and seventy years the United States of America has changed from a nation made up almost entirely of farmers to one which is primarily urban. He states that in 1790, five per cent of the population could be considered urban, while in 1960, seventy per cent were urban (Beyer, 1965, 87, 88). A similar change from rural to urban is noted in Canada. Census data give the level of urbanization in Canada in 1851 as less than fifteen per cent. This level had increased to about thirty-five per cent by 1901, and had passed fifty per cent by 1931. By 1961, the degree of urbanization in Canada had reached seventy per cent (Stone, 1967, 33). Along with the change from rural to urban, there has been an expanded role for the planner in the development and growth of urban areas (Mumford, 1961, 448).

Integrally related to the development and growth of cities has been the transfer of some functions from the family to other public and private institutions. With the grouping together of large numbers of families and individuals in a limited geographical area, it was beneficial to the safety and economic aspects of a community to provide some services on a community basis. Examples pertinent to planning and the family are the provision of water and sewage services. In addition, services for protection, such as police and fire,
were previously provided by the family. Today, of course, it is expected that these services will be provided by the community. The highly specialized nature of some functions, such as education and recreation, has also brought about the transfer of most aspects of these functions from the family. Also, with a population which is more concentrated in space, it is more feasible for institutions outside of the family to assume responsibility for these functions. Today, it is usually specialists who provide these services with sophisticated equipment in special buildings or areas. Again, it becomes customary to have these functions provided for the family by non-family members, including planners (Cavan, 1969, 524).

The spread of democratic values, accompanied by increased strength of democracy at the political level, has also been an influence in changing attitudes toward the family and in weakening functions at the family level. As individual family members moved within the urban area, they interacted with persons of different backgrounds with different rules of conduct and value systems. As a result, an individual viewed the particular social patterns of his family as only one of many existing patterns (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 47, 49). In some instances, there was a desire for a more equal opportunity for all members of the population. An example is the transfer of the educational function from the family to public institutions provided by the community for all children.
Contemporary North American Family

A. General Changes in the Family

The typical contemporary family earns more than previous families, and the majority of families now secure the basic necessities of life with relative ease. As a result, they live better than ever before (Duvall, 1967, 59).

1. Shift from Production to Consumption

With the changes in economics and production due to industrialization, there has been a change from the making of goods to the earning of money and the buying of goods. In comparison to the early North American family, the contemporary one is essentially a consumption unit. They select, buy and arrange goods made by industries outside the home (Duvall, 1967, 58; Martinson, 1970, 114). The emphasis has thus shifted from "making a living" to "earning a living" (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 123; Winch, 1952, 474). As a result, the self-sufficiency of the family has increased. Accompanying this change in emphasis, there has been a change in the character of the economic bonds among family members. Instead of being economically interdependent, the family has been altered so that now there are the "breadwinners" and the "dependents" (Moore, 1968, 48; Winch, 1952, 474).

With industrialization and our present-day economy there
has also been a shift from the painstaking construction of an article that would last a family for years to the rapid replacement of goods. The earlier philosophy of "make it do" has been replaced by "get the new model" (Duvall, 1967, 59).

Today, the burden of producing things has moved from the farm land and home to the factories. Some families still make some of their goods, but home production is no longer a necessity. Instead, it is usually pursued for the purpose of fulfilling the need for a recreational activity, that is, a hobby. There are some families, however, in which members perform some "do-it-yourself" projects involving home repairs and renovations for the purpose of providing a more satisfactory dwelling unit at a more economical cost (Klemer, 1970, 27; Martinson, 1970, 114).

For the urban wife, in particular, most activities of home production have become optional. With the coming of mechanization during the industrial revolution, it was no longer feasible for women to work in the home to the same degree as it was previously. This was because household handicrafts could no longer compete with goods mass produced by power machinery in the factories (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 123). If home production is now valued, it may not be due to the money saved. More often, it is valued because of a desire to be personally creative or to provide a superior or unique product for family or guests (Martinson, 1970, 114).
2. Work of Women Outside the Home

Another force which has brought about the segregation of work from the family is the more diversified educational opportunities for women (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1968, 56). Previously, girls were trained by their mothers in such skills as sewing, cooking, and other essentials of homemaking. This education was not only for the purpose of imparting technical knowledge, but also for conditioning young girls to the view that household accomplishments were something of which to be proud. But today, to a large extent, both the technical and "attitudinal" aspects of homemaking are ignored at all levels of public education as well as in the home. Today, girls are encouraged to seek a liberal arts education or professional training such as in nursing or teaching. Moreover, many women are being formally educated in the full range of professional disciplines, and are entering a greater variety of occupational positions (Kephart, 1966, 231; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1968, 56). One of the current problems in the family that is becoming increasingly significant is how to reconcile an academic education with the household duties and maternal obligations which confront the average wife (Kephart, 1966, 230; Lantz and Snyder 1969, 309). Kephart points out that:

"... it is one thing to be mentally stimulated by the humanities, the fine arts, the social and physical sciences; it is something else again to find oneself unable to use or enjoy these intellectual benefits because of the press of routine home-making tasks." (Kephart, 1966, 230).
In recent generations, the attitude of society towards the traditional woman as a housewife has also changed. Even though a high level of skill may be required to run a contemporary home properly, the woman who has chosen to devote her life to her family is considered inferior to the woman who also has a career (Kephart, 1966, 229). The contemporary woman, in contrast to her grandmother, is less likely to take pride in housekeeping as a means to status (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 132). Today, then, the term "housewife" has come to signify low status, and a woman is likely to refer to herself in self-deprecation as a mere house-wife (Kephart, 1966, 229; Kirkpatrick, 1955, 132).

Today, however, there are a great number of women in the North American labor force. In particular, there has been a great increase in recent years in the number of married women who are employed outside of the home. One of the contemporary deviations from the traditional pattern of family life is the employment of married women with children (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 124). At the turn of the twentieth century, practically half of the women in the United States never entered paid employment. By the nineteen-fifties, at least nine out of ten women worked outside their homes sometime during their lives. More married women are also employed now than formerly. In 1890, only three out of every ten working women were married, as compared to six out of every ten by the nineteen-fifties. Of the women who are married, in the early nineteen-fifties, three out of
every ten were currently working (Duvall, 1967, 55, 56). In 1953, the proportion of the labor force which was composed of women at working age was 32.4 per cent. Of the female population in 1952, approximately fifty per cent were married. Of the married women, 26.8 per cent were working outside of the home, and 25.3 per cent of these had a husband present (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 124). Between 1950 and 1960, there was an increase from 24.8 per cent to 30 per cent among married women with a husband present who were in the labor force. This was an increase of more than twenty-five per cent within a decade (Parsons, 1968a, 38). There is also a significant number of married women with children who are in the labor force. In 1952, of married working women who had a husband present, 13.9 per cent had children under the age of six, and 20.7 per cent had children under the age of eighteen (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 124).

In Canada, there has also been an increase in the number of married women, with a husband present, who are in the labor force. For example, married women comprised 47.3 per cent of the female labor force in 1961, compared with 56.7 per cent in 1971. It is also found that in 1971 the following percentages of married women at different ages were in the labor force: 33.8 per cent aged 14-19; 46.8 per cent aged 20-24; 35.6 per cent aged 25-34; 36.9 per cent aged 35-44; 35.9 per cent aged 45-54; and 23.3 per cent aged 55-65. Many married women with families, therefore, continue to be employed outside
From these statistics, it is seen that the contemporary North American woman is less often only a housewife and volunteer worker than her predecessors (Parsons, 1968a, 38). There is also somewhat of a cycle for the career of the married woman with children. There is a general tendency for a young wife to work for a few years after she marries. When her first child arrives, she may temporarily leave the labor force, or take a diminished schedule until the child and subsequent children demand less care in the home. By the time the children reach adolescence and are near the launching stage of the family life cycle, the mother may return to work outside the home (Duvall, 1967, 58). It will be noted in Chapter IV that the choice of dwelling unit type, tenure, size and location also tends to follow a pattern which, in part, is influenced by the employment of the wife and the birth and development of children.

It is suggested by some authors that the primary reason for women to work outside the home is an economic one. In some instances, however, the personal satisfaction gained from a job is an important reason. Kirkpatrick states that there is a wish to attain a higher standard of living for themselves and their dependents. As a result of only one wage earner in the family, there is often a low family income in relation to felt needs and desires (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 125). Martinson recommends that the way for the wife to achieve a higher level
of living for her family is not to produce goods in the home, but for her to participate in the labor force and thus to earn a salary (Martinson, 1970, 114). The improved occupational status of women has also been cited by Kephart as an economic source of strength in a marriage. He feels that wives have often reinforced or preserved marriages because of their financial contributions (Kephart, 1966, 229).

The opportunity which women have taken to work outside of the home has also had an effect on the relationship of the wife to her marriage partner. In the past, women were looked upon as being inferior to their spouse (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 49). Now that women are permitted to occupy independent jobs, they have become independent of members of their family, such as a husband, father, or brother, for their very existence (Goode, 1968, 118; Klemer, 1970, 23). In addition to obtaining their own work and controlling the money they earn, women are better able to assert their own rights and wishes within the family (Goode, 1968, 118). Women now have more equal treatment within the family because they have acquired a certain element of power by virtue of their economic contributions to the support of the family. A woman's employment outside of the home has also increased her personal contacts which have, to some extent, released her from the male dominance of the traditional family (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 50, 51).
3. Change in Husband/Wife Roles

One of the consequences of the increased employment of women outside of the home is a change in the roles of family members (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 475). For instance, the role of the male as the wage-earner, protector and representative of the family outside of the home has been altered (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 126). A change in roles has not only permitted wives to take on many roles traditionally reserved for men, but has also made it possible for men to perform and gain gratification from certain traditionally feminine activities such as child care. In the contemporary family, there has been a focus on reallocating familial and occupational roles on the basis of skills and interests (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1968, 56). Accompanying this trend there has been the evolution of more complex and flexible roles for family members both within and outside the home (Duvall, 1967, 61; Martinson, 1970, 117). Today, all family members are more likely to "pitch in" to help another, particularly in emergencies. However, in some instances, such as with the woman's working outside the home, the time span for giving assistance is often prolonged. Today, the husband is usually much more deeply involved in routine tasks and child care than he was in earlier times (Martinson, 1970, 117, 118).

B. Purpose of the Family

For the early North American family, the most formidable problem was that of staying alive. With primitive techniques
and equipment, elementary knowledge of agriculture and limited financial resources, the energies that the family had went into the provision of goods for their physical existence. Therefore, there was an emphasis on the economic aspect of production. After the industrialization and urbanization of North America, less energy and time was required for the direct support of the physical needs of the family. Therefore, today, there is the opportunity for a greater interest in the individual. As a result, the basis for marriage and the family has shifted from an economic one to an interpersonal relationship centering on the satisfaction of personal needs (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 56, 65).

In an urban society, generally characterized by impersonal and often transitory relationships, the family has now placed increased emphasis on fulfilling psychological and sociological needs (Moore, 1968, 48). With the emphasis on personal satisfaction and happiness, the characteristics which individuals seek in a mate have undergone change. Romantic love and emotional interaction are now usually the basis of choice, rather than whether the wife will be a good cook or seamstress (Kirkpatrick 1955, 135; Ogburn, 1968, 61). With marriage now usually based on romantic love, there is also a trend for both husbands and wives to expect more of each other in intangible roles, such as: an understanding companion; a stimulating colleague; and a loving and sympathetic parent (Duvall, 1967, 61). Between marriage partners in
particular, today there is the expectation of a more inclusive companionship than in the traditional rural family. For instance, companionship may be sought with regard to philosophy of life, recreational activities, cultural interests and politics (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 135). Another reason why individuals look to the family for companionship is because of the impersonality of casual contacts with people outside the family. In North America, it is usually within the family that intense human satisfactions are pursued (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 133). Companionship with other family members, which takes place primarily in the dwelling unit, is thus sought as one means of attaining happiness for individual family members.

The home environment, including the physical aspects of the dwelling unit and the neighborhood, which are influenced by planners, are thus important to the family (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 479).

One purpose of the contemporary family is thus to provide for the affectional life of the family members. For society, too, the family is still the only recognized place for the reproduction of children to replace members of the society (Ogburn, 1968, 60). However, today's family is much smaller than that of the early rural North American one. A reason for the decline in size may be that the cost of raising children today is greater than before. When children are regarded from an economic viewpoint, today they are considered an economic liability or a luxury expenditure, rather
than an investment, as in the early family (Kephart, 1966, 166, 248; Moore, 1968, 52; Ogburn, 1968, 62; Winch, 1952, 476). Children now exist not for what they can do to help the family, but rather for themselves as growing persons with rights, privileges and values as uniquely theirs (Duvall, 1967, 64). With smaller families today, which are usually restricted to the nuclear family, there is also a disposition for parents to be more attentive to the needs and desires of their one or two children (Greenfield, 1969, 251; Winch, 1952, 478). Fewer children, therefore, make it possible for each child to have more advantages, such as better food, less illness, and a superior well-being of both a physical and psychological nature (Ogburn, 1968, 62). The emphasis with respect to children has thus been shifted from the quantity of children produced to the quality of children raised (Blood, 1968, 558). For all family members, it is usually no longer enough to make ends meet or to just feed, clothe and supply shelter for a child. Today, more and more families are seeking a higher quality of life for all their members, (Duvall, 1967, 67). It will be noted in Chapter IV that one of the primary reasons for the desire to own a single family detached house is related to the belief that this type of tenure and dwelling unit type is better for children. Thus, for planners, there is a need to provide housing suited to the requirements of households with children.
C. Goal of the Family

In the early North American rural family, the active effort of all family members was required for survival and the improvement of the family's economic situation. As a result, the family's needs had priority over those of an individual. Today, however, in an industrialized and urbanized society where there are more diversified opportunities for each family member, emphasis is placed on the needs, values and goals of the individual (Duvall, 1968, 60; Kephart, 1966, 252; Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 65; Ogburn, 1968, 60). For this type of society, it is necessary for the family to produce achievement-oriented, future-oriented, independent, self-reliant persons. To develop this attitude in a person, the family must permit, and even foster, individualistic expression (Klemer, 1970, 28; Martinson, 1970, 127). Therefore, there has been a change from the group-centered family to a person-centered family, with particular emphasis on a child-centered family (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 64; Martinson, 1970, 127). As a consequence of this change, the family is seen as existing for its members, rather than the members for the family. The contemporary family can be described as a collection of discrete family members, each being served by the family without being unduly restricted by its demands (Martinson, 1970, 127). In the changes in the design of the North American house, which are described in Chapter III, it is seen that, today, privacy for children is desired, as evidenced by a separate bedroom
for each child, and the provision of both a family room and living room, which allows separation of the two generations for recreational purposes.

One goal of the contemporary family is thus to give priority to the individualism of family members. Lantz and Snyder describe this as "the right of a person to be the active agent in soliciting his own interests out of the array of those that are available" (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 52). This means that the individual is freer to pursue the goals that he himself selects, rather than being forced to accept the goals set for him by his family. There is thus often a tendency to think in terms of "what I want" (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 123). Lantz and Snyder point out, however, that individualism is designed to create in the person an awareness of and respect for the rights and dignity of others (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 52).

The individualism of each family member has influenced the life style of the family itself, since the nature of the family is now chosen by its individual members. As a consequence of greater freedom of choice, there tends to be an increased variability of familial behavior (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 135). This diversity in family life style is in contrast to the earlier family which lived according to relatively rigid rules, which were established and maintained by social and moral pressures of the entire society (Duvall, 1967, 61, 65). For instance, today's couple may choose whether to have children
or not; may choose to remain close to the place where they grew up, or move around from place to place; may choose to "live it up" as they go along, and spend all they earn, or save all they can spare for the future (Duvall, 1967, 65). Today, there is thus a greater responsibility on a married couple for their own destiny and degree of satisfaction in their familial relationships (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 135). With regard to planning, there is thus a need for diversity in the type of dwelling unit, size, tenure and location, so there is satisfaction with accommodation for families of various life styles.

Since there is greater freedom for individual persons today, and each one is encouraged to develop himself and to work out his own problems in his own way, there is a greater expectation of personal happiness (Duvall, 1967, 64; Kirkpatrick, 1955, 136). The nature of happiness as a family goal is seen by Seeley and his colleagues as "... a blend of material well-being, success, social status, good physical and mental health," with family life an essential element in the attainment of happiness (Seeley et al, 1956, 218). With the goal of individualism, it is regarded as more important for the person to find happiness than for the family to do so. However, Martinson points out that it is debatable whether or not personal happiness can be achieved at the expense of the family (Martinson, 1970, 129).

With the change from familial goals to those of an
individual, there tends to be a more democratic interaction between family members. The authority in the contemporary family is usually no longer invested in one person. Instead, there is a more democratic approach to decision-making through family discussion (Duvall, 1967, 62). Quite often the power to make decisions and pass judgments is given to the family member, who, in the opinion of a majority of the family, is the most competent in a particular situation. In other words, the authority in a democratic family is delegated on the basis of consensus and competence. With this system, the family member who is most competent in certain matters may not necessarily be the most competent in others. Therefore, authority in this type of family tends to be delegated to more than one person at a time, with each person being responsible for decisions regarding different matters (Lantz and Snyder, 1969, 52).

D. Functions of the Family

During the last years of the nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth century, there have been major changes in the functions of the North American family. In particular, many traditional family functions have been taken over by or are in the process of transfer to other specialized and distinct institutions or agencies, such as the police force and the school, which may involve planners (Cavan, 1969, 524; Kephart, 1966, 247, 248). Many previously home-centered
functions are thus reduced by the participation of family members, either individually or collectively, in organizations whose membership encompasses non-family members, and whose location is normally outside of the home. These specialized organizations also often make competing claims with the family for the time, money and energy resources of family members, since participation is usually individual rather than familial (Moore, 1968, 47).

This transfer of functions is often viewed as a loss of family functions, and regarded as indicative of the breakdown of the family. However, the transfer of functions relieves the family of burdens it cannot cope with in an industrialized and urban environment. This release of functions thus makes possible a more complete fulfillment of functions that are still retained, and the possibility of undertaking new ones (Cavan, 1969, 524).

1. **Economic Function**

Economically, the function of the family has changed, since few families produce anything as an economic unit (Kephart, 1966, 248; Kirkpatrick, 1955, 123). Instead, money is earned to buy the goods and services which provide most of the necessities and luxuries of the average contemporary North American family (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 123). Therefore, the economic function of the family, which was previously based on production, has changed to an economic function based on
consumption (Vincent, 1967, 26).

