MOTIVATION FOR THE COHOUSING COMMUNITY:

A STUDY OF TWO GROUPS

by

MARILYN RUTH JESKE

B.A., Warner Pacific College, 1975

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(School of Social Work)

We accept this thesis as conforming

to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

August 1992

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of _Social Work_

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date _August 13, 1992_

ABSTRACT

Cohousing is a Danish model of collaborative housing that seeks to achieve a balance between privacy and community. It is characterized by an intentional neighborhood design, extensive common facilities, a participatory development process, and complete resident management. This exploratory study examined the motivation of members from two pioneer groups, one American and one Canadian, each involved in developing cohousing communities. Ten in-depth interviews were conducted with group members to study their motives for involvement in the cohousing projects. Respondents indicated that they wanted a greater experience of community which was supportive and a safe and enriched environment for their children. In their desire for challenge, they experienced personal growth and fulfillment through the process of making decisions by consensus. The respondents had affiliation motives that were consistent with motivational theory.

Findings also suggest that the model has a strong potential for developing supportive networks for families and individuals. This study is relevant for community practice of social work because it provides a housing alternative that focuses on community. It serves as a starting point for discussion about the cohousing model.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

INTRODUCTION

The author's social work education, training and experience has been focussed in the field of child protection. Through this experience, it became clear that isolation and loneliness are pervasive in maltreating families. A keen interest in the prevention of child abuse and neglect led to an exploration of the role of the community in supporting families. This study took an ecological perspective towards families. It is a view of families that looks beyond individual characteristics, personality, and family dynamics. It is directed at improving transactions between people and environments in order to enhance adaptive capacities and improve environments for the participants (Germain, 1979).

Two general research questions for study emerged. How can families be strengthened and supported? In which settings do social support networks emerge? The search for answers to these two questions led to the discovery of the cohousing community as described by McCamant and Durrett (1988) in *Cohousing: A Contemporary Approach to Housing Ourselves*. The book is an account of how the Danish people had designed a housing model that met their needs for community and provided opportunities for social support as well as individual privacy.

The cohousing community was examined because it was created through the grassroots efforts of families and

individuals. It is a community development strategy to developing social support networks. The study focussed on identifying the motives of cohousing group members who became involved in pioneering a housing model that was new to North America. The study served as a starting point for discussion about the cohousing community as a model for a supportive environment.

Chapter 1

LITERATURE REVIEW

Housing Design

The industrial revolution has caused a massive
population influx to the cities. With greater urbanization,
attendant social problems and demographic changes have
placed increasing stress on the family unit. It is
informative to review the literature on housing design to
examine how the needs of women, children and families are
addressed in urban housing.

Despite the traditional role of women as homemakers,
little attention has been paid to meeting their needs in the
design of homes and neighborhoods. In her exploration of
alternatives to conventional housing, Franck (1989) stated
that urban forms ultimately rested on the visions, values,
choices and interests of powerful groups. The most powerful
people in North American cities are middle-aged white men
whose needs and preferences have set housing standards; and
yet our cities house people at different stages of the life
cycle (Short, 1989). Suburban designs are discriminatory as
men benefit by access to urban amenities and avoid domestic
chores while limiting the choices of women (Mazey & Lee,
1983).

Housing has been viewed as a commodity provided by the private market and the residence as private and isolated from the community which surrounded it (Wekerle, 1988). The active involvement of women in the design, development and management of cooperative housing communities has provided an alternative paradigm to the market experience of women within current housing trends. In the wake of the demise of the helping aspect to neighborhoods, (Porteous, 1977), women have designed housing developments that meet their needs and those of their children. The creation of a supportive community was a key goal in the development of two women's housing cooperatives in Toronto described by Wekerle and Novac (1989).

Cooper Marcus and Sarkissian (1986) reviewed the current literature and addressed the impact of the physical environment on human behaviour. Subsequently, they developed 254 design guidelines contained in their book: *Housing As If People Mattered*. Children's need for a safe environment in which to live and learn is a major topic in the book.

Franck (1989) described collective housing against the backdrop of the prevailing image of the American household as the nuclear family with the father as the breadwinner and the mother as the stay-at-home homemaker who cares for the two children. The single-family detached home represented the cultural values of stability, security, status, independence and privacy. The integrity and individuality of

the secluded family unit was maintained. However, the
traditional form of housing has been found to be inadequate
due to the changing facets of family life. In response to
the need for an alternative, collective housing featured
spaces and facilities for joint use by households of
different ages and lifestyles. Supporting shared activities
was a central characteristic of this type of housing and not
an added amenity.

Cohousing

The concept of cohousing was brought to public
attention in North America by two American architects,
Katherine McCamant and Charles Durrett, who had studied the
phenomenon in Denmark and wrote the first English book on
cohousing. From the Danish *bofaellesskaber* directly
translated as *living communities*, they coined the term
"cohousing" which is a trademark of McCamant & Durrett
(1988). It has four common characteristics: the
intentional neighborhood design, extensive common
facilities, the participatory development process, and
complete resident management. Each of the characteristics
may have been present in similar kinds of housing; however,
their unique combination in cohousing has distinguished it
as a specific kind of housing model.