2. Status-Conferring Function

In the early North American family, a person was more a member of a family and less an individual. Since the reverse is characteristic of the contemporary family, there is a change in the source of prestige and status (Ogburn, 1968, 59). Today, with the emphasis on individualism, the passing on of a family tradition is of less importance to parents than is the freeing of their children to create their own lifestyle (Martinson, 1970, 127). A child is no longer expected to follow in his father's footsteps, but instead is encouraged to find his own interests and talents, and to choose a vocation that is meaningful to him (Duvall, 1967, 64, 65). With this attitude of society, personal achievement is frequently recognized more than family name (Goode, 1968, 115). It is thus generally true in North America that the occupational system is the major source of prestige and status for the family (Winch, 1952, 476).

It is also characteristic of many contemporary families that personal achievement replaces collective pride in possessions that have been accumulated for generations. As a consequence, the family is less integrated by the bond of a common interest in tangible property, such as a family homestead (Kirkpatrick, 1955, 133). Today, too, the inheritance of property often tends to occur when the offspring have
reached the peak of their own earnings. Therefore, property inheritance seldom assists the young family, who often have limited financial resources and could benefit from receiving an inheritance. This timing occurs because offspring now marry and bear their children at an earlier age and parents have long life expectancies (Moore, 1968, 51).

Even at times when help is needed, particularly of a financial nature, the contemporary family will less frequently seek support from other family members. If money is offered from parents, the children of today often renounce this economic assistance. This attitude relates to the feeling that individuals should be responsible for their own destiny (Goode, 1968, 115; Kirkpatrick, 1955, 135).

3. Educational Function

For the contemporary family, the formal, secular and moral educational relationships between parents and their children, which previously took place in the home, have declined (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 466; Kirkpatrick, 1955, 132). One reason for the decline is that in a technological age very few parents are able to prepare their children for the vocations in which they will earn their living (Klemer, 1970, 27). Moreover, in North America, by the twentieth century, free public education was one of the major building blocks of democracy (Kephart, 1966, 249). As a result, formal education has been turned over to the various levels and types of schools,
and to employers (Klemer, 1970, 27). However, the educational function has not simply been transferred from the home to the school, as there has been a major change in the magnitude of educational activity (Moore, 1968, 48). The educational institutions may now offer such services as guidance counselling, medical and dental examinations, and psychological and psychiatric assistance as well as clubs and workshops (Kephart, 1966, 249). The length of today's educational experience is also prolonged for most individuals. In recent years, there has also been the expansion of education into the preschool level. There has been an increasing number of nursery schools, which now take children of younger ages out of the home. The family has thus had much of its responsibility for the training of the child during the early years of his life reduced. However, the family is still important in transmitting basic habits of language, manners and morals (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 467, 468; Kirkpatrick, 1955, 132).

4. Religious Function

In contemporary North American society, religion does not seem to be as important in family matters as in the early family (Ogburn, 1969, 59). Today, if a child receives any religious training, it is primarily from the church, rather than in the home (Klemer, 1970, 27). Therefore, religious training is usually devoid of any family connotation. In addition, it is now less customary for a family, as a whole,
to be the unit of church participation (Kephart, 1966, 250).

5. **Recreational Function**

The pursuit of recreational and other leisure time activities is a former familial and home-centered function which has diminished as a family function in contemporary society.

For the early North American family, there was usually little time available for recreational pursuits. However, with industrialization, there has been an increase in the amount of leisure time (Kephart, 1966, 250). During the twentieth century, there has been a significant decrease in the number of hours worked each week. This has been reduced from approximately sixty hours a week to often less than forty hours a week. Accompanying this reduction, there has been an increase in the length of vacations (Duvall, 1967, 59; Klemer, 1970, 28; Moore, 1969, 48). In addition to acquiring more discretionary time, the contemporary family also has more money to spend than most of their predecessors (Duvall, 1967, 59; Klemer, 1970, 28; Martinson, 1970, 129). Another change during the twentieth century which has affected the family's recreational function is the improvement and increased availability of both private and public transportation (Kephart, 1966, 250; Klemer, 1970, 28).

The attitude of the family towards recreational activities and entertainment has also undergone change. Formerly,
through family participation, they produced most of their own entertainment and made their own recreational facilities.

Today, however, recreation and entertainment is regarded as a service which is bought. As a consequence, entertainment, for the most part, is passive in nature. That is, people are spectators, rather than participants. Today, then, catering to leisure time pursuits is a giant business, since commercial enterprises supply forms of amusement broad enough to meet a variety of demands (Kephart, 1966, 250, 251). In addition, commercial enterprises usually cater to large numbers of people at the same time (Cavan, 1969, 525). For instance, there are theatres, movies, operas, symphony concerts, race tracks, bowling alleys, swimming pools, skating rinks, golf courses, bridge clubs and many other facilities and activities (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 468; Kephart, 1966, 250). Today, there is also an increasing trend for community agencies, such as park boards, schools and art galleries, to sponsor organized recreational programs (Cavan, 1969, 525). More opportunities for recreational pursuits, such as skiing, fishing, hunting, boating, swimming, water skiing and camping, are also provided by various levels of government and private enterprises, and frequently involve planners, particularly in the allocation of space and resources.

It is interesting to note that today's North American families pursue leisure time activities "with a vengeance." Studies indicate that attendance at sporting and other enter-
tainment events is high, and vast expenditures of money are made for the equipment and services required to perform many activities (Duvall, 1967, 61; Klemer, 1970, 28; Martinson, 1970, 129).

The increase in leisure time available to the contemporary family has increased the potential for familial or at least home-centered activity (Moore, 1968, 48, 49). However, leisure time activities have spread far beyond the family and the home, since more family members seek these pursuits from commercial enterprises (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 468; Cavan, 1969, 525; Kirkpatrick, 1955, 132; Klemer, 1970, 28). Klemer notes that "various family studies have indicated that the "most enjoyable" recreation for the family is recreation outside the home" (Klemer, 1970, 28). In addition, today the participation of the family as a group is minimized (Kephart, 1966, 251). One reason is because the family is usually a residual claimant on the time of its members who have various extrafamilial obligations to outside organizations whose schedules are seldom synchronized with that of the family (Moore, 1968, 49, 50). Also, even though an individual may spend a significant portion of his discretionary time in some activity within the bounds of the home, several family members in the home at the same time may not be spending that time together (Moore, 1968, 49). For instance, they may be viewing different television programs, each with a different set in separate rooms, or they may be pursuing separate hobbies.
Another reason for the decrease in family participation as a group is the increased emphasis on individual independence and personal achievement. As a consequence, the different age groups within the family tend to segregate themselves, and associate most frequently with their peer group during discretionary time periods (Moore, 1968, 50). As previously mentioned, in the contemporary North American house there is often a separate bedroom for each child, and also both a family room and a living room for entertainment and recreational activities. An indicator of the tendency for young contemporary parents to engage in social activities outside of the home, and on an adult rather than a total family basis, is the rapid rise in the use of babysitters in recent years (Moore, 1968, 51).

6. Protective and Security Function

In a comparison between the early North American and the contemporary families, it is found that some aspects of the protective and security function have been lost, some diminished, while one aspect has been greatly strengthened.

Today, for instance, the various levels of government supply police protection, and it is customary for communities to have professional or volunteer fire departments (Kephart, 1966, 251). Thus, the family has lost these aspects of our physical protection.

Health protection and care by family members is an aspect
which has been reduced, since it is now shared with a number of agencies. For instance, public health agencies provide for control of contagious disease and conformity to sanitary standards; schools provide physical education programs, and often medical and dental inspections, and nutritious lunches; various types of public and private hospitals care for the ill and infirm; and doctors and nurses with many specialities assume responsibility for the diagnosis and treatment of the ill (Cavan, 1969, 525; Kephart, 1966, 251). For many North American families and for most Canadian families today, there is also the assurance that medical care can be financially afforded. This is because today there are governmental and private, individual or group insurance plans which cover either hospital care, doctors' fees, or both. In many instances, membership in these plans is compulsory. Even if an individual or family has insufficient funds to pay the insurance premiums, medical care is usually subsidized or paid entirely by the government, a welfare or social agency (Cavan, 1969, 526,527).

The obligation of mature children to provide security for their parents has also diminished. Quite often there is a view that assistance should be provided if urgently needed, but only without serious sacrifice to one's "own" family. It is thus customary today for the aged to maintain their own residence, if it is at all feasible (Moore, 1968, 52). It has become customary in North America, particularly in recent years, for accommodation to be planned and built specifically for the use of senior citizens. Three movements have developed
in recent years which help to provide individuals with sufficient funds for living. One development is toward compulsory savings, for instance through a private or government pension plan, or both. A second development is toward the assumption by employers of financial responsibilities toward their employees, not only during periods when they are working, but also during periods of unemployment and after retirement. A third development is direct relief from the government upon reaching a designated age, or evidence of need (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 466; Cavan, 1969, 525, 526; Moore, 1968, 52).

The one aspect of this function which has been greatly strengthened in the contemporary urban society is the feeling of individual security which is based on a sense of belonging (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 470; Martinson, 1970, 127). The security given by the family may take the simple form of providing food, clothing and shelter. Frequently, though, the family also provides security based on emotional involvement. Therefore, familial relationships are important in the security function since they tend to fulfill an individual's need for affection, love, solace, comfort and acceptance (Klemer, 1970, 29; Martinson, 1970, 127; Winch, 1952, 479). The importance of the house and the home environment, where companionship and other aspects of the security function are sought, has been previously mentioned.
Summary

Changes in family structure, the purpose, goals and functions have occurred over time, along with the change from a rural to an urban society. The early North American family, which was an extended one, emphasized economic aspects related to the production of goods and services necessary for their survival. This emphasis was reflected in the criteria for mate selection, which stressed having a sturdy constitution and good work habits. The goal of the family was a familistic one, meaning that the interests of the family were of prime importance. In this type of family, the roles of family members were well defined, and authority was given to one person, usually the eldest male. The functions required by the family were supplied primarily by family members in the home environment.

The contemporary North American family, now usually a nuclear one, varies from the earlier form in that its economic importance is based on the consumption of goods and services which are produced outside of the home. Since production is no longer so important, the criteria of mate selection has changed. Now the choice of a marriage partner stresses romantic love and companionship. In addition, the goals of the family have changed. Instead of a group-centered family, there is a person-centered family with the emphasis on individualism rather than familism. Today, the family
is more oriented to the personal needs and desires of each member, but to the child in particular. There is also a greater importance placed on achieving happiness. Few traditional roles of family members are maintained. The family is also a more democratic institution since family members designate authority on the basis of consensus and competence. Many aspects of the former functions of the family have been transferred in varying degrees to other institutions and agencies which are outside of the home. Parsons notes that there is the

"...beginning of the relative stabilization of a new type of family structure, in a new relation to a general social structure, one in which the family is more specialized than before, but not in any general sense less important, because the society is dependent more exclusively on it for the performance of certain of its vital functions."

(Parsons, 1968b, 100)
CHAPTER III
THE FAMILY'S HOUSING

Introduction

In the previous chapter, changes that have occurred in the characteristics of the family as an institution in our society were described. Since the characteristics of the family's house have also changed over time, a similar survey of domestic architecture will be undertaken in this chapter. The characteristic houses of the early North American family of the mid-seventeenth century to the early eighteenth century will be described, as well as the houses of the contemporary family of the twentieth century. Also included is a survey of the domestic architectural styles during the transitional years between the two forms of families in the above time periods. The period of the eighteenth century and the nineteenth century includes the most typical architectural styles of the transitional years during which the characteristics of the early North American family were dominant. The housing characteristics of the transitional period from the mid-nineteenth century to the early twentieth century are examined in more detail than the earlier transitional years. This period is important as it was during these later years that rapid growth in industrialization and urbanization, which have been responsible for the greatest changes in the family, took place. It was, therefore, during these years that many
of the features which characterize the twentieth century began to appear more strongly.

Although several forms of dwelling unit type, such as single family detached, or row housing may be alternatives for the family during some of the architectural periods, the survey in this paper is restricted to a description of the single family detached house. Frequently, the architectural historians are primarily concerned with the most outstanding examples of domestic architecture of a specific period, which are usually the houses of the wealthy families. In general, however, the basic characteristics of a particular style are evident in the houses of all but the lowest classes of the society. In this paper, therefore, the description of the various architectural styles is pertinent to the houses of the middle class families, unless noted otherwise.

In surveying the various periods of North American housing, the characteristics described will include the physical attributes such as shape, size, plan, exterior and interior design, and equipment, as well as the attitude towards functionalism, the source of the architectural design, and the source of labor for construction.

To understand why certain forms of housing are popular for awhile and then change, it is necessary to know more about the society than just the architectural characteristics of their buildings. Gowans stresses that "Affected by economic conditions, social structure, climate, technology, religious
beliefs, and tides of fashionable taste ... architecture ... is history in its most tangible form" (Gowans, 1964, xiv). House forms thus grow from and express the fundamental character, beliefs and aspirations of the particular people who made them and lived in them. Preceding a description of each style of housing, therefore, is a brief discussion of the social history of the period. Emphasis has been placed on the society's attitude to nature and their immediate environment, which includes the house. Through this discussion an attempt is made to provide reasons which justify a particular form of housing as the style considered valid by the families of the period. With this information the planner can thus evaluate various characteristics of housing in terms of their validity as an expression of a family's beliefs, and with respect to the psychological and physical needs of the resident households.

While there is little information directly relating the characteristics of the family to the design of the house, the following discussion is intended to outline some of these relationships.

**Early North American Housing**

**A. Medieval House - Mid Seventeenth Century to Early Eighteenth Century**

As mentioned in Chapter II, the majority of the settlers to the eastern coast of the United States and Canada were from
the middle and lower classes of European society. From the "folk" level, they brought with them an outlook which was primarily medieval. Therefore, the medieval world which produced great cathedrals, illuminated manuscripts, esoteric treatises on divine geometry, and the cosmic nature of beauty was largely unknown to them. The art and architecture of these settlers was that of the late Gothic styles of Western Europe even though this style was already outmoded in the aristocratic population of their home countries. The emigrants to the North American colonies could thus aspire to equal the farmhouses and houses of the towns from which most of them came. This is due to the fact that their architectural taste was established by seeing the buildings that surrounded them as they grew up, and which they lived in and loved as home (Gowans, 1964, 3, 109, 110; Gowans, 1966, 12, 14, 15; Mendelowitz, 1960, 66, 67; Morrison, 1969, 5, 6).

With respect to their architecture in the new settlement, the early families not only lacked the time, the skill, the architectural knowledge, the materials, and the money to duplicate the great Gothic and new Renaissance buildings of their homelands; they lacked even the desire (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 532).

The general attitude of Medieval society toward nature was that it existed for man's use, but not for his enjoyment. Medieval man felt that nature should be interfered with no more than was necessary. This attitude was based on a feeling
that man must not take destiny into one's own hands, but that all things worked together with good results for those who loved God. Therefore, man should not deliberately pit himself against the order of nature. If this was done and there was an exploitation of natural resources, he believed that this could only lead to ruin. He also felt that one should not force materials to appear unnaturally, but that one should work in the nature of the material. As a result of this attitude Medieval man took no satisfaction in a desire to master nature. He was interested, however, in controlling his environment for practical purposes (Gowans, 1964, 110, 111).

1. Colonial House - Mid-Seventeenth Century to Early Eighteenth Century

The term "Colonial" is applied to the style of housing that comprised the first permanent form of residence for the settlers of North America. For the purpose of this paper, the housing of the French, English and Dutch who settled along the North-eastern seaboard of the United States and the area along the St. Lawrence River of Canada will be discussed.

The construction of their buildings, including the house, was undertaken by the families themselves. The materials used were those which were available locally. Many of the materials were used in their natural state, while others were altered somewhat by simple operations. In the New England colonies where building stone was lacking and lime was scarce, timber was the primary building material. In the St. Lawrence River
area, however, there was an abundant supply of field stones, which had to be removed from the fields, and lime was in good supply. Therefore, stone houses were most common in this area (Gowans, 1964, 4, 5; Gowans, 1966, 10; Morrison, 1969, 15; Traquair, 1947, 8, 12). In the actual architectural design, simplicity and practicality characterized the Colonial buildings. Their homes were a direct outgrowth of urgent practical necessities, and their attitude to the use of materials. The only purpose of the house was for physical use. It fulfilled little more than the basic requirement of shelter for the family. It also provided a place in which to carry out some of their production activities such as preserving food and making clothing, and for storing such products (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 532; Foote et al, 1960, 83; Morrison, 1969, 6, 7).

The dominant type of dwelling unit for rural families of modest means often began as a rectangular shape of one storey or one and a half stories. In size, the house was built no larger than necessary for the basic needs previously mentioned (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 532; Scully, 1969, 36; Whiffen, 1969, 4).

However, the house was thought of as a family homestead, to last for several generations. In order to accommodate the subsequent extended family group, it was necessary to increase the space in the house several times. Thus, the initial building was not conceived as a self-contained whole, complete once and for all. Instead, houses took form, as needs changed, by
a series of additions, with little consideration to the overall effect. This addition of space was accomplished in several ways, for example: by the conversion of the attic to a full-sized room; by the building of an additional room on the other side of the chimney; or by the addition of a lean-to across the back. As a result of this approach to housing the family, the resulting rambling, irregular shape of the exterior is probably one of the most typical features of Colonial houses (Beyer, 1965, 8; Gowans, 1966, 10, 16; Mendelowitz, 1960, 72, 74).

The early builders carefully related the exterior design of their dwellings to the climatic conditions, particularly the heavy snowfalls. Thus, a characteristic of their homes was a steep roof. For houses of wooden construction, the severe climate also necessitated the use of an outer layer of clapboard siding. In addition, the houses were often placed near the roads, and raised three to four feet above the ground (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 533; Traquair, 1947, 60).

The design of the facade was a frank and honest statement of interior uses and structural necessities, as there was little concern for the formal qualities of design such as balance and proportion. For instance, if of necessity one room was required to be larger than the adjacent one, this difference in size would be reflected in the asymmetrical arrangement of the facade. Doors and windows were also inserted where they came most naturally, rather than having
their placement dictated by some aesthetic principle (Gowans, 1964, 110; Gowans, 1966, 17; Morrison, 1969, 6, 7).

In the original house of the rural families, the dwelling unit often consisted of only one room and a loft, or attic. The room was a multi-purpose one that served as a kitchen, storage room, dining room, living room and bedroom. This room, which had a low ceiling, was dominated by a large fireplace that served for heating, lighting and cooking. The one division in the room would be a small entrance area. If the house had an upper loft or partial storey, a small stairway would also be included in this area. The loft or attic of the house also served as a sleeping area, usually for several children in the one room, and as a storage place for food and household supplies. When lean-tos were added, cooking and some other household activities, such as candle-making, were transferred there (Beyer, 1965, 8, 9; Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 532, 533; Mendelowitz, 1960, 71; Scully, 1969, 37).

Later, as the family grew or resources increased, a second room was added at the other side of the entrance. In some instances, a two-room house was built initially. One room usually served for general living purposes, as in the house previously mentioned. The other room was the parlor, which was only used on special occasions, such as receiving important guests, or for important family gatherings (Beyer, 1965, 9).

In the floor plan of this size of house, the entrance
would usually be located between the two rooms. If a lean-to was built on the back, there might be a central passage through the middle of the house (Beyer, 1965, 9; Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 532; Mendelowitz, 1960, 72; Whiffen, 1960, 4).

The early North American farmhouses were also entirely unpretentious, as they had very little applied ornament. There was some structural and textural enrichment derived directly from the materials used, or from the building processes. It was characteristic to leave many structural elements, both inside and out, plainly in view. For instance, in the interior, the ceilings had exposed, heavy beams, and the walls had rough plaster, vertical boards, or both, used as sheathing. In general, the character can be described as having "... straightforward, vigorous solutions of problems; strength and directness akin to medieval houses" (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 532, 533; Gowans, 1964, 110, 111; Mendelowitz, 1960, 76; Morrison, 1969, 7, 16; Scully, 1969, 37).

Transitional North American Housing

A. Classical House - Eighteenth Century

The Colonial form of housing continued to be built as the first permanent homes of some of the settlers moving westward. However, in the original settlement areas, after two or three generations of "pioneering," there was increased prosperity for most of the population. In general, the task of providing
the essentials for survival was an easier one. The size of the population was enlarged and its character was changed by an influx of immigrants who were representative of more specialized trades and professions. A new leisure class was now more evident as there were merchants, ship owners, manorial lords and royal governors. In this population, class distinctions became increasingly important. With a relatively stable way of life, therefore, there began to be manifest a culture held in common by wide segments of the society (Beyer, 1965, 9, 25; Gowans, 1964, 149, 217; Gowans, 1966, 40; Morrison, 1969, 271, 272; Mendelowitz, 1960, 105, 106, 110).

With a more diverse social milieu there was a desire among some families for greater elegance and refinement in their house. The attitude of the family towards their house was, therefore, undergoing change. They were no longer satisfied with the colonial attitude of imitating the architectural forms which were nostalgically remembered from their homeland, or of considering houses from only a functional point of view. There was now an interest in the aesthetic qualities of the house. In particular, there was an increasing desire to live in a house whose style was considered fashionable at that period of time. However, there were differences in the abilities of families to attain a house which was in vogue. Only a small proportion of the houses constructed were great mansions whose designs were outstanding examples of the style. Most of the construction was for the
middle class, which consisted of tradesmen, artisans and many farmers. Their architecture was primarily of simpler, more unpretentious buildings that followed the lead of their "betters." There was often a time lag of as much as thirty to fifty years, however, between the construction of a particular style for the upper class and houses with similar characteristics for the lower populace. Throughout the architecture of the time, therefore, there were similarities in the general characteristics of the houses. The differences in the families' social class would be noticeable in such factors as the location of the house, and its size, materials, and amount and authenticity of ornament. In the middle and lower class houses, the current-stylistic characteristics were also often intermixed with ones which were vestigal survivals of the medieval tradition (Beyer, 1965, 9; Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 535; Gowans, 1964, 149, 209).

During the eighteenth century in the New England area of the United States the colonies were united under English rule. The English were also the conquerors in Canada and, therefore, most of the immigrating peoples were of English origin. Although the area along the St. Lawrence River was still predominantly French, there was a strong English community being established along the Southern Great Lakes by immigrants from both the United States and Britain. For inspiration in their architecture, they looked to the aristocratic and urban world of England, which was, at this time, concerned with the concepts
and philosophy of life referred to as "classical." This meant that in their buildings there was some basic relationship to the architectural forms of Greece and Rome (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 535; Gowans, 1966, 39, 40; Mendelowitz, 1960, 105; Morrison, 1969, 271, 272).

There was now a different attitude to life based on an evolving and different concept of the relationship between man and nature. Man was now beginning to realize the possibility of ordering the world in terms of his own experience, capabilities and scale. He held convictions that: the world has a basic immutable order; men by powers of reason can discover what that order is; and upon discovering the order, they can control the environment as they will. In a phase of idealism, man theorizes about art and life as it might, and ought to be, rather than art and nature as it is. In this way man recognizes the supremacy of man, in which there is a rigid exclusiveness, a love of order, of symmetry, and of definite limits. The medieval acceptance of nature taking its course is gone, along with, in architecture, the additive composition of buildings, and the exposed construction. In its place there is a strong sense of discipline. As a result, this emphasis fosters the principle that all forms of art and architecture should be composed according to a definite system, so that the form is immediately and self-evidently comprehensible to the individual human mind (Gowans, 1964, 116-120). In architecture, therefore, the "supreme example" of the
classical mind is:

"... the central-type building, wherein all parts are clearly and comprehensibly related to a central point or element, and the building as a whole is precisely cut off from its surrounding environment and horizon ..." (Gowans, 1964, 175).

1. Colonial Georgian House - Eighteenth Century

The classical style of architecture which followed the Colonial is referred to primarily as "Colonial Georgian." In place of the rambling spontaneity of the Colonial house, these houses were designed with a sense of discipline based on symmetrical balance, principles of proportion and order. There was the deliberate repetition of characteristic elements at regular and definite intervals. The resulting formality was one of the most notable characteristics of the period. For the proportions of the buildings, consideration was given to the scale of humans. There was also the extensive use of decorative details from the ancient Roman and Grecian architectural forms, such as triangular and segmental pediments, columns and pilasters, balustrades and urns (Gowans, 1964, 120; Gowans, 1966, 43).

In the Colonial house, needs of the interior were the primary influence on the exterior massing and treatment of the facade. This was rarely the case in Colonial Georgian houses, where the shape, size and placement of interior spaces were affected by the design treatment of the facade, and the general proportions and shape of the house. These features were established by guides for composition. The function and design,
therefore, were often considered to be irrelevant to each other (Morrison, 1969, 300).

Information about this style was readily available to most classes of the population from builder's handbooks and architectural design books which had explicit plans and details. These publications were very popular among the home owners and local carpenters who were usually responsible for house construction (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 533; Gowans, 1966, 47; Whiffen, 1969, 8).

These people were no longer medieval builders or traditional artisans who were working with materials in a natural way. Instead, they were men with a new feeling of confidence in their ability to impose their will on the environment and to create order. As a result, there was a new emphasis on the control of the materials which were available. The concern for the direct and natural expression of materials thus became obsolete. The classical practice of imitating the effect of one material in another reflected the new attitude of controlling materials. For instance, wood was cut and painted to look like ashlar masonry, plaster was cast in forms appropriate to wood carving, and bricks were moulded and rubbed to imitate stone (Gowans, 1964, 130, 141, 142; Gowans, 1966, 17).

The houses were now larger in size when initially built and were usually two rooms deep and two, or two and one half, stories in height. The houses frequently had four rooms to
each floor, with each room occupying one corner of the house. The house shape was simple in mass, and a rectangular form was deliberately chosen. Small houses were squarish in plan, while larger ones were elongated rectangles. It was customary for the long side of the rectangle to face the road or street (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 536; Mendelowitz, 1961, 108; Whiffen, 1969, 8).

The facade was bisymmetrically composed in an ordered rhythm and according to principles of proportion. The doorway was centered and often emphasized with several elements, such as simple mouldings, pilasters, columns, a pediment, or a small porch. The windows were often emphasized by mouldings, pediments and shutters. The commonest type of house had two windows on each side of the door and five in the storey above. They were placed in a regular pattern so that there was order in the appearance of the exterior. The functional relationship of the windows to the interior spaces was not considered to be as important as the formal appearance of the exterior design (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 536, 540, 541; Gowans, 1964, 131, 142, 143, 158; Morrison, 1969, 300; Scully, 1969, 41; Whiffen, 1969, 8).

Since houses of this period were larger in size, the interiors were more spacious. In comparison with the Colonial house, which was first built with one multi-purpose room or two rooms, these houses had more separate rooms, often with specialized functions. There may have been a separate living
room, dining room, and kitchen, for instance, with the kitchen at the back of the house. Circulation throughout the house was greatly improved by a spacious central hall and larger openings between rooms (Beyer, 1965, 9, 10; Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 536, 538; Mendelowitz, 1960, 114, 117).

B. Classical Revival House - Late eighteenth Century to Mid-Nineteenth Century

By the turn of the nineteenth century, the reference to classical architectural forms no longer expressed self-evidently good, and unquestioningly accepted principles of life, but, rather, became ends in themselves. Unlike the classicists of the eighteenth century, these people were no longer as concerned with the general principles of design that were conceived to be responsible for the timeless appeal of the Greek and Roman buildings. In the new approach to classicism, the correctness of detail was most important. This emphasis was stimulated by scientific archaeological studies, such as the excavations of Pompeii, which were widely publicized. In the United States, which was now independent of England, there was an obsession among the leaders for the symbolism of Rome, and later, of Greece. There was an emphasis on regarding architecture as a means of communicating ideas. As a result, architectural forms were chosen for their symbolic implications rather than for their fitness for particular building uses. In particular, there was an interest in the republican institutions of Rome as well as in the rational philosophies of
classical times. Ancient Greece was of interest because it seemed synonymous with democratic ideals. It was the belief of the intellectual and political leaders that the new United States nation was "living proof of the classical conviction that men could control their destinies and mould worlds to their will..." (Gowans, 1964, 164, 243-250, 268; Gowans, 1966, 65-71, 86; Mendelowitz, 1960, 191, 202; Morrison, 1969, 574, 575).

In Canada, which was still under British control, there were not the strong feelings for the symbolic associations of freedom and democracy with ancient Greek and Roman buildings. There was the claim, however, that classical architecture was also "best" or "right" in a moral sense. The society felt, therefore, that classical forms could influence the people who lived in them, or around them, towards a conduct that was correct, and towards a way of thinking that was clear and rational. As a result of this attitude, there was some acceptance of the Classical Revival architectural forms in Canada. The primary examples of these styles, however, were built by colonists from the United States and the British colonial upper class. The Classical Revival in Canada was thus not as widespread as the classical tradition of the Colonial Georgian in the United States (Gowans, 1966, 68, 71, 79).
Following the American Revolution there was little construction in the United States for several years. When large-scale construction began again, styles based on a classical revival, which was well established in Europe, were desired by the new republicans. The influence of Rome preceded that of Greece. The architectural style based on Rome was known as the "Federal" style. The chief characteristics of this style was the attempt to duplicate Roman buildings, particularly the temples. When this was not possible, elements from Roman buildings were used "as properly as possible." Again, books on architectural design were invaluable to the customers and carpenters for the construction of houses (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 540; Mendelowitz, 1960, 189, 191).

It was primarily the public buildings of the new government, and the houses of a few of the political and intellectual leaders that duplicated Roman ones most closely. The upper classes of merchants, manufacturers and professionals, however, built houses in a simpler style, which were also based on Roman characteristics. For the majority of the population the construction of a late Colonial Georgian type of domestic architecture continued for many years. After the turn of the century, however, the general character of the Federal houses of the upper class appeared in most houses, particularly the middle class ones, which were constructed across the country.
(Gowans, 1964, 164, 165; Mendelowitz, 1960, 192, 207, 208, 212).

In the architecture of this period, the basic classical principles of the Colonial Georgian style, such as symmetry and order, were retained. Another similarity was that functional considerations were almost completely sacrificed. Now, however, the inconveniences that arose were justified by the symbolic value which was achieved. In the buildings which duplicated the ancient Roman temples most closely, the commonly used features were domes, vaults, arches, columns, and a projecting portico on the main facade, which was colonnaded and topped by a triangular pediment (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 541; Gowans, 1964, 166, 245; Mendelowitz, 1960, 191, 198; Whiffen, 1969, 31).

Most of the domestic architecture of this period is distinguished by its relative simplicity and refinement. Delicacy is perhaps the most obvious characteristic. In comparison to the Colonial period, the materials were smoother and finer in texture; the shapes were smaller in scale; and the colors were lighter. The size of the Federal house was often larger than the Colonial Georgian one. The more imposing structures were three stories in height with low hipped roofs almost hidden by cornices and balustrades. The facade was a simple rectangular unit, symmetrical in design. In most houses, the chief focal point of the facade was the entrance which often had a one-storey porch, usually semicircular in shape.
and supported by columns (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1969, 542; Gowans, 1964, 166; Mendelowitz, 1960, 208, 210; Whiffen, 1969, 23).

In the interior, there were no radical innovations from the previous Colonial Georgian style regarding the placement of rooms. In general, the plan of four rooms to a floor, arranged around a central hall and staircase was retained. However, variations in the plan which provided for more privacy, comfort and ease of management, began to appear. More rooms were planned for specific purposes and they also varied in size according to their function (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 542, 543; Gowans, 1964, 116; Mendelowitz, 1960, 208, 240, 241; Whiffen, 1969, 23).

2. Greek Revival House - Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century

The style known as "Greek Revival" followed the Federal style. It came to its height in the decades between 1820 and 1850. As in the Federal style, the temple form was the primary reference for architectural forms. The strictest duplication of these ancient buildings was undertaken in the public buildings. As in the previous style, however, certain characteristic features of the ancient Greek buildings became an integral part of the domestic architecture being built during the period (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 544; Mendelowitz, 1960, 191, 202; Whiffen, 1969, 38, 45).

During the years of the Greek Revival there were a few
professionally trained architects in the United States. Architects were still fairly rare, however, and, as a result, the popularity of the style was spread across the country by the continued availability of builder's guide books (Gowans, 1964, 270, 271; Mendelowitz, 1960, 210, 211).

The domestic architecture of this period showed greater diversity and originality. Both a T-shaped and an L-shaped plan evolved for city and modest farm houses, for example, and the principle of symmetry was, therefore, weakened. The exterior facades were also more varied in the treatment of the temple type, which had colonnades on all four sides. Numerous houses, for instance, had only a portico across the entire front and simpler houses dispensed with the columns and used only small pilasters and restrained mouldings at the entrance. If a portico did not dominate the front of the house, a pedimented gable usually ran across it. The temples were also characterized by a single storey and no windows, and were thought to have been made of white marble. Since most of the houses were of two stories, an attempt was made to make them appear only one storey high, as the original temples. To achieve this effect, two storey colonnades were used and windows were made as inconspicuous as possible. Irrespective of the building materials used for the exterior, they were finished to look like white stone, as in the original temples, if at all possible. For example, the wooden houses were invariably painted white and wall surfaces were as smooth as possible
and generally severe and unadorned. In contrast to the Colonial Georgian houses, these structures had their longest dimension running from the front to the back. With this siting of the structure, the house in an urban area could be accommodated on a narrower lot (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 544, 545; Mendelowitz, 1960, 191, 203; Whiffen, 1969, 38).

The interiors were similar to those of the Federal style since basic room planning was not greatly changed. One difference in the interiors was the scale of the detail and decoration since a feeling of heaviness and grandeur was now in vogue (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 545; Mendelowitz, 1960, 247-249).

C. Victorian House - Mid-Nineteenth Century to Early Twentieth Century

The study of the Victorian period has particular significance in this paper, since many of the causes of change in the characteristics of the family, mentioned in Chapter II, occurred during this period.

At this time there was a renewed feeling of prosperity and progress. The belief in progress was expressed through an enthusiasm for science, education, innovations and inventions, and many types of social reform. The period is notable for its technical achievement, material advances, and the accumulation of great fortunes. The effects of industrialization, which was primarily centralized in major cities, were beginning to be apparent (Gowans, 1964, 282, 300; Mendelowitz, 1960,
In the decades toward the end of the nineteenth century, the great commercial empires of wheat and beef, iron and copper, railways and steamships, real estate and banking were established. Great gains in transportation were made in both the United States and Canada, by the construction of transcontinental railways. Industries also boomed, particularly in the north east and midwest of the United States. There was significant growth in the steel mills, stockyards and many types of factories. In addition, there was the mechanization of agriculture. New inventions included such items as the telephone, the electric light, the phonograph, the typewriter, the gas engine, modern plumbing and central heating. As well as a great increase in the types of material goods available to the public, there was the development of the trade union movement. Change in education was also evident. The public school system took form and the growth of universities was renewed. The primary interest in higher education was in scientific and technological studies. However, the researchers were usually specialists who were concerned only with their own work. As a result there was often ignorance regarding relationships within fields of study (Gowans, 1964, 282, 298; Mendelowitz, 1960, 357, 358; Mumford, 1955, 5-7, 17, 23, 33-36, 39, 42).

In general, there was a feeling of confidence throughout the population which was associated with the above advances in
industry, science, and education. There was also great optimism for the future. These attitudes of confidence and optimism were accompanied by a re-awakened interest in the past. In particular, there was an interest in archeology, history and religion due to the belief that lessons learned from the past would provide a guide to the future. At this time the securing of first-hand knowledge of the past was facilitated for wealthy families by the greater ease in travelling abroad, while for the general population there was an increase in the attainability of travel books (Gowans, 1964, 339; Gowans, 1966, 88; Mendelowitz, 1960, 216, 217; Mumford, 1955, 37).

The public realized that with industrialization, increased urbanization and the growth of business enterprises across the country, life was becoming more complex. With this development there was the knowledge that the classical tradition, based on the individual's ability to control and mould his world, was deteriorating. The individual's self-sufficiency which characterized the previous rural generations, therefore, was being decreased (Gowans, 1964, 309).

Accompanying changes in attitude of the society, there were changes in architecture. By about the eighteen-forties, the applicability of the Greek Revival was being criticized by many members of the intellectual and artistic community. It was considered to be essentially un-American, primarily because the temple form was inappropriate for domestic pur-
poses. There was also the feeling that the classical symbolism in architecture had an artificial, pompous and futile quality. Moreover, the use of architectural elements for symbolic association was now considered to be a sentimental and romantic concept rather than a classic one (Gowans, 1964, 272-274; 282; Gowans, 1966, 86; Mendelowitz, 1960, 217).

In the current society which considered emotion and sentiment more important than logic and rationality, there was the romantic longing for the old, the distant and the emotionally exciting. Diversity was valued for its own sake. The distinctiveness of other cultures and epochs was also valued in this romantic movement. Instead of the concept of abstract beauty, which was central to classicism, the romanticists maintained that forms seemed beautiful only because of thoughts which arose in the mind of the spectator (Early, 1965, 27-36).

During the previous classical era, artistic expression had focussed on the rational by emphasizing the ordered, the balanced and the controlled. In the society of the last half of the nineteenth century which experienced the progress of free enterprise, however, there was a stronger desire for human adventure and individualism that influenced creative expression. Now, artistic expression encouraged the dominance of feeling over reason, and a reliance on personal taste and intuition rather than on traditional concepts. In some instances,
this attitude to artistic expression was reinforced by an antagonistic feeling towards the scientific developments and the industrial technology of the period (Mendelowitz, 1960, 217, 218; Mumford, 1955, 5).