Porcino (1991) has studied cohousing and has provided
this definition:

Cohousing, a form of "living communities" based on the very successful villages found in many Scandinavian countries. A group of people purchase land together, build their own separate homes and a large community house. Residents of all ages come together in the desire for a more practical and social home environment. Based on democratic principles, the community has no professional management; instead, each resident serves on an interest-group committee. (p. 1)

The cohousing model achieves a balance between community and privacy. Residents maintain their own dwellings while a communal approach to everyday life is taken. Social contact between residents is facilitated by clustered housing and connecting pathways. The kitchen windows and front doors of the units open onto a central courtyard with space for children's play and sitting areas that encourages informal gatherings. Private backyards provide for solitude and intimacy.

The wide array of common facilities are centrally located to encourage interaction. A striking feature is the common house. It contains a kitchen and dining hall in which the group shares the evening meal as an integral part of the daily routine. The common house may also include a children's playroom, workshops, recreational areas, guest rooms, and laundry facilities. Each family and individual decides when to participate and at what level. "The common facilities, and particularly common dinners, are an important aspect of community life both for social and practical reasons" (McCamant & Durrett, 1988, p. 10).

Porcino (1991) has included cohousing in her study of community housing for middle aged persons. She provides this description:

> Cohousing is a grass-roots movement growing out of people's dissatisfaction with existing housing choices. It begins with people whose major bond is the need for affordable housing and a supportive community. But it is primarily the architecture--the unique design of individual homes and shared dwellings--that encourages and even demands a sense of community. The communities are small--between twenty-five and forty clustered homes. Individual houses are designed to be completely self-sufficient. Opportunities for both social interaction and privacy are built in. (p. 64)

Fromm (1991) includes cohousing as one of several examples of collaborative housing that has developed independently in a number of European countries. In Holland, it is called *central wonen*, a term retained in English. In Sweden, it is known as *kollektivhus* which is loosely translated as *collective housing*. The type of building has varied in each country as well as how it was developed and owned. However, since these types of housing developments are similar in fundamental ways, they are defined as collaborative housing. The seven elements of collaborative housing are: common facilities, private dwellings, resident-structured routines, resident management, design for social contact, resident participation in the development process, and pragmatic social objectives (Fromm, 1991, p. 17). Cohousing has a number of features that distinguish it from cooperatives as an example of collaborative housing. "Social and supportive

services, such as child and elder care, may be included. An
intergenerational mix of residents govern and maintain the
housing, with an emphasis on community" (Fromm, 1991,
p.269).

Fromm (1991) has provided a summary statement which is
helpful in defining this form of housing:

> The essence of collaborative housing is that community
> is created by meeting everyday needs in a communal way.
> The most straightforward and utilitarian chores--
> cooking, watching children, sweeping the walkway--
> provide the opportunity to meet neighbors, talk, and
> develop relationships. (p. 10)

Despite many similarities with intentional communities,
communes, or cooperatives, the cohousing communities have a
number of fundamental differences. Separate and often
isolated communities have been formed by groups attempting
to escape from mainstream society. They have been based on
common religious, political, or personal beliefs. In
contrast, cohousing residents claim no particular ideology.
Holding only to broad social objectives to improve
individual and family life, they remain integrated into
society. There is a deliberate and planned focus on
encouraging social interaction and a sense of community.

Another significant departure from other communities
involves making decisions by consensus which forms the
foundation for the participatory process in the cohousing
model. Defined by Johnson and Johnson (1987), consensus is:

> a collective opinion arrived at by a group of
> individuals working together under conditions that
> permit communications to be sufficiently open--and the

group *climate to be sufficiently supportive* [italics added] --for everyone in the group to feel that he or she has had a fair chance to influence the decision. (p. 102)

Consensus is total agreement. However, each individual must express one's opinion and view. The only way that the final decision is of higher quality than a democratic vote is due to the fact that everyone has an equal voice and a valuable viewpoint to share. This synergistic process produces an outcome that is of greater value and benefit to the group than anything that could be created through individual effort alone.

Porcino (1991) identified several characteristics of successful communities.

Residents' obvious thoughtfulness toward one another. (p.5)

A safe environment in which people can speak and be heard; in which their ideas are valued, appreciated, and accepted; where individual differences are accepted. (p.5)

A group of people who can resolve conflicts without destructive physical or emotional trauma. This may involve decision making by consensus or any other method that works for a particular community. (p.5)

An environment conducive to personal fulfillment and growth. (p.5)

Excitement and a sense of adventure. (p. 6)

These characterristics are also used to define a cohousing community.

The European Experience

A number of events converged to create cohousing. It began in 1964 with the vision of Jan Gudmand-Hoyer, a Danish architect. He and his wife, a psychologist, were dissatisfied with their urban housing. They wanted a home in which they could raise a family. The available options of the single-family suburban house, apartment building, or row housing were isolating and lacked common facilities that would provide a sense of community.

The couple joined a circle of friends to discuss the possibility of a more supportive living environment. They were inspired by the book *Utopia* by Thomas