During the Victorian period, another change in the attitude to nature occurred. There was no longer the classical attitude toward nature as something to be conquered, disciplined and shut out. The Victorian ideal was to have elements drawn from the world of nature into the orderly architectural world of men. Therefore, there was the desire to have nature and architecture complement each other to produce the effect of a single co-ordinated whole (Gowans, 1964, 287, 288, 309, 310; Mendelowitz, 1960, 218, 219).

The leaders of the community usually wished to escape from the deteriorating conditions in the cities which had been brought about by their rapid growth during industrialization. Instead of taking positive action about such conditions as slums, they tended to ignore them and retreat to nature and their suburban villa. They accepted the concept of allowing nature to take its course in the growth of cities as it does in the woods and hills of the countryside (Gowans, 1964, 310).

As with the previous styles, the Victorian began first in Europe and then appeared in North America. Due to industrial expansion during this time there was a significant
increase in the number of wealthy people. Unlike the recent generations which had primarily inherited their fortunes, there was a new wealthy social class of families who had made money themselves as independent capitalist entrepreneurs. Among the many nouveau-riche, there was usually a strong desire to show off their wealth. One of the ways of doing this was to imitate the mansions currently being built in Europe. The lower economic classes of families were likewise imitators of the wealthy class. Hence, there was a widespread acceptance of Victorian styles. Due to the stronger national nature of both the United States and Canada during this period, brought about by easier communication, Victorian ideas and architectural forms were in evidence throughout most of their populated regions (Gowans, 1964, 288; Gowans, 1966, 126; Mendelowitz, 1960, 253, 362; Mumford, 1955, 33).

Accompanying the expansion of industry there was an enormous growth in the population of cities due to the influx of people from rural areas, and immigrants from Europe. As a result there was an urgent need for housing. With the crowding of the existing areas of cities there was a strong desire to move to the outlying areas. As mentioned previously, the wealthy families were interested in a "retreat" in a natural setting. As a result there was the growth of suburbs primarily for the wealthy. Planners were usually involved in the design of these new communities. The romantic impulse was evident, since the "natural," meaning the informal and irregular,
was favored. Mumford states that "the principle of laissez-
faire was applied by the new urban planners to both the
environment and the buildings of man" (Mumford, 1961, 489). In the transportation pattern, the streets avoided straight lines, even when no curves were given by nature. This was done for the sake of the irregularity which they produced. The contrived curves of the streets also allowed the user to view the buildings over a period of time, and from a variety of angles. This approach was considered picturesque by the Victorians. Functional and practical considerations, however, were often put into practice. For example, the suburban house was often consciously sited for sunlight, for breezes, and a view (Mendelowitz, 1960, 228, 361; Mumford, 1961, 488-490; Scully, 1969, 88).

Towards the latter part of the nineteenth century there was also a significant change in the professions and trades responsible for the construction of housing, as was evidenced by the separation of the architect from the engineer, and frequently the separation of these two from the builder. In general, the professional architect was trained as an artist according to the conventions and ideals of earlier ages. The engineer was concerned with developing a science of construction which utilized the new industrial materials and processes, and which was suited to the needs of the society of that time. The builder was a dual figure. He was a combination of the
businessman who engaged in construction, as a money-making activity, and the carpenter who directed the actual construction of the building. This group was largely educated in the carpenter-handbook tradition. As in the earlier times, the handbooks supplied the builders with the plans and exterior designs that they used for the majority of houses. The houses of the wealthy were an exception, however, as they were designed mainly by architects (Mendelowitz, 1960, 361, 362).

1. Picturesque Revivalism and Eclecticism - Mid-Nineteenth Century to Early Twentieth Century

In this period, when society valued the aura of associations surrounding particular architectural forms more than the forms themselves, a showy, theatrical quality developed in their architecture. The architect now considered a building essentially as a system of pictorial symbolism. The task was to match appropriate images with specific ideas. There was thus a strong desire to arrange visual compositions on intellectual grounds rather than according to functional convenience. As a result there was an eclectic approach to designing (Early, 1965, 27-36; Gowans, 1964, 287, 291).

In architecture, the early years of the Victorian period served as a transition between the extremes of the preceding classicists and the later years of the romanticists. These years were characterized by the continuation of "revivals"
based on their symbolic values. The primary intent in their election was to evoke a mood of romantic nostalgia for the past.

One variation from previous periods was that no single style was dominant. Instead, there was almost complete freedom of choice. A "good" architect was expected to know the distinguishing characteristics of half a dozen or more styles from the past. Quite often there would be imitations of buildings or monuments from a diversity of places and times. Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Gothic, Romanesque, Moorish, Hindu and Chinese sources were all used. Some styles, such as the Gothic and Italianate styles of the Middle Ages, were far more popular than others. An important custom, which distinguishes this phase of the Victorian style from the later one, was that the characteristics of the various historic styles were not mixed in the same building (Early, 1965, 27-36, 39, 47, 60; Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 547; Gowans, 1964, 287, 291; Gowans, 1966, 86-88; Mendelowitz, 1960, 217; Whiffen, 1969, 37).

Soon after the Gothic and Italianate Revival styles replaced the Classical Revival houses, the reliance on only one medieval style for the characteristics of a building began to break down. The mixing of styles on one building became common, and then practically obligatory (Gowans, 1964, 287).

The primary quality that was being sought by the romanticists in domestic architecture was "picturesqueness"
which meant, explicitly, "like a picture." The image that was desired was one related to the passage of time. For instance, a ruin or an imitation of a ruin which brought to mind a picture of time's inevitable destruction would be considered picturesque. There was thus a desire for something other than the order and symmetry of the classical mode. In general, a "picturesque" quality was achieved through irregularity in place of symmetry; informality instead of formality; and exuberance in the use of decoration rather than restraint (Gowans, 1966, 107; Mendelowitz, 1960, 218, 219).

Due to the importance now placed on irregularity, informality and the new attitude to nature, a rustic appearance was in vogue. Variety, particularly in outline, massing and texture were considered essential to the picturesque style. This effect was achieved by the use of broken, jagged, and variegated outlines, contrasts of textures, free plantings around foundations, interrupted vistas, and uneven landscape settings. Diversity through contrast was thus considered an asset in this style (Early, 1965, 60; Gowans, 1966, 107, 121).

The historic architecture which had the greatest appeal to the Victorians, as previously mentioned, was the rural architecture of the Tudor Gothic and the Italian villa styles. The primary reason for their appeal was their irregularity in both plan and silhouette. This irregularity was admired
in itself and because it seemed to follow the scheme of nature which thus enabled a building to fuse more easily with its natural surroundings. These styles were also admired because they produced jagged patterns of light and shade which softened the three dimensional mass of the structure. This effect also varied at different times of the day, and from the different locations from which the building could be viewed (Early, 1965, 60, 61; Gowans, 1966, 87; Scully, 1969, 88).

The domestic architecture of the small town, the rural, and suburban middle class cottages is characterized by many of the following common features: increased height; a vertical emphasis; irregularity in massing, silhouette and surface treatment; asymmetry of facade and plan; and a calculated restlessness. The use of steep pointed gables, a tower, turrets or spires, buttresses and chimneys of the Gothic style gave the illusion of added height to the building. In addition, they created an irregular silhouette. Columns, towers, and gables were used for this purpose in the Italian villa style. Variety in the shapes and sizes of the windows, which were often filled with mullions or tracery, was also used to relieve the monotony of plain, broad wall surfaces. Irregularities in the massing of buildings were achieved by butting together varying shapes and sizes of well-defined rectilinear blocks, and by the projection of various elements from the wall surfaces. Verandahs were practically always used, as were bay windows,
balconies and extended eaves. As a rule, the individual blocks of the building were grouped asymmetrically. For instance, the tower usually stood off-center, near a corner. However, symmetry was usually evident in the elevations of the individual building blocks. Some houses, particularly in the Gothic style, were still symmetrical. In general, this was more characteristic of the houses of the middle and lower classes, and houses of the small-town and rural areas. To a certain extent, this was a carry-over of the classical tradition. The most frequently used decorative features were supporting brackets, bargeboards, columns, and balustrades. These served the purposes of achieving irregularity and a feeling of restlessness. To add to the picturesque characteristics of the house and also relate it to nature, the walls were often covered in vines (Early, 1965, 61-65; Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 547; Gowans, 1964, 309, 319, 322, 323; Gowans, 1966, 103, 106, 107; Mendelowitz, 1960, 219, 226, 228, 229; Whiffen, 1969, 53, 69, 87).

Many of the houses, particularly those of the middle class, appear tall and narrow. Unlike the majority of the earlier houses, these Victorian ones were designed with the narrower dimension facing the street. This type of plan was related to the narrow lots which were common at that time. In general, the houses were at least two storeys in height. The desire for picturesqueness and irregularity was stressed in the interior plan and decoration, as well as in the exterior
design. New arrangements in the floor plans were thus introduced. Instead of the symmetry of the former periods, which restricted the development of efficient plans, there was a freedom and flexibility in the size, shape and location of the various rooms. In the homes of the general population, however, the rooms tended to be small. Basically, the interior consisted of small isolated cubicles with windows opening to the outdoors and doors opening into halls. Some features common to most houses included high ceilings; steep, narrow and dark stairways; long halls; and high, narrow windows covered with heavy curtains and draperies, which allowed little light to enter. The front door was usually off to one side. The entrance area consisted of a long hall, and a stairway to the second floor was beside it. Opening off to one side of the entrance hall was the parlor. As in the early Colonial house, this room was reserved for special family occasions and the entertainment of guests. It was customarily the dining room which served as the main living area for the family. Here the family was together for meals, and for various activities in the evening (Gowans, 1966, 123-126; Mendelowitz, 1960, 219, 228, 229, 251, 362, 363).

Although, in general, the plan of the house was more functional, functionalism was not always the primary concern. One example of an inconvenient arrangement was the frequent placement of the kitchen in the basement or in another location
somewhat removed from the dining room, where all meals were eaten. For the majority of middle class families, however, this was not considered as an inconvenience since servants were retained to perform household duties. In many of the middle class Victorian homes, there were also rooms for a variety of special purposes, such as a library and conservatory (Foote et al, 1960, 84; Gowans, 1966, 126; Mendelowitz, 1960, 362, 363).

Contemporary North American Housing

A. Contemporary House - Mid Twentieth Century

In both the United States and Canada Victorian ideas and picturesque houses survived until around the nineteen-thirties, particularly among the families of the middle and lower classes. At this time, a new attitude to North American living was accepted and a new set of premises established which affected the architecture of the period. The new ideas thus constituted another change of tradition comparable to the shift from Medieval to Classical, and from Classical to Victorian (Gowans, 1964, 287, 288, 417, 428; Gowans, 1966, 132; Mendelowitz, 1960, 391, 524).

Gowans gives three principle reasons for the change from the Victorian era. One reason was that it became obsolete aesthetically "...because there is a limit to how long you can go on responding to the visual excitement of eye-catching forms;
sooner or later the thrill must be gone" (Gowans, 1966, 132). Secondly, it became obsolete technologically because a style based on eclectic borrowings from the past could not make good use of the new materials and techniques that were the result of recent scientific inventions. Finally, it lost its symbolic significance of representing the past in a romantic manner when knowledge of the past was expanded by intensive historical research and more frequent foreign travel (Gowans, 1964, 339; Gowans, 1966, 132).

The collapse of Victorian society was also precipitated by events of the First World War, and the Depression which began in 1929. The war was significant since, as a result of it, many of the younger generation, particularly in Europe, began to go against Victorian attitudes which most of the older generation still believed to be valid. The Depression brought about a decisive end to the Victorian era when the social and economic world, which provided the basis of Victorianism, collapsed almost completely (Gowans, 1966, 146, 147).

Again, however, around the turn of the twentieth century, there was a group of North American individuals who criticized the Victorian styles of architecture. They felt that the ideas and architectural forms had become inadequate as they ceased to be useful, appropriate, practical or even very well understood. These "radical" individuals who worked on what they called "progressive" principles wanted to use the technological advances that made possible radically new
types of structures. They also wanted to express the sociological changes that were transforming the previous individualistic society into a more impersonal one characterized by large corporations and institutions. They argued for the "honest" expression of materials, and "clean" lines, or "natural" and "organic" structure. What the "progressives" intended was to use the building materials, such as steel and concrete, in a way which reflected their unique qualities; to design shapes and plans which were suited to the characteristics of the materials; and to create forms related to human needs. Their ideas, however, were interpreted by the Victorian public and the academically trained architects, who were proponents of picturesque architecture, as being restatements, in different terms, of the intent of the previous classicists and revivalists. These so-called "rebels," therefore, were not generally accepted at this time, and there is little evidence that many of them had much impact on the architecture of North America during their lifetime (Gowans, 1964, 288, 389, 402, 406, 429; Gowans, 1966, 132, 148; Mendelowitz, 1960, 391; Scully, 1969, 90, 91, 105; Whiffen, 1969, 152).

In architecture, by the end of the nineteen-thirties and throughout the nineteen-forties when the Victorian rationale was finally shaken, North Americans did not look as much to their "pioneers" of a modern architectural movement as to the architects of the International Style which emanated from Europe. Since there was little building construction activity, except of a military nature, during the Second World War,
there was no significant development of a new architectural style, in that decade. The political events in Europe preceding this war, however, are important to North American architecture since many of the leaders and progressive architects of the European modern movement fled from Europe to the United States where some of them accepted high positions in the architectural schools. As a result, the International Style continued as an architectural influence. In general then, the forms of North American houses which have been constructed since the building boom of the nineteen-fifties have been derived from the characteristics of the International Style (Foote et al, 1960, 7; Gowans, 1964, 417, 432, 433, 447; Mendelowitz, 1960, 508, 514; Scully, 1969, 178, 180.

This style had a great impact on the architecture of North America due to the fact that its premises seemed to correspond with the anti-Victorian feelings of the population during this time. Thus the acceptance of many of the characteristics of the International Style was due to an intuitive and emotional response based on a feeling of revulsion towards all Victorian things and ideas. Among the intellectual leaders during the nineteen-twenties and nineteen-thirties and for the majority of the population by the nineteen-forties, there was little desire for "the old" in general. These people felt no associations with the past as the Victorians had. The contemporary person felt that he was not so much just a part of history, as he was the maker of history. As a result of this attitude
there was scorn for architectural forms that were borrowed from the past or were in any way dependent upon it (Gowans, 1964, 433, 435, 438; Gowans, 1966, 149).

In North America, during the period following the Second World War, there was a feeling of unlimited wealth, resources and technology. A tremendous change in man's attitude to nature had also occurred again. No longer was nature, as in the Classical tradition, a chaotic element to be contrasted with the ordered architecture of man, or as to the Victorians, a romantic place to retreat from industrialized society. Man now felt that his control of nature was more complete due to his superior knowledge in many fields of pure and applied science such as chemistry, physics, medicine and psychology. Man thus envisioned himself as "... rising triumphant over all natural limitations" (Gowans, 1964, 441, 450, 460, 461, 470, 471; Gowans, 1966, 156, 157).

The population was, however, aware of many strong tangible and intangible forces, such as political, economic and social ones, which curtailed individual freedom and which often led to conformity. An important characteristic of contemporary thinking that has influenced architecture is the emphasis placed on economics. For instance, in situations where a selection must be made from several alternatives, economic factors are frequently of greatest concern in making the decision. Also, in the provision of housing today, there are a variety of
business enterprises and public agencies involved, such as lending institutions, subcontractors, permit and inspection officers, and real estate personnel. All of these, in varying degrees, have an influence on the form of architecture. The financiers, in particular, have a great deal of influence since they are interested in a "good risk." This frequently means that approval is given only to architectural forms which have already proved to be acceptable by the public. Due to this conservatism, previous architectural forms are perpetuated. Thus, many of the actions and choices of contemporary society are conditioned by economic forces. Along with this emphasis on economics, which is often associated with the economy of expenditures, there is the desire for efficiency. This desire is also reinforced by the expectation that with current scientific and technological advances, a better solution to a problem can be discovered and utilized (Gowans, 1964, 440, 443, 462, 464).

Many of the industrial and technological advances of the Victorian era have been significantly accelerated during the twentieth century. For instance, there is a greater standardization in the production and supplying of goods and services. More services are also provided outside of the home, as was noted in Chapter II. In addition, many new appliances and materials have facilitated the performance of many tasks, which, if done by the traditional method, would be considered as "chores." Another development of importance to housing, in
this century, is the growth in ownership of the automobile. Changes in the family which are related to industrialization and urbanization have also influenced house design. For instance, the contemporary family is usually a nuclear family, which can live in a smaller house than the extended family of previous generations. Also, with the shift from a predominantly rural to urban society, as was noted in Chapter II, there has been the separation of the place of work from the residence and its immediate environment. Accompanying this change has been the change in the family from a production unit, which required the co-operation of all family members, to a consumption unit, with members of the family as individuals. With regard to house design, space is no longer required for the home production of most household supplies, food and clothing, as was necessary for earlier families. Also, with the change from the goal of familism to individualism, more privacy and independence for each family member is sought. In the cities, too, where most contemporary families reside, there is an increasing involvement with a primarily man-made environment (Foote et al, 1960, 85, 86; Gowans, 1964, 409; Gowans, 1966, 157; Mendelowitz, 1960, 495; Scully, 1969, 111; Winnick, 1957, 71).

1. Modern Home - Mid-twentieth Century

The change in many attitudes of society since the Victorian era is reflected in a contemporary architectural style which, in many elements, is the reverse of the previous
picturesque one. This is one reason for the general appeal of the International Style. Contemporary houses, which show influences of the International rather than the Victorian style can be described as having: a horizontal emphasis instead of a vertical one; simple instead of complex massing; severe flat planes instead of bulging outlines; smooth and plain textures instead of rough and patterned ones; the absence of ornament instead of an abundance of it; an emphasis on lightness and transparency through the use of fine, reflective surfaces instead of the emphasis on solidity and bulk; the integration and flow of undefined spaces instead of isolated, confined cubicles; fusion between the interior and the outdoors instead of isolation; and increased light instead of darkness. In modern houses, therefore, the greatest changes are in the use of space, surface, light, and the relation to the outdoors. In addition, the incorporation of new technological discoveries in structural design, in materials and in the provision of basic equipment in contemporary houses is an important characteristic (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 4, 5; Foote et al, 1960, 92, 265; Gowans, 1964, 433, 438, 441, 447, 460; Gowans, 1966, 148, 151, 153, 156; Whiffen, 1969, 241, 243).

The concept of functionalism has also been stressed to an unprecedented degree in mid-twentieth century North American housing. A functionally designed house as defined by Beyer is one that is "... so planned and built that it will
accommodate in the best manner possible all the activities that go on in it" (Beyer, 1965, 280). To the general public however, functionalism is broader in scope as it refers to the utility and economy of resources, particularly those of time, energy and materials (Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 10, 78).

Since few houses today are custom built, as was characteristic of the previous periods, an attempt is now made to design basic houses suited to the most common home-centered activities of all families, which include: meal preparation and eating; sleeping; leisure and entertainment; personal hygiene; and cleaning. Many psychological needs of individual family members, such as privacy, are also considered more important in domestic architecture today. In general, the contemporary house is considered to have four major zones as distinct areas for the above activities: the entrance, the group living zone; the private living zone; and the housekeeping zone. With an emphasis on efficiency as well, relationships between the rooms in which these activities are pursued and the resulting circulation patterns are of more importance than in the previous architectural styles. The selection of materials which are easy to maintain and the provision of many mechanical conveniences are also items that the contemporary consumer expects to find in new houses. For the contemporary family, it is noted that such house-centered activities as meal preparation and cleaning are greatly
simplified, in comparison with previous generations, due to the current availability of ready-made products, which can be purchased, instead of made, by the family. To-day's family, compared to the early North American family, as noted in Chapter II, is primarily a consumption unit for goods and services, rather than a production one (Beyer, 1965, 281, 284-294; Foote et al, 1960, 92; Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 8, 19; Tyler, 1957, 11).

In the twentieth century the production of single-family dwellings has also changed. No longer do most families rely on their own labour, or local tradesmen, to provide a house, built to a family's specifications, on their plot of land. Instead, there is the growth of construction organizations which build houses on their own land, and then market them to families. Today, then, the family usually buys a ready-built house, as a consumer, rather than being involved in its production, as were the earlier North American families. Since the primary motive of construction organizations is to make a profit from their enterprise, there is a great deal of standardization in houses which reduces the cost for the builder (Beyer, 1965, 212; Foote et al, 1960, 84, 87; Gowans, 1964, 471; Tyler, 1957, 12).

In domestic architecture today there are certain common characteristics in spite of a great desire for individuality as expressed by diversity in details. The most typical contemporary house, particularly of suburban developments, is a
one storey or split level house. However, with the increased
cost of land, the two storey house is now being constructed
more frequently. The house became smaller during the earlier
part of this century, but has increased in size slightly
since around the nineteen-fifties. The decrease in size may
be attributed to several factors, such as the decrease in
family size due to the change from an extended to a nuclear
family form as mentioned in Chapter II; the increased cost
of providing housing which includes more mechanical devices;
and the increased cost of serviced land. It is estimated
that about one-third of the cost of contemporary houses is
attributable to mechanical equipment considered "necessary"
by today's families, but which was uncommon or nonexistent
fifty years ago. With less space in the house, it was typical
to eliminate the dining room as a separate room by combining
it with either the living room or the kitchen. The kitchen
area and the bathroom were also reduced in size, and houses
with only one or two bedrooms became common. Changes were
also made to the exterior to reduce costs. Verandahs, for
instance, were frequently reduced to small stoops. The garage,
which had become part of the housing complex around the nine­
teen-twenties, was also changed. At first it was a separate
building located at the back of the lot, on the alley. In an
try to reduce housing costs it was then either eliminated
or reduced to a carport attached to the side of the house.
With the increased prosperity of families during the nineteen-
fifties, however, the house was increased slightly in size. The dining room began to appear again; a second living area, the "family" room was included; and more than one bathroom and at least three bedrooms became common. The kitchen was also frequently enlarged to include laundry facilities which had previously been in the basement. An outside patio, as an extension of the house, was now a feature of most new houses. The garage, too, was again enclosed, but as an integral part of the house construction (Beyer, 1965, 127; Foote et al, 1960, 8, 85, 238; Gowans, 1964, 422, 424; Mendelowitz, 1960, 514; Tyler, 1957, 13, 14, 17; Wheeler, 1969, 79, 267; Whiffen, 1969, 217; Winnick, 1957, 9, 71, 72, 77, 78).

The interior of the contemporary house is characterized by the segregation of particular zones, as mentioned previously. Due to the emphasis on functionalism, within each zone there is usually direct circulation between areas that are related in activity. The kitchen, in contrast to its placement in the Victorian house, is now most frequently located adjacent to the dining area. When the house has a separate dining room, however, it is usually used only when the family entertains guests or celebrates a special occasion. The preferred location for the family room is also adjacent to the kitchen and an attempt is made to have it directly related to an outdoor patio. This relationship is desirable for the family
with young children since the parents can supervise their activities more easily. Due to the desire for a feeling of more formality and quiet in the living room, and informality and lively activity in the family room, the two rooms are purposely separated. This separation is also intentional, particularly in families with older children, since it facilitates the pursual of different activities by the two generations without interference. In contemporary houses, as compared with earlier ones, the placement of the living room and kitchen is frequently reversed. The living room may open onto the garden at the rear of the lot, while the kitchen faces the street. There has also been a major change in the use of bedrooms. Now they serve as multi-purpose rooms for individual family members, particularly children. In addition to being used for sleeping, they are also used as play, hobby and study areas and for the entertainment of friends. There is thus a tendency for individual family members to have more personal and private spaces for a wider variety of activities than was the case in earlier families (Beyer, 1965, 284-294; Faulkner and Faulkner, 1968, 19-67; Foote et al, 1960, 349-360; Tyler, 1957, 14, 17, 18).

Relationship Between the Family and the House

Prior to the mid-nineteenth century, the representative North American dwelling unit was the farmhouse, and the typical family was a rural one. A century later, the majority of
families were urban. Accompanying this change there has been a reversal in the importance of the house and the land surrounding it. To the rural family, the house was considered a basic part of the farm. The early North Americans were primarily concerned with the quality of the land from which they obtained their means of survival. The family, therefore, did not place as high a priority on the acquisition of a house as on the farmland, which may also have included a house, or on which one would be constructed. The contemporary family, in contrast, places a great deal of importance on the house itself, particularly the interior, and the general character of the neighbourhood, particularly the people.¹ Today land is seldom important in urban housing areas as a source of livelihood for the family. An important factor in the attitude of the family to their housing has thus been the removal of economic production, which supplies the means of obtaining the necessities and luxuries of life, from the housing environment (Foote et al, 1960, 83, 85; Moore, 1968, 48).

The early North American house, itself, was also important to the economic basis of the family as a place for producing goods since many activities required for survival were undertaken in the living quarters. These included the prep-

¹Housing preferences will be discussed in Chapter IV.
aration, preservation and storage of food, the construction of clothing, and the manufacture of household products, such as candles. The contemporary family, in comparison, is primarily a consumption unit which buys goods and services outside of the house. For many of these families the dwelling unit is used primarily as a place to sleep, eat some meals, obtain privacy, relaxation and intimate companionship, and to store artifacts (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 486; Duvall, 1967, 58; Martinson, 1970, 114; Seeley et al, 1956, 43).

When the early family needed more space in their home, it was customary to alter the existing dwelling unit in some way. In general, houses during the transitional period were initially built large enough to accommodate a large family, which was usually an extended one. Today, however, when families change in size they tend to move to a different house that fulfills their spatial needs more adequately. As a result, previous families remained in one location, perhaps for several generations, whereas today's family is a mobile one (Blood, 1972, 241). In Foote et al, an analysis of the "housing cycle" of the median United States family of the mid-twentieth century, in relation to the stages of the family life cycle, is provided. The family is characterized as having six to seven different dwelling units which range from a one to three roomed, rented, dwelling unit in the central city, to a six roomed, owned, house in the suburbs (Foote et al,
The houses constructed before the twentieth century were thus usually larger in size and built to last. They were conceived as "...a permanent abode, a lifetime investment and a family haven" (Beyer, 1965, 127; Foote et al, 1960, 84).

The actual house structure has also changed with respect to the equipment provided. Whereas the house previous to the twentieth century was basically a shell, with a heating device included, the contemporary house is expected to have a variety of mechanical equipment as a part of its structure. The increasing desire for labour-and time-saving appliances is partly due to the fact that contemporary families usually spend less time in the dwelling unit and the fact that more emphasis is placed on individual expression through recreational and professional activities (Beyer, 1965, 37, 40, 127, 281).

The earliest form of North American housing was also constructed with primary consideration given to the physical needs of the family. Although this general attitude continued to be characteristic of subsequent periods, there was the growth of other needs, such as privacy, status and prestige, associated with the house. The contemporary owned house is also often important as an economic investment and source of economic gain (Beyer, 1965, 212; Federal Task Force, 1969, 17).

The plan of the house and the use of interior spaces
also reflects changes in the family. In the early family, for instance, the use of one room for most house-related activities facilitated the achievement of the goal towards familism. The presence of all family members during non-working or sleeping hours in the one room also encouraged the participation of the family as a whole in recreational pursuits and religious observances and training. The attitudinal and vocational education of the girls was also more easily transferred from the mother when both generations were together almost constantly. Throughout the transitional period of the house, trends toward the use of space for specialized functions and increased privacy were evident. It was still customary, however, for the family to spend much time together, particularly at meals, and in the evening. The preferred location for family gatherings was the dining room. The contemporary house, in contrast, reflects the importance of the goal of individualism, the attainment of personal happiness through self expression and select companionship, and the emphasis on children. It is now customary for each child to have a separate bedroom in which he pursues many of the activities, such as studying, that would have previously been accomplished around the dining room table, in the presence of other family members. With separate rooms, too, children are frequently allowed to create their own visual environment. This is also where they may retreat for privacy or entertain
their peers, without the interference of brothers, sisters, or parents. The popularity of the family room also reflects the emphasis on facilities for children. The simultaneous use of this room by children, and the living room by adults allows the two generations to seek pleasure in their own choice of independent activities when desired. In many instances, however, the family room is used by the family as a whole. The decreased importance and use of the dining room reflects the changing custom of family members eating together. This is partially due to the fact that the schedules of family members are more difficult to synchronize when so many activities take place outside of the house. The asymmetrical external design and interior plan of today's house is also indicative of the informality characteristic of most contemporary living patterns.

The increase in the number and kinds of mechanical equipment, which are considered an essential part of the contemporary house, also tends to reduce the amount of time required for household tasks. In addition, the materials used in contemporary houses frequently require less maintenance. With these conveniences, many more women are able to work outside of the home, as was noted in Chapter II. Also, as noted in Chapter II, the roles of husbands and wives have changed somewhat, with husbands now performing more household duties which were traditionally female oriented. With the above changes in equipment and materials, household tasks are generally easier to perform by all family members.
CHAPTER IV

THE FAMILY'S HOUSING BEHAVIOR AND EXPRESSED PREFERENCES

Introduction

The previous two chapters of this paper have provided sociological information about certain aspects of the family: information concerning some social beliefs which have influenced the physical form of North American domestic architecture; and an outline of the major styles of housing that have been popular during various periods of North American history between the mid-seventeenth and twentieth centuries.

It has been noted in Chapter II that although there are general characteristics which typify the contemporary North American family, there are differences among individual households. They vary, for instance, in their needs, preferences, and abilities to obtain suitable housing, which are factors that usually tend to change during the lifetime of the family. It is evident in Chapter III that the preferences of a society regarding housing characteristics also undergo change.

In this chapter an attempt is made to provide the planner with information concerning the contemporary family's housing behavior, their expressed preferences for housing, and their stated causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their residential environment. This information will provide the planner with additional knowledge for use in determining guidelines for characteristics of a residential environment.
suited to the contemporary family's needs and desires.

In our twentieth century North American society "... mobility is the mechanism by which a family's housing is brought into adjustment to its housing needs" (Rossi, 1955, 178). Many research studies provide information on residential behavior, attitudes and preferences; the incidence of residential mobility; the characteristics of mobile households; the causes of residential mobility; the criteria sought in a subsequent dwelling unit; and the family's housing cycle. Studies on home ownership of a single family detached house\(^1\) also indicate many of the family's preferences for housing. In order to provide the planner with a better understanding of the family as a housing consumer this chapter presents a literature survey on residential mobility and the desire for ownership of a single family detached house.

RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY AND THE DESIRE FOR HOME OWNERSHIP

A. Incidence

1. Residential Mobility

Contemporary North American households are considered to be extremely transient, due to the fact that they frequently move from one dwelling unit to another (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 486). Many families, therefore, do not live in

\(^1\) Further references to "home ownership" in this paper refer to ownership in fee simple of a single family detached house.
the same dwelling unit for the complete life cycle from the formation of the family through marriage to the death of the partners (Troelstrup, 1965, 263).

In comparison with the early North American family form, there are several changes in the contemporary family which facilitate residential mobility. For instance, as was noted in Chapter II, the change in the economic function of the family from a production unit to one that is based on consumption has been partially responsible for the separation of the place of work away from the residence. This loss of a tie to the house has contributed to the ease of mobility of today's families (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1968, 55; Vincent, 1967, 26).

Also noted in Chapter II was the change in the family from an extended form in early North American society to the nuclear one of today. Goode has observed that the smaller nuclear family, which establishes an independent household, is freer to move, physically, from one residence to another (Goode, 1968b, 65).

Associated with the above change in the structure of the family, the decreased importance of the ancestral home, which had formerly been passed from one generation of the family to the next, was also discussed in Chapter II. The emotional ties to the house as an object intimately related to the family over a long period of time have therefore
declined to a certain extent. This change in attitude has also contributed to the greater ease of residential mobility (Burgess and Locke, 1960, 486, 489).

Individual research studies provide the following information on the rate of residential mobility. Data obtained by Whitney and Grigg between 1947 and 1952, which sought migration histories for the previous twenty years, indicates that the mean number of moves for respondents was 1.8. Thirty-one per cent of the families did not move at all; twenty-five per cent moved only once; forty-two per cent moved between two and seven times; and an additional two per cent moved eight to fourteen times (Whitney and Grigg, 1958, 644, 645).

More recent research indicates the following rates of mobility. Rossi's study, in the early nineteen-fifties, of four areas in Philadelphia, found that mobility, as indicated by the proportion of households living in the area for less than twenty-three months, varied as follows: sixteen and thirty per cent in two "high status" areas; and fourteen and forty-one per cent in two low status areas (Rossi, 1955, 23). In Deutschman's study between 1960 and 1963, he found that 19.5 per cent of the households changed their residences (Deutschman, 1972, 351). During a similar time period Lansing, Mueller and Barth found that among the group of metropolitan area families studied, fifty-two per cent had moved during
the previous five years (Lansing, Mueller and Barth, 1964, 18).

For the whole population, it is stated by Rossi that during a one year period one person in every five moves from one dwelling unit to another (Rossi, 1955, 1). This rate of mobility is consistent with the figure of twenty per cent moves per year which is often used in Census reports, which includes all persons of age one and over. The Bureau of the Census of the United States, in reporting mobility rates by year from 1947 to 1967, states that the proportion of population moving ranges from 18.6 to 21.0 per cent (United States Census, 1966, 1). Rossi estimates that over a ten year period, 1940 to 1950, about three quarters of urban citizens moved from one place of residence to another (Rossi, 1955, 1). From Canadian census information, it was found that between 1950 and 1961, the total number of internal migrants constituted 42.4 per cent of the total population aged five and over in 1961 (George, 1970, 185). Other studies in both the United States and Canada indicate that on the average one family in five moves each year (Deutschman, 1972, 349; Simmons and Simmons, 1969, 145). Rossi comments that"America's city dwellers change their housing, it seems, almost as often as they change their cars"(Rossi, 1955, 1).

In some studies, researchers are seeking information on the type of move i.e. local or distance. Between 1947 and 1958, the United States Census information shows that about
two thirds of the migration is within the same county; about one fifth is within the state or between contiguous states; and the remainder tends to be moves farther than to a contiguous state (United States Census, 1958, 8-9). In Canada, of the internal migrants between 1956 and 1961, sixty per cent were intramunicipal, thirty-two per cent were intraprovincial and eight per cent were interprovincial migrants (George, 1970, 185).

Whitney and George report that local moves account for a greater rate of movement than does in-migration. Fifty-seven per cent of the moves were local changes of residence, whereas migration into another county was found to be responsible for forty-three per cent of the moves. It was also suggested by their data that when a family undertakes one or more distance moves, the last distance move is followed by local changes of residence. They report that fifty-one per cent of the families experienced only local moves; thirty-two per cent combined distance and local moves, and seventeen per cent made only distance moves (Whitney and Grigg, 1959, 647, 648).

Other researchers have been concerned with the type of residential mobility of families in certain locations of a community. This often includes information regarding the location of the family's previous residence. Kalbach, Meyers and Walker, in their research, studied the incidence of
mobility among families from different areas of a city: the central area; an industrial suburb; and a residential suburb. Their findings indicate a greater residential mobility among middle class families in residential suburbs, both in the percentage of mobile families and the frequency of mobility, than among the families residing in the central city or in the industrial suburb. The residential suburbs consistently were comprised of a greater proportion of families moving two to five times. It was also found that families in residential suburbs had a higher proportion experiencing: only a long distance move or a sequence of long distance moves; interstate moves followed by intracounty moves; and intracounty moves. Of all the mobile families in the sample, approximately fifty per cent of the most recent moves were made within the same metropolitan area. The population of both types of suburban areas, however, was comprised of more families who had moved there from outside of the metropolitan area than from the central city (Kalbach, Myers and Walker, 1964, 312, 314).

In the evaluation of rates of mobility, however, it has been demonstrated that high average mobility rates are in part due to a limited number of households in the population who make frequent moves while the majority of the population remains more stable (Goldstein, 1959, 231; Lansing and Mueller, 1967, 53). Evidence of this occurrence was mentioned above in the studies of Whitney and Grigg, and Kalbach, Myers and Walker.
2. **Desire For Home Ownership**

North American society is also characterized by a high rate of home ownership, which has been traditional in Canada and the United States. Beyer points out in 1965 that in the United States "There has never been a year, since housing construction has been recorded, that homes built for ownership have not outnumbered those built for rent" (Beyer, 1965, 249). The percentage of total United States housing that is owner occupied has also increased (Troelstrup, 1965, 263). Beyer states that in 1890, forty-eight per cent of the occupied dwelling units were occupied by owners; forty-six per cent in 1920; forty-eight per cent in 1930; forty-four per cent in 1940; and fifty-five per cent in 1950 (Beyer, 1965, 119). By 1960 and 1964 it was estimated that 61.9 and 62 per cent, respectively, of all occupied houses were owner occupied (Grose and Crandall, 1963, 401; Troelstrup, 1965, 263). In Canada, as well, residential construction is primarily for owner occupancy, and, as a result, it is considered as "... a nation of homeowners" (Wheeler, 1969, 139).

Kelly notes that since the depression, in particular, the proportion of families who own their own home has been rising steadily (Kelly, 1969, 468). This is primarily due to the fact that near the end of World War II there were major legislative changes in housing policies made by the governments of the United States and Canada, which made home owner-
ship attainable for a great many more families (Tyler, 1957, 12; Wheeler, 1969, 67). The endorsement of home ownership, as opposed to rental tenure, by politicians is evident in the statement of Beyer that "...it must be recognized that our (United States) public policy has, for many years, encouraged ownership" (Beyer, 1965, 249). This attitude of government officials is also applicable to Canada, since legislation has been passed in favor of home ownership. For instance, the 1944 to 1954 housing policy of the Federal government included the direct lending of twenty-five percent of the capital amount of an approved National Housing Act mortgage loan at a relatively low interest rate of three percent, which was a lower rate than available on the conventional market (Wheeler, 1969, 67). It was this policy which stimulated the desire for home ownership, and which was also intended to benefit the economy since many jobs were created in the construction industry. The emphasis of the Canadian federal government on promoting home ownership was still apparent in the National Housing Act of 1954. Many policies were changed, with the effect that home ownership was now attainable by families of lower income. One of the changes involved the discontinuation of direct mortgage lending at a subsidized rate of interest, which was replaced by mortgage loan guarantees for mortgages from private lending institutions. Other changes included an increase in the amount of the loan, a decrease in the down payment required, and an increase in the
period of amortization (Wheeler, 1969, 68, 85). As a result of policies which encouraged ownership there was a building boom which consisted almost exclusively of the construction of single family detached houses (Foote et al, 1960, 190).

Many authors have observed the preference of the majority of families for home ownership. Woodbury comments that "... the desire to own one's own home is both wide-spread and deep-seated in American culture" (Woodbury, 1953, 322). Abu-Lughod and Foley observe in Foote et al that "... owning a home ... is a basic part of the American dream of the good life" (Foote et al, 1960, 190).

Early studies, reported in 1948 by Rosow, estimate the aspiration to own one's home as varying between sixty-five and eighty-nine per cent of the population, depending on the sample tested and the structure of the investigation (Rosow, 1948, 751). Caplow found in his nineteen-forties' research of Minneapolis households that 91.1 per cent of the respondents felt that most families should own their own homes. His research indicates that 73.4 per cent of renters replied "yes" when asked if they would prefer to own their home and make monthly payments on the purchase price instead of paying rent; and that 86.7 per cent of owners replied "no" when asked if they would prefer to occupy their present home as a renter on a long term lease at reasonable rent (Caplow, 1948, 725, 726).

A more recent study by Lansing and Hendricks in a Detroit
area survey found that eighty-five per cent of the respondents desired the ownership form of tenure (Lansing and Hendricks, 1967, 34). The most commonly cited reason for selecting the condominium row house, as given by Canadian residents in the late nineteen-sixties, was the desire for home ownership, which the purchasers could not afford in the form of a single family detached house (Condominium Research Associates, 1970, 9). The desire for a residence in the form of a single family detached house is evident in both the United States and Canada. Lansing and Hendricks note that:

"No matter how the data on preferences are considered, the main conclusion is that, if they could do as they pleased, many more people would like to live in single family houses than do live in them" (Lansing and Hendricks, 1967, 36).

A similar preference is common in Canada, as expressed by Lipman, as cited in Wheeler:

"It is widely believed that the majority of Canadians still regard the single-family house as the most desirable form of accommodation" (Wheeler, 1969, 174).

The research of Lansing, Mueller and Barth of families living within Standard Metropolitan Areas of the United States indicate that sixty-seven per cent of the population lived in single family houses, but eighty-three per cent would prefer this type of dwelling unit. The group who would like to shift from a multiple family unit to a single family one comprised
twenty per cent of families residing in metropolitan areas, while the group wanting to make the opposite kind of move included only three per cent of families (Lansing, Mueller and Barth, 1964, 46). A later study by Lansing and Hendricks revealed that slightly more respondents, eighty-seven per cent, favored a single family house. This study also found that nearly two-thirds of the families living in multiple family units expressed preference for living in a private house (Lansing and Hendricks, 1967, 33, 34).

Michelson notes that, from the survey findings of Lansing's latter study, seventy per cent of the sample already lived in single family homes (Michelson, 1968, 39). Michelson also found that the fifteen per cent of families who did not choose to live in a single family home in the future opted for a duplex, triplex, or row house. It was observed that no one wanted to live in a multi-family walkup apartment. In the same study, in response to photographs of a single family house, a town house, a maisonette, and an unfamiliar "futuristic" multiple dwelling (of equal size internally and the same cost to buy or rent, as desired), eighty-three per cent of respondents chose the single family house, with most of the remaining choices going to the town house (Michelson, 1970a, 190, 191).

The choice of a condominium house, as mentioned previously, was also found to be an attempt of the family to
approximate a single family, detached house which was owned. Three out of every four respondents, however, expressed a preference to own a single family detached house in the future. Their current form of housing, therefore, was considered as a temporary type of dwelling unit in the family's housing cycle (Condominium Research Associates, 1970, 10).

B. Motivational Factors Affecting Residential Mobility and the desire for Home Ownership

Residential mobility and the desire for home ownership can be attributed to several factors. Many of the studies have attempted to determine characteristics of the household which cause the family to move. Some factors which have been found to relate to mobility are: age of household head; stage in the family life cycle; type of dwelling unit tenure; occupation; income; desire for status; dissatisfactions with the house and/or neighborhood; and residential location. In the following literature review, it will be noted that some of the above factors are inter-related. For instance, the age of the head of the household is often associated with a particular stage in the family life cycle. An increase in income and/or an advancement in occupational position is also often reflected in the desire for a more prestigious dwelling unit or location. There is also seen to be some differences in household characteristics, which cause moves, between families that make local moves, and those that move longer distances.
Some studies have also been concerned with the features which are preferred in the ownership of a single family detached house. It is observed, however, that many of the reasons given for residential mobility are related to the desire to move from a rented dwelling unit to one which is owned. As a result, many characteristics sought in home ownership appear in the literature on residential mobility.

Leslie and Richardson point out that the same families who find a dwelling unit satisfactory for a time may become dissatisfied with it as the circumstances of the family change (Leslie and Richardson, 1961, 901). One example is the influence of the various stages of the family life cycle which cause changes in the size of the family. Rossi and Spears both note that households in the early stages of the family life cycle usually have many demands on their financial resources which affect their ability to bring housing requirements into line with their needs, particularly for space. Young married couples usually do not have sufficient funds to obtain housing that fulfills their needs much in advance of the time when the family size increases. (Rossi, 1955, 72; Spears, 1970, 457). The family may also consider their housing incongruent with their socioeconomic status as a result of an increased income or higher position from job related factors, or from an inheritance, and thus move to bring these factors into line with each other.
Rossi has described the migration process as consisting of "push" and "pull" forces which usually operate together. The household may experience certain "push" factors which tend to create a desire to move out of the current dwelling unit, and certain "pull" factors which are the desired characteristics pertaining to available places to which the household may move. They tend to reinforce the "push" factors. From the results of his research Rossi noted that the more numerous the complaints mentioned by a household concerning their present residence, the more likely was the desire to move. Among voluntary movers, i.e. households who have a clear choice between staying and moving, the "push-pull" forces are operative. With involuntary movers, however, the "push" element usually has not been formulated through the buildup of mobility desires. Examples of involuntary moves include those brought about by eviction or destruction of the dwelling unit by natural elements or man. They may also occur as the result of other decisions made by the household, such as to accept or to seek a job in a different area. Influences outside of the family may also cause a temporary or permanent income loss which may also mean an involuntary move to a less expensive dwelling unit (Armiger, 1966, 23; Lansing, Clifton and Morgan, 1969, 26; Rossi, 1955, 7; 8, 9). According to Abu-Lughod and Foley, cited in Foote et al, approximately sixty per cent of moves are the result of a voluntary decision on the part of the household to seek a new residence. These households would
thus probably go through the "push-pull" process of forming mobility desires before actually looking for a new home (Foote et al, 1960, 155).

Chevan points out that there may be factors related to the family, such as social class, racial and ethnic considerations, and adequacy of family financial resources that tend to modify the needs, desires, or ability of the family to find suitable housing (Chevan, 1971, 451). There are other constraints, as well, which tend to alter the criteria sought in a new dwelling unit, and which may be evident in the characteristics of the residence selected, if a move is possible. Three examples are: the housing market; the consumer's knowledge of available units; and the time available for the search process.

In the search for a new residence the household usually evaluates alternative possibilities before making a choice. During this process the consumer rarely finds everything he desires in one dwelling unit. As part of the selection process, therefore, the housing consumer experiences tradeoffs in which certain factors become of prime importance, while still other factors are sacrificed altogether. Abu-Lughod and Foley, cited in Foote et al, state that:

"Thus, the housing choice is not only a compromise among location, tenure, and dwelling, it is also a compromise within dwelling among equipment, design, state of repair, and space - with cost the comparatively inflexible limiting factor which makes the other choices necessary..."
Stated preferences may be and often are severely modified on the housing market" (Foote et al, 1960, 219).

With regard to the evaluation of literature describing stated preferences for a residential environment, Lamanna notes that often the things that one is accustomed to having are taken for granted, and therefore, are not mentioned as requirements. Other desires which are relatively absent from one's life experience, however, are apt to be given a great deal of importance in stated preferences (Lamanna, 1964, 321).

1. Stage in Family Life Cycle/Age of Head of Household

In Rossi's classic study of residential mobility in Philadelphia, it was found that the major social characteristic which distinguished mobile households from stable ones were variables closely related to the family life cycle. Most moves were made by a family within a decade after its formation, when space requirements changed as did the desired social environment. Mobility, therefore, is usually greatest during the period when families are experiencing their greatest growth, which is when they require additional space. Rossi notes that the younger the family, and the larger its size, the more inclined it is towards moving. The size of the family, however, is not always related to the life cycle, but again the mobility desire is primarily a response to the need for more space in the dwelling unit (Rossi, 1955, 6, 9, 10, 71, 73).
The formation of a family through marriage is characterized, in contemporary society, by the acquisition of a separate dwelling unit (Foote et al., 1960, 97; Rossi, 1955, 2). Glick and Parke report that "all but thirteen per cent of the married couples in 1960 who had been married less than a year had established a separate home" (Glick and Parke, 1965, 198). The typical contemporary family thus places a high value on having a separate dwelling unit for the nuclear family (Beresford and Rivlin, 1966, 247). Rossi notes that residential shifts are also often the result of a change in marital status brought about by separation, divorce, or the death of a family member. The dissolution of households, however, does not as consistently result in moves as does the formation of new households (Rossi, 1955, 2).

The analysis of the housing cycle for the median family by Abu-Loghod and Foley, as cited in Foote et al., indicates residential moves for five of the six stages of the family cycle: pre-child, child-bearing; child-rearing; child-launching; widowed. As in Rossi's results, mobility is highest during the child-bearing stage, when two or three moves are typical (Foote et al., 1960, 99). Whitney and Grigg found that recently formed families with the husband and wife in the younger age groups displayed relatively high mobility rates when compared with families with teen-age children. Their data point to the relative stability of the middle years of the family life cycle with respect to place of residence.
(Whitney and Grigg, 1958, 646). In the study of a central area in Boston by Ross, he found that families moving within the local area cited features of the house and changes in the family's size and composition as the primary causes of moving (Ross, 1962, 262).

The research by Lansing, Mueller and Barth of individual families moving within Standard Metropolitan Areas of the United States reports that moves were frequently made due to changes in the family size and composition, for instance, marriage, births, death or divorce, which altered the requirements for space (Lansing, Mueller and Barth, 1964, 20). Spears, in his results on mobility between 1948 and 1967 for Rhode Island residents, states that "Apparently the resettlement process which is initiated with marriage is often not completed with the original move to establish a new home for the newly married couple." The results of the studies of Rossi and Abu-Lughod and Foley are again confirmed, since mobility is high during the early stages of the family life cycle, particularly when children are born, and then decline during the middle stages of child-rearing and child launching. Speare's results indicate, however, that persons who marry earlier than average and those who have children earlier than average appear to have higher mobility rates than average, while those who marry later and have children later have lower mobility rates. It is also noted again that, when death of one marriage partner occurs after the postchild stage of the family life cycle, the
probability of moving is substantially increased, and that a move is undertaken by at least one partner when separation or divorce breaks the marriage union (Speare, 1970, 453, 454).

The study conducted by Chevan, in the early nineteen-sixties, of residential histories for households within the Philadelphia and Trenton Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, also supports the effect of an increase in family size on mobility. He notes that in any given period the birth of children is associated with higher rates of mobility for that period, and the more children born, the higher the rates of moving. This is due to the fact that the addition of family members increases the pressure on the available housing space. His data indicates that rates of mobility are high during the early years of marriage, and then decline during subsequent years (Chevan, 1971, 453, 454, 456).

The 1963 study by Deutschman of households in the New York Metropolitan area indicates that an increase in family size is related to mobility. He found that the group most affected was the two person family increasing to three persons. When the family size remained constant with two persons the rate of mobility was twenty per cent. The rate rose from 2.3 to 3.4 times this figure, however, when the family increased in size (Deutschman, 1972, 353).

The age of the head of the household is also an indicator of the tendency to move. As previously mentioned, the differ-
ent ages are often associated with specific stages of the family life cycle. In the study by Abu-Lughod and Foley, mobility is highest when the husband's age is between twenty-five and thirty-four (Foote et al, 1960, 99). It has been noted in Rossi's study, also, that households with a head under thirty-five years of age has the highest mobility. Rossi states that "it (the early stages of family life cycle) is the period in which the household, because of the financial demands made upon it by these rapid changes in size and composition, is least likely to be able to bring housing into line with its needs" (Rossi, 1955, 72, 73).

The study by Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol concluded that the age of the household head differentiated movers from nonmovers more frequently than other variables (Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol, 1963/64, 150). Glick, from data of the nineteen fifty United States census, notes that the mobility rate was twice as high in families where the head was under thirty-five years of age as in those where he was from thirty-five to forty-four years old, and five times higher than when he had reached the age of sixty-five (Glick, 1957, 79).

The study by Speare in 1968 also confirms the relationship between mobility and age. The mobility rates are highest for the eighteen to twenty-four age group. They decline until the forty-five to fifty-four age group, after which he found, in contrast to some studies, that mobility rates remained approximately constant. From the results of his research
Speare stresses the fact that persons of the same life cycle stage but of different ages exhibit different mobility rates; and persons of the same age but at different life cycle stages are often quite different in their mobility behavior (Speare, 1970, 453, 457).

Deutschman notes that the average household headed by a man in his early thirties would have two times the probability of moving as compared to the household headed by a man in his early forties; and three times the probability to move as a household headed by a man of fifty years (Deutschman, 1972, 350).

The desire for, and degree of satisfaction with home ownership also varies with stages in the family life cycle and the age of the household head. Branch found that the greatest desire for, or satisfaction with home ownership (seventy-eight per cent) was expressed by household heads under thirty and by families with young children. The least satisfaction with home ownership (sixty-seven per cent) was found among the age group over fifty. Only twenty-five per cent of the younger group were actually home owners, whereas thirty-three per cent of the older group owned homes (Branch, 1942, 21). In the more recent study by Lansing and Hendricks approximately ninety-five per cent of married couples with children, who lived in rented multiple family accommodation expressed a desire for a single family house, due to the
increase in family size associated with the family life cycle (Lansing and Hendricks, 1967, 35).

2. Tenure

Many studies of residential mobility show that the type of tenure of the dwelling unit is a major determinant in the decision to move. Renters are found to be more mobile than owners, particularly renters who seek ownership. Rossi's study indicates that renters who prefer to own are considerably more mobile than renters preferring to rent. He found that forty-seven per cent were anxious to move to an owned dwelling unit, whereas twenty-one per cent were anxious to move to other rented accommodation. His study also shows that sixty-one per cent of renters wanted to move, whereas only thirty-three per cent of owners had that desire (Rossi, 1955, 68-70). The study by Whitney and Grigg also confirms the higher rates of mobility among renters as compared to home-owners (Whitney and Grigg, 1958, 646).

Lansing, Mueller and Barth also found that one of the major reasons given for moving was that families wanted to become home owners (Lansing, Mueller and Barth, 1964, 20). In a study by Brademas the respondents gave the desire for home ownership as the reason for leaving their previous neighborhood in twenty per cent of the relocation cases interviewed (Brademas, 1956, 79).
It was found by Lansing, Clifton and Morgan that there may be an attitude of "temporary" towards a rental type of tenure, as compared to home ownership, which caused a desire to move (Lansing, Clifton and Morgan, 1969, 26). Lansing and Mueller note that, of recent movers, about three out of ten owned their homes before they moved, and about four out of ten owned their homes after they moved (Lansing and Mueller, 1967, 152). Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol found that over fifty per cent of all the previous renters in their sample changed to ownership in their most recent move (Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol, 1969, 2). Speare's study indicates that, on the average, renters were four to five times more likely to move than home owners (Speare, 1970, 457). This rate of mobility was found to be lower in the research of Deutschman. He notes that the likelihood of renters moving in a given time period is two times greater than that of owners (Deutschman, 1972, 352).

A primary motive for the preference of owned tenure over rented is due to the increased opportunity for individuality and independence when title to the residence is held by the occupants. Although the owner has certain legal constraints on his property, such as municipal by-laws relating to zoning, he is not restricted in his activities by a landlord. One of the expressed advantages of ownership is the fact that alterations may be made to the residence as desired by the family. The property can, therefore, be modified to
fulfill the needs of the family more satisfactorily, for instance, by adding rooms or enlarging existing ones and by providing play equipment for children. Individuality can also be achieved through self-expression by painting walls any color desired, or by constructing built-in furniture. The family can, therefore, create an environment that is suited to their tastes (United States Savings and Loan League, 1964, 29). A recent study by Michelson notes that of four different housing types, single family, row house, walk up, and high rise, the highest percentage of respondents cited individualism as a value associated with a single family house (Michelson, 1970b, 143).

It is also recognized that another reason for the preference of owned tenure, as opposed to rental tenure, may be due to some tax provisions that encourage home ownership (Beyer, 1965, 361). For instance, in the United States, there are possible income tax advantages for home purchasers, which are not applicable to renters, since taxes and interest charges on the loan for the purchase of the dwelling unit may be deducted for income tax purposes (Troelstrup, 1965, 268). In Canada, also, there are certain tax advantages associated with home ownership. In British Columbia, for instance, provisions are made for a rebate on property taxes for home owners (Province of British Columbia, 1960, Chapt. 308). Legislators, therefore, encourage home ownership through tax provisions, as well as through mortgage lending policies,
as previously mentioned in this chapter.

3. **Economic/Status**

Economic factors relating to jobs are also an important influence on residential mobility, particularly for long distance moves. Changes in a job or occupational position are often accompanied by an increase in income and/or a higher position. Such changes frequently reflect an increase in status and prestige which not only creates a desire, but may also provide the resources for a "better" dwelling unit, or dwelling unit location.

Lansing and Mueller state that "it is clear that members of the labor force move largely for economic reasons: sixty-one per cent mentioned economic reasons only." It should be noted, however, that the respondents were primarily persons who had made long distance moves, thus the moves were motivated by job related factors. Professional and technical people, in particular, moved for economic reasons (Lansing and Mueller, 1967, 59). Anderson also reports that, among migrants, an increase in education also tends to increase the propensity to move. She found that the best-educated group has the highest rate of migration, and that college educated people tend to dominate the long distance migratory movements. It is thus the professional and semi-professional employees who are the most mobile (Anderson, 1966, 32). Lansing, Mueller and Barth found that moving plans vary little by income group,
but increase in frequency with higher education (Lansing, Mueller and Barth, 1964, 18).

In the study by Whitney and Grigg, however, it appeared that families with below average incomes, and those who held blue-collar and clerical jobs, rather than managerial and professional positions, had a higher mobility rate (Whitney and Grigg, 1958, 646). Deutschman's study indicates that unemployed workers show a high mobility rate due to the fact that they move to seek better employment opportunities. Laborers were found to have the highest rate of movement for the study period. Professional workers also exhibited a very high rate of residential mobility. The occupation of "managers, officials and proprietors," as well as retired workers, had the lowest rate of residential movements. This study also reports that the influence of a new job on a new residence is evident in approximately one-quarter of all moves (Deutschman, 1972, 351, 352).

Incongruities between the household's perception of their socio-economic status and the characteristics and/or location of their present dwelling unit is frequently a reason for moving. Rossi found that the desire for a particular location was second in importance when looking for a new dwelling. He felt that the interest in specific neighborhoods was related to the fact that the area symbolized an especially desired "social climate" (Rossi, 1955, 153, 155).
Beyer, Mackesey and Montgomery found in their study of household's in Buffalo that movement to suburban areas was partly a desire: to be with the "right sort of people" (Beyer, Mackesey and Montgomery, 1955, 32). Paxton's study of households, whose reason for moving was to buy a house, indicates that the desire for a "good" location, particularly one where the neighbors would be congenial, was of significant importance (Paxton, 1955, 15).

Whitney and Grigg's data shows that ninety per cent of local moves were categorized as status reasons (Whitney and Grigg, 1958, 650). The 1958 research of Lamanna in Greensboro, North Carolina, indicates that the social attributes of the residential environment, particularly status, i.e. "the right kind of people", ranked second and third out of a possible thirteen variables. The least desirable feature of a community was the heterogeneity of types of persons (Lamanna, 1964, 318). Bell's study also indicates that households desire a neighborhood with "people-like-ourselves" (Bell, 1968, 236). Pape notes, from his research of middle management personnel in Vancouver, that a majority of moves into their present or previous residences were made in order to adjust residence requirements to the family's status and prestige needs as they changed with employment position (Pape, 1959, iii, iv).

The results of the study by Ross indicate that status reasons are important in moving, particularly among households
desiring to move from the central city to a peripheral urban area (Ross, 1962, 262). Leslie and Richardson found in their study of households residing in a relatively new urban subdivision that upward social mobility far outweighed all other considerations in producing residential mobility. Of forty-four households who moved during one year, forty-two were judged to have done so as part of the process of upward social mobility (Leslie and Richardson, 1961, 899). Evidence of social mobility is also apparent in the research of Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol. Their findings suggest that, among persons dissatisfied with their neighborhoods, those who perceive neighborhood location as being indicative of status are more likely to be movers than those who do not (Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol, 1963/64, 148).

With respect to both the incidence of home ownership and the desire for it, there are also differences among the population sub-groups which relate to socio-economic status. Meyerson et al note from a study of home ownership by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that the degree of preference for home ownership varies markedly by income group: in the upper-income group it is approximately eighty per cent, seventy-five per cent in the middle-income group; and sixty-six per cent in the low-income group (Meyerson et al, 1962, 56, 57, 85). Abu-Lughod and Foley, cited in Foote et al, note the fact that those occupational groups which strive the greatest for middle class attributes, have the greatest positive motivation
for home ownership. This desire, therefore, is stronger in
the white-collar class than among unskilled or semiskilled
workers (Foote et al, 1960, 191). Dean observes that the
desire for ownership between these groups is for significantly
different reasons:

"...white-collar workers are drawn toward
homeownership by ... the desire for a
better neighborhood and a more up-to-date
house...while having a place for their
old age appeals more to wage earners"
(Dean, 1951, 66).

The quest for security through home ownership, which
assures a home for old age, is noted in an earlier study ("The
Urge to Own", 1937, 374). This attitude was confirmed in the
eyear study by Branch, as indicated by the fact that the most
important reason why renters wanted to own was for security
or stability reasons (Branch, 1942, 15). Reasons related to
security, again for old age, and a source of stability for the
family in contemporary society were also evident in Rosow's
findings (Rosow, 1948, 753).

The above desire for security and stability is largely
related to psychological factors. The feeling of "security", however, can be based on financial considerations. In general
there is the belief that ownership of a dwelling unit, as
opposed to renting, is more economical and will lead to an
increased return of the investment on resale. This belief,
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although not necessarily valid for all households, is confirmed in many studies. Research findings which were reported in 1937 give the reasons of "more economical in long run" and "good investment" as the second and third most important reasons for preferring to own ("Urge to Own", 1937, 374). Paxton found that the reasons given for buying a home that were "financial considerations" referred to: the investment aspect of buying; higher rental payments than for a house; and security in owning a home (Paxton, 1955, 10). Rosow found that there was the following attitude toward the security aspect of home ownership:

"Presumably by purchasing a home, rent payments become a type of "savings" since property is being acquired rather than payments being made for the privilege of tenancy. This real property is potentially a liquid asset of necessity, whereas rent (as use payment) is noncumulative and, hence, no asset" (Rosow, 1948, 753, 754).

Greenwald states that one of the advantages of owning is that it provides a saving incentive, and that it is possible to benefit considerably when house prices are increasing if one sells a house, providing that a new one can be acquired at a reasonable cost (Greenwald, 1958, 75). The 1969 Canadian Federal Task Force states that:

"People seem almost to have accepted continuing inflation as a way of economic life, and, having done so, they are looking more and more to investment sources for their earnings and savings which seem to offer protection against declining purchasing power. In the recent years at least, there have been fewer better sources than single family dwellings, prices of
which generally have been rising in a supply-short market at rates sufficient to cover off even the worst inflationary loss. Single-family dwellings then increasingly have become not only a place to live, but a good investment as well" (Federal Task Force, 1969, 17).

The ownership of a single family detached house is also considered to be a source of prestige. Abu-Lughod and Foley, in Foote et al, state that the house assumes "...a symbol of economic achievement and social standing" (Foote et al, 1960, 111). Rosow's study indicates that status-prestige desires ranked second in importance in the motive for home ownership (Rosow, 1948, 752). Meyerson et al note the fact that:

"...homeownership seems to give many people a larger measure of prestige and social status than they obtain through rental tenure. These people believe, that, in the eyes of the community, they become stable and dependable citizens when they become home owners" (Meyerson et al, 1962, 85).

4. Residential Environment

The degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the residential environment, which, for the purposes of this paper includes the dwelling unit itself and the neighborhood characteristics, is another factor influencing the mobility of families and their desire for home ownership. Meyerson et al point out that the housing consumer cannot select housing apart from a package of related goods and services:

"With the house go schools; churches, shops, visual environment, places to play, neighbors, status attributes, a municipal administration, a journey to
work (perhaps with a commitment to a particular form of transportation), and even an orientation toward cultural, social and commercial activities - in short, a way of life" (Meyerson et al, 1962, 5).

Some studies have attempted to determine the specific aspects of the residential environment which cause moves. In general, dwelling unit characteristics are found to be stronger motivational factors than neighborhood characteristics. Dwelling unit characteristics are also found to be more important in the choice of a residence. Brown and Moore note, however, that certain neighborhoods are eliminated from consideration before the search for a new dwelling unit begins, based on the household's knowledge of residential areas and the criteria desired in the new location. The search for a suitable dwelling unit, therefore, is restricted to certain geographical areas of the community (Brown and Moore, 1971, 207).

It is also often evident that causes of dissatisfaction with the dwelling unit in which the family is living are reflected in the criteria sought in the new dwelling unit. As previously mentioned, there are frequently tradeoffs encountered during the search process which alter the hierarchy of preferences.

Rossi found in his study that complaints about the space within the dwelling were most important in distinguishing between mobile and stable households. This dissatisfaction was followed by complaints concerning the social and physical characteristics of the neighborhood, and the cost
associated with the dwelling unit. Complaints about the journey to work, and about the distance from friends or relatives were found to be only slightly related to mobility desires. The criteria sought in choosing the new home, in rank order, were: space in the dwelling unit, particular dwelling design features, dwelling location, and finally cost. Cost, however, appeared as the major consideration in the actual choice, followed by space, location and neighborhood characteristics (Rossi, 1955, 154, 164).

Paxton notes that when price becomes a constraining factor households would sacrifice features of the house first: usually one less room, and less expensive details, such as fireplaces and built-in equipment; and next they would sacrifice location, as respondents would choose a less expensive site (Paxton, 1955, 16).

Abu-Lughod and Foley, cited in Foote et al, note that dissatisfaction with the current residence is responsible for the majority of decisions to move within the same community. The major sources of complaint, which confirm Rossi's findings, are summarized by Abu-Lughod and Foley in descending order of their importance for creating mobility desires: insufficient space within the dwelling; an unsatisfactory social composition of the neighborhood surrounding the dwelling; a too high cost of housing, particularly with respect to the value received; and poor design and layout of the dwelling unit (Foote et al, 1960, 155, 156).
The reasons given in Dewey's study for moving from the urban center to the periphery of Milwaukee are primarily related to the desire for a better environment for children. This desire accounts for eightyone per cent of the responses given as the reason for moving (Dewey, 1948, 121). The study of Ross in Boston is also concerned with the reasons for desiring to move to and from a central city area. The reasons given by local movers are primarily related to features of the house, particularly the lack of space. The quality of the neighborhood is less important, and convenience of location is least important. For distance movers, however, location is most important, and is followed by features of the house and status reasons (Ross, 1962, 262).

In the results of the study by Whitney and Grigg it was found that with local moves only nine per cent of the reasons for moving were associated with non-status characteristics of the dwelling unit. Moves to a "better" house, to a "better" street, or to a "more desirable" neighborhood, which reflect neighborhood and housing dissatisfactions, were categorized as status reasons (Whitney and Grigg, 1958, 650). The results of the research by Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol indicate that, in evaluating environmental factors as the causes of moves, housing unit dissatisfactions are of more importance than neighborhood considerations (Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol, 1963/64, 151).
Lansing, Mueller and Barth found that for households who had moved within the past five years the primary factors in the moving decision were: the house itself, thirty-two per cent; neighborhood considerations, twenty-two per cent; nearness to place of work, thirteen per cent; other location-considerations, eighteen per cent; cost considerations, fourteen per cent. In expressed reasons for plans to move, the characteristics of the house were again the most important. This study, therefore, again indicates the important role of the degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the dwelling unit in the moving decision (Lansing, Mueller and Barth, 1964, 21).

The importance of the dwelling unit is confirmed in the 1964 study by Weiss, Kenny and Steffens of middle class families residing in newly constructed, suburban, single family houses around Greensboro, North Carolina. The six most important factors in choosing present and future residential units indicate that the characteristics of the individual dwelling unit are most important. The provision of sufficient interior storage space and rooms ranks first, and the arrangement of rooms ranks sixth. The cost of the dwelling unit and lot, which ranks third, indicates, as in Rossi's results, that this aspect of housing is a major factor. The desire for a large lot ranks fifth. Both physical and social characteristics of the neighborhood are important factors. The quality and character of the homes ranks second while the desire for a neighborhood with a good reputation and prestige ranks fourth. It
is important to note, however, that each of the above items was ranked first by at least twenty-eight per cent, and up to sixty-nine per cent of the respondents (Weiss, Kenny and Steffens, 1966, 27-29). Lamanna's research findings indicate that the physical characteristics of the neighborhood, with the exception of "good roads and sidewalks", which ranked first, were clustered towards the bottom of the scale (Lamanna, 1964, 318).

The data from a study by Greenbie of families in Madison also confirms the findings of other researchers that reasons relating to the house predominate over neighborhood reasons for moving. In the two areas from which he drew his sample, the city centre and a suburb, the respondents indicated that for both their previous and present residence, the house was more important than the neighborhood. The largest percentage of responses (forty-one and forty-three per cent) to the question of why they moved from their previous home was a desire for a bigger house. In reply to a question as to whether the family would have stayed in their former neighborhood if it was possible to replace the house there in a satisfactory manner, there were a significant number of respondents (forty-two and forty per cent) who answered "yes." When asked if they would replace, in a satisfactory manner, their present house on the same site with a more suitable one, there was again a similar response. This indicates that many families would remain in a neighborhood if they could improve their dwelling unit (Greenbie, 1968, 77, 79, 80, 84).
A mobility study during the nineteen-sixties by Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol of households in forty-three metropolitan areas across the United States reports housing and neighborhood preferences. A dwelling unit that has a nice appearance inside and a less desirable outside appearance, is overwhelmingly preferred to a place that presents a very nice outside appearance but less desirable appearance inside. The interior characteristics of the dwelling unit, therefore, are of more importance than those of the exterior. A better neighborhood quality with either a less desirable housing unit or a less accessible location is also overwhelmingly preferred to a less desirable neighborhood with either a better housing unit or better accessibility. This last preference is in contrast to the prime importance given to characteristics of the dwelling unit as expressed in many of the previously mentioned studies (Butler, Sabagh and Van Arsdol, 1969, 2). Beyer confirms the observations of Butler et al, as he states that features of the location have precedence over the dwelling unit design:

"... the most satisfactorily designed house or apartment can become an unsatisfactory place to live if it is not in a desirable location. In fact, if a choice is required between a house that lacks certain design qualities but which is situated in a desirable location and one that is well designed but situated in an undesirable location, most families probably would choose the former" (Beyer, 1965, 313).

In Michelson’s recent study of housing expectations of households moving, and intending to move within a suburban
single family housing area, and a high-rise central city area of Greater Toronto, he found that several dwelling unit characteristics were slightly more important than the neighborhood. The general categories of main reasons given by both wives and husbands for the move away from the current home are ranked as follows: dwelling unit; unit interior size and layout; exterior setting; family composition; and neighborhood. The general categories of main reasons given by both wives and husbands for the choice of a new residence are ranked as follows: unit interior size and layout; neighborhood; exterior setting; access; and dwelling unit. It is noted that dissatisfactions causing the "push" are often related to the factors creating the "pull." The priority of the factors operating in the "push-pull" forces, however, often are not identical. This is illustrated in the increased importance of neighborhood considerations in the choice of a new residence, as well as access (Michelson, 1972, 85, 88).

The relationship between the location of the residence and some other factors, such as place of work and proximity to friends does not appear to be a particularly important consideration in the choice of a dwelling unit. Rossi's findings indicate the belief that a desirable "social climate" has greater priority than the convenience to their jobs, or to friends (Rossi, 1955, 155). Lamanna found that respondents in his study gave a low rank to the accessibility of various activities, services and the closeness to friends (Lamanna, 1964, 318).
Wolforth in his Vancouver study of the place of work-residence relationship concludes that this distance appears to be a less important determinant of residential location than the costs of housing (Wolforth, 1965, iv). Beyer, Mackesey, and Montgomery found that the closeness to work was one of the factors often sacrificed in "trade-offs."

"Though it is generally assumed that people would like to live where they can get to work as cheaply, quickly, and conveniently as possible, they (families) will forego these conveniences in favor of certain other considerations..." (Beyer, Mackesey and Montgomery, 1955, 36).

Lansing, Mueller and Barth found that living close to the place of work was of "no importance at all" to forty per cent of recent movers, and only "somewhat important" to another twenty-five per cent. These responses were particularly evident among married couples with children (Lansing, Mueller and Barth, 1964, 38). Deutschman states that the young married couple without children seeks to maximize the interaction of the nearness to work and entertainment. They, therefore, usually locate in the city centre. When children are added to the household the family goes through a transitional period. The desire for closeness in time, cost and convenience to the worksite and entertainment declines, and is replaced by the need for an increased amount of living space, proximity to playgrounds and parks, and nearness to schools (Deutschman, 1972, 350). The desire for nearness to schools was evident in the study of the home purchase decision
by Weiss, Kenny and Steffens as respondents ranked this factor as seventh in importance, from a list of approximately forty items, in choosing present and future residential locations. It is noted that the majority of respondents had school-aged children (Weiss, Kenny and Steffens, 1966, 27).

The preference of families for a single family detached house is also primarily related to structural features of the dwelling unit and the lot. In general, the size of detached homes, as compared with apartments, is larger, as the former usually has both a larger amount of floor space and number of rooms (Foote et al, 1960, 200; Winnick, 1957, 78). This provides the family with a greater opportunity to attain privacy for individual members, as well as a place for them to pursue hobbies and recreational activities with less interference to others. These are aspects regarded as important to the contemporary family (Beresford and Rivlin, 1966, 247; Winnick, 1957, 7).

The increased feeling of privacy with respect to neighbors is also an important aspect of the detached house, as compared to a row house or apartment which has common walls. The desire for a large lot is also related to privacy, as this provides greater distance from neighbors. Paxton's study indicates that one of the reasons why home buyers moved from their former dwellings was due to their desire for privacy. It is reported that three out of ten buyers wanted a larger lot (Paxton, 1955, 10, 16). Weiss, Kenny and Steffens also found
that among home buyers the desire for a large lot ranked fifth as a factor of importance in choosing present and future dwellings (Weiss, Kenny and Steffens, 1966, 27). The greater preference for a large lot over a small one was expressed by married couples with children in the research by Michelson (Michelson, 1968, 41). The desire for private outdoor space was also confirmed by Lansing and Hendricks (Lansing and Hendricks, 1967, 59).

The primary concern for privacy is due to the potential disturbance caused by noise. Lansing and Hendricks note that respondents feel that single family homes are less noisy than multiple units (Lansing and Hendricks, 1967, 81). Raven notes that while people in apartments suffer more from noise disturbances than people in detached houses, the more important consideration in privacy is the restriction which people feel on making noise themselves. As a result, individual and family hobbies and leisure activities tend to be more passive, such as viewing television (Raven, 1967, 236).

The detached home is considered better for raising children, since children like to make noise, both vocally and through strenuous activities, and this form of dwelling is considered to allow them more freedom. Michelson comments that there is a general attitude that:

"Where a family shares walls with less than perfect soundproofing with other families, though, this noise must continually be nipped in the bud lest one antagonize the neighbors or invite retaliation" (Michelson, 1970b, 99).
The private outdoor space at ground level which is adjacent to the detached house is another feature preferred by families, particularly those with children. The primary reason for this preference by parents is due to the greater ease in supervising the activities of their children, since they can usually be seen and heard. It is, therefore, easier to attend to children when problems arise (Michelson, 1970b, 97). This outdoor space is also considered desirable since it allows a variety of activities to be performed by various family members. This may include hobbies such as gardening or building a boat; recreational activities such as sports; and household functions such as drying laundry. The entertainment of guests may also be transferred from the inside of the dwelling unit to the outdoors, as evidenced by the increasing popularity of "barbeques." (Foote et al, 1960, 259, 260). Lansing, Mueller and Barth note that:

"... people, and particularly young people with children, do attach a positive value to closeness to the out-of-doors, open spaces and informal living..." (Lansing, Mueller and Barth, 1964, 37).

C. Housing Cycle Related to Family Life Cycle

As noted in the previous chapter, the contemporary family is characterized as living in six to seven different dwelling units during the family life cycle (Foote et al, 1960, 97-118). Meyerson et al observe that the family may live in five to eight different dwelling units due to changes in the family
life cycle (Meyerson et al, 1962, 94). Simmons has attributed five of the eight or nine expected lifetime moves of the family to events associated with the family life cycle (Simmons, 1968, 630).

Abu-Lughod and Foley, in Foote, summarize the housing cycle as follows: In the "pre-child" stage, the couple lives in a rented dwelling unit of one to three rooms in the city centre. During the "child-bearing" stage, when the family size is expanding, there are two or three moves to rented dwelling units of three to four rooms, which is located in the middle or outer rings of the city centre. The "child-rearing" stage, with a constant family size, is characterized by one move to an owned house of six rooms, located at the periphery of the city or in the suburbs. In the next stage, that of "child-launching", the family size begins to decline. There is usually one move, again to an owned, six room house, but the location is in the suburbs. In the "postchild" period the couple is unlikely to move (Foote et al, 1960, 99).

Meyerson et al note a similar pattern of residential mobility related to the family life cycle of the "normal" housing consumer which is described as follows: The family, when first married, moves to an apartment where they live for a year or so, during which time their first child is born. They then move to a larger apartment which they occupy for the next three years. At the end of this time period a second child is born. The family now desires a larger dwelling unit,
and outdoor play space, adjacent to the residence, for the first child. Since the family still lacks sufficient funds to buy a house, they rent an older home, near the edge of the city, for two years. When the third child is expected, a small new suburban house is purchased. Approximately twelve years later the family income has increased substantially, and a larger house is purchased, in which they plan the stay "for the rest of our lives." Most couples do continue to occupy this residence as their "permanent" home. For other families, the likelihood is that the family will remain in the second owned home for only twelve to fifteen years. If the family income increases, the tendency is to move to a more pretentious home or a better neighborhood. Other families, when the children have left home, move to the greater convenience of an apartment or a smaller house. Following the death of one partner, the remaining one may move to a small apartment, or into the home of a married child. The housing cycle is, therefore, comprised of two to four apartments, one rented house, and two to three owned houses during the family life cycle (Meyerson et al, 1962, 93, 94).

Summary

In the review of literature, the studies have documented the degree of residential mobility and desire for owned, single family detached housing which characterizes the contemporary North American family. The consumer's reasons for leaving a
residence, and his preferences in seeking a new one are sought by researchers, as are the motives for home ownership. It is evident that the consumers vary in the characteristics of housing which cause dissatisfaction, as well as in their preferences and motives for an alternate form. It is also found that many factors associated with the consumer's behavior and attitudes toward residential mobility and the desire for ownership of a detached dwelling unit are interrelated. These areas of study, as a result, are very complex, and a summary, therefore, suggests only a few direct cause and effect relationships. There are, however, some general tendencies of families which are evident from the previous survey of literature.

Researchers have noted that residential mobility within a metropolitan area is undertaken by families primarily to bring their housing needs into line with changes in family size during the various stages of the family life cycle. In general, the greatest rate of mobility is associated with young families (age of head of household under thirty-four years) which are experiencing growth during the child bearing stage of the family life cycle, and who, therefore, need more space. The young families, in the family formation stage, are also usually renting their accommodation. Since these families move frequently, the mobility rates of renters are found to be higher than that of owners. The move from rented to owned tenure occurs often, due to the fact that home ownership of a single
family detached house is considered the ultimate goal of a majority of households.

Residential mobility is also often the result of dissatisfactions with the current dwelling unit and/or neighborhood due to the feeling that the characteristics of the residential environment are incongruent with the socio-economic status of the family. A move, therefore, frequently occurs to bring these two factors into line with one another.

Long distance moves, in contrast, are most often associated with job related factors. It has been noted in several studies, however, that long distance moves are frequently followed by local moves.

The desire for home ownership is expressed by a majority of respondents in the literature reviewed. Home ownership of a single family detached house is felt to be the best form of house for fulfilling the needs of a family, particularly one with children. Research studies have indicated that the greatest degree of satisfaction among home owners is evident among the group of young families with children present. A primary motive for home ownership, however, is the desire for outside space adjacent to the dwelling unit. This is due to the desire for privacy from neighbors, particularly with regard to noise, and for child-related reasons, such as the ease in supervising play activities. The opportunity to alter the structural and decorative features of an owned home are considered important. The ownership of the dwelling unit, as opposed to rental tenure, is valued as a source of individuality and of a feeling
of independence. The economic aspects of home ownership, particularly with respect to lower monthly payments as compared with rents, and the expectation of economic gain on resale, are considered important, but less so than the previously mentioned factors. Home ownership is also associated with increased prestige, as there is an attitude that home-owners are "better citizens" in comparison with renters.

In the selection of a new residence and the desire for home ownership the characteristics of the dwelling unit are generally considered most important. Of primary concern is the amount of interior space. The social characteristics of the neighborhood, however, are also very important. In some studies this was given precedence over the dwelling unit attributes. The attributes of the house and location as indicators of status and prestige have been cited as major factors in residential choice and the desire for home ownership. The physical qualities of the area are of less importance, as is the accessibility to other things, particularly the place of work and friends.
CHAPTER V:
IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING

Introduction

The primary intent of this paper has been to provide the planner with sociological information concerning the family; knowledge of their social beliefs which influence domestic architecture and a brief outline of the housing styles; and the expressed housing preferences of households, as well as information on their housing behaviour. From the description of the contemporary North American family; their current housing characteristics; and the literature on residential mobility and the desire for ownership of a single family detached house, which was undertaken in the previous three chapters, several implications for the planning of a more satisfactory form of housing environment are evident.

Residential Mobility

A. Rate of Residential Mobility

With respect to the high rates of residential mobility in North America which were noted in Chapter IV, there is the observation by some authors that most families do not like to move. Those who do move, however, often do so reluctantly, with the hope that the disadvantages and inconveniences of moving will be outweighed by economic or other gains. There is a concern by sociologists, for instance, that geographic mobility places a strain on families, particularly when social ties within a community are severed (Blood, 1972, 241, 242).
Residential mobility may also result in changes in the characteristics of communities, which may involve the planner in providing different types or numbers of community services, such as schools and streets. Since considerable capital investment is usually involved with community facilities, changes in their requirements may thus create extra burdens on the municipality (Simmons and Simmons, 1969, 87, 87, 111, 112). As a result there is a feeling by many people that the rate of residential mobility should be decreased.

1. Consumer Information

There are some steps which involve planners which may tend to decrease this rate. For instance, the results of several studies reviewed in Chapter IV, such as those by Whitney and Grigg, and Kalbach, Myers and Walker, indicated that long distance moves were frequently followed by local moves. It has been suggested that some families who make more than one move may have selected a less than satisfactory dwelling unit. This may be due to the fact that they were aware of only a fraction of the housing available because of insufficient information of the housing market and/or the characteristics of areas, or insufficient time to search for a residence (Simmons and Simmons, 1969, 146, 147). The planner could thus provide a valuable service by contributing to the information available to the household in a form of use to them. For instance, he could compile profiles on the various neighborhoods within a metropolitan area which could include
demographic information on residents, condition reports on existing housing, a site plan, as well as current and proposed plans for altering the area. Such a service could be available at a central location, perhaps as part of an information bureau at the municipal building.

2. Housing Construction and Design

A second implication for planners with regard to a reduction in mobility rates is to assist in alleviating one of the primary causes of residential mobility - the adequacy of interior space. Within the house itself, the space requirements, as mentioned previously, vary among families, and within families during different stages of the family life cycle. From the residential mobility studies reviewed in Chapter IV it was found that one of the primary reasons for moving was given as a need for a different amount of space (usually more). It is evident that for the contemporary North American family the most frequent way of bringing the family's space requirements into line with its needs is to move. This is in contrast to the behaviour of the early North American families as described in Chapter III. During the Colonial period, for instance, it was customary to accommodate an expanding family size by constructing additions to the initial house. In the following transitional periods, however, the house, when first constructed, was large enough for the anticipated size of the family. There are other solutions to this problem, however, which could be pursued by planners, architects and engineers.
One possibility is to provide moveable partitions as walls in the interior of the house, in place of the rigid walls which are almost universally installed. With moveable partitions the family could alter the size, shape, placement and number of rooms so as to better accommodate the household members. A possibility for changing the size of the entire house would be through the use of prefabricated, modular components that could be added or taken away as needed by the family. With the use of prefabricated units, there is also the possibility that the family could exchange units as needs changed. For instance, a nursery could be replaced by a family room for older children.

Greenbie's study, noted in Chapter IV, indicated that a large proportion of his respondents preferred to stay in the same neighborhood if satisfactory housing could be provided in a reasonable manner. The use of prefabricated housing, therefore, may eliminate the necessity of moving, as the family could have a more flexible housing design.

3. Financial Assistance
   a. Purchase of a Large Sized House

Another means of decreasing the number of moves created by an increase in family size involves the possibility of having families move into a dwelling unit large enough to accommodate an anticipated increase in family size over a period of several years. It was pointed out in Chapter IV, however, that few young families can afford a large dwelling unit much
in advance of the time required. This financial problem could be alleviated to a certain extent by the availability of financial assistance, perhaps in the form of a housing supplement or subsidy.

b. Purchase of Existing Housing

If families did not move from one neighborhood to another so frequently the area would be a more stable community. Peter New points out that the stability of a community and the feeling of community depends on decisions of individuals to stay in the community and interact with fellow citizens, and, therefore, to preserve the quality of the environment (New et al, 1965, 5). Some residential movement is desirable, however, as when families move into an area and stay, the neighborhood tends to be revitalized. This would be an advantage since the balance in the demand for existing facilities such as schools would be maintained. For instance, in many older areas of a city there were once young families with children present, for which schools and other services were provided. When the children completed their schooling this facility would no longer be required unless young families with children again moved into the area. Because of this, families in the early stages of the family life cycle should be encouraged to move into established neighborhoods. However, government mortgaging policies tend to encourage the ownership of new housing, as mentioned in Chapter IV, which is usually in suburban areas due to the lack of space in cities (Wheeler, 1969, 67). This situation could be alleviated with government
incentives for the purchase of existing houses, such as providing funds for mortgages, and for renovations and repairs.

**Satisfaction With Housing Environment**

A. **House**

1. **Design**

Greater satisfaction with forms of housing other than the owned, single family detached dwelling unit could also be provided by planners and architects. It would be valuable, however, to have further information concerning the heirarchy of features desired in the structural design of the single family detached house, and the characteristics of the lot. Most of the literature on preferred housing characteristics is evaluated according to the frequency of response for items. Therefore, knowledge of the heirarchy of preferences in "tradeoff" situations, as mentioned in Chapter IV, would be helpful to the planner and architect in providing satisfactory forms of alternate housing types. For this reason, further research into the preferences for the dwelling unit and lot could be undertaken. For instance, if it was found, as indicated in the studies reviewed, that the desire for outdoor space adjacent to the residence was still of primary importance, and would, therefore, not be "traded off", since it was valued as a place for children to play under easy supervision of a parent, then this feature could be incorporated in an alternate form of housing. As a possible improvement for a low rise multi-unit building, an individual entrance and stairway for each unit or group of units would provide easier access for both parents
and children to the outside. An enlarged external entrance area, similar to a "porch" would also provide a play area for children in close proximity to the dwelling unit. If it was found that a large lot was desirable since it provided more privacy from noise between neighbors, this problem could also be somewhat alleviated by better sound proofing materials, and the use of natural materials, such as shrubs and trees, which tend to buffer noises (Lynch, 1962, 100).

2. **Tenure**

Further information on the aspects of home ownership which are given high priority by families would also provide the planner with knowledge of features preferred by families in alternate forms of tenure. If it was found that the desire for individuality and independence was of primary importance, some means of providing for this in rental tenure would provide greater satisfaction to the family. For example, in a landlord-tenant situation, a contract concerning decorative or structural changes of the accommodation could be entered into by the two parties, so that the tenant could alter his suite under certain circumstances.

3. **Greater Number of Alternate Forms**

A greater variety of housing types and sizes within a neighborhood may also provide greater housing satisfaction for many families. For instance, there are frequently a number of households who do not wish to leave their neighborhood, even though their house is larger than required. If an alternate
form of housing was available there would be a greater possibility of the household moving and this would provide a larger house for a family experiencing growth.

B. Neighborhood

1. Diversity in Resident Households

As noted in Chapter IV, the qualities of the neighborhood are important to families, particularly the social character. There is the concern for "the right kind of people" and "people like ourselves." Although the precise meaning of these terms is unknown, in general they usually refer to people having a similar way of life, which includes similar attitudes and values. There is, therefore, a range of other household characteristics, such as age and stage in family life cycle, which could vary, and still be considered the "right kind of people." However, in many neighborhoods there tends to be little diversity in the ages of the households and the stage in the family life cycle. With regard to the family's desire for individuality of each member, as expressed in Chapter II, there would be a greater variety in neighborhood experiences if a greater diversity existed in the resident households. This could be accomplished by planners if residential developments were designed with alternate types of housing units, such as size variations. The provision of small units, as well as large ones could accommodate families in various stages of the family life cycle in the same area.
Need for Research and Support

A. Relative Importance of Housing

From the description of the contemporary North American family in Chapter II, it is also evident that the family is a person-centered family, rather than a group centered one. There is also an emphasis on individualism, with the fulfillment of the personal needs and desires of each member being considered important. Within the family, however, individuals seek happiness through an intimate companionship with their spouse, and children, or parents and brothers and sisters. The house is important to the family as the place where physical and psychological needs are fulfilled. The house usually becomes a "home" as a result of the many family experiences, associated with activities in the actual physical building, that are the source of memories. The dwelling unit is, therefore, important to the contemporary family. However, the degree of importance of the house with respect to other things which the family considers important, such as recreational activities and education, is unknown to planners.

Several authors have expressed the concern that the housing consumer may have changed his tastes with regard to the heirarchy of his values. Winnick notes that:

"There is also reason to believe that the reduction in the amount of "house" people buy is not entirely due to its high relative cost but is the result of changing consumer tastes. The competition of other expensive consumer durables, the high cost of domestic service, and the shift of many family activities away from the home are among the factors which caused pinching on housing space" (Winnick, 1967, 8).
It has already been noted in Chapter III that the components of the contemporary house are very different than those of the early one, since much mechanical equipment is now provided in contemporary houses as "necessities."

Meyerson observes from some of Winnick's research that the proportion of family incomes allocated to housing expenditures has dwindled steadily for some years. It is noted, however, that budget allocations to necessities tend to fall relatively as real incomes rise, whereas expenditures on luxuries rise. Winnick attributes much of the decrease in housing expenditure to the increase in housing costs, which the consumer does not feel are reflected in increased satisfaction with the dwelling unit. It is stated that:

"Thus, the consumer not only gets unduly less house for his money, but his awareness of the shrinking satisfactions so derived discourages him further...from making compensatory upward adjustments in his housing expenditure. His thoughts turn toward alternative expenditures from which he can gain more additional satisfaction from applying extra dollars than he can from applying extra dollars to improved housing" (Foote et al, 1960, xx, xxi).

With the increased cost of housing today, the above observation of Winnick may still be valid. For this reason, it is important for planners to undertake consumer studies in order to determine the current relative importance of housing to the household. It would also be of value to the planner to know the minimum requirements of a dwelling unit which would be considered satisfactory to the residents, as well as the
characteristics of the accommodation currently on the market which households consider superfluous. With this information for particular sub-groups of the population, the planner would have knowledge of a range of housing characteristics desired, as necessities, by families, and some information on families' housing standards.

B. Preferred Characteristics of Housing Environment

Many of the consumers' likes, dislikes and preferences in his residential environment are already known from research studies reviewed in Chapter IV. It is important to note, however, that changes in the purpose, goals and functions of the family change over time, and, therefore, their attitudes and preferences for housing may also change. In addition, many of today's families who are in the early stages of the family life cycle have had a different pattern of housing cycle than the older households who represent part of the sample in many of the surveys undertaken ten or more years ago. This factor may also affect the attitudes of the housing consumer. For instance, the young households who spend several years in an apartment, with many services supplied, such as the maintenance of grounds, and plumbing and electrical repairs, may not desire some features of the owned, detached house as it existed for an older generation. Younger families may, therefore, be satisfied with a small lot, and a cluster form of housing, for which there is a manager to supervise and/or carry out maintenance. The increased participation of married women in
the labor force, as indicated by the statistics in Chapter II, may also be an important influence on the preferred characteristics of the housing environment, particularly for a reduction in home-centered tasks.

The changing role of husband and wife in the performance of household tasks, which often occur when both partners are employed outside of the home, was mentioned in Chapter II. This may also be an influence responsible for changes in housing preferences. As a result, periodic surveys of the consumers housing behavior and preferences should be undertaken by planners.

C. Government Support for Innovative Housing

In considering alternate forms of housing, the consumer usually bases his opinion on experience with which he is familiar. Innovative forms of housing, therefore, need to be constructed so that consumers can evaluate them more adequately and realistically. Since private developers and financial institutions who lend money for housing construction are usually reluctant to sponsor a new type of project without assurance that it is a good risk, innovative forms of housing are seldom undertaken as mentioned in Chapter III (Wheeler, 1969, 50). For instance, with respect to the initial construction of condominium row houses, many developers encountered difficulty in securing mortgage money from the financial institutions due to the fact that the consumer response to this form of residence was unknown (Ryan, 1969, 17). With
this attitude of builders and lenders, who are responsible for housing, the government should consider, to a greater extent, the initiation and support of programs for innovative forms of housing.
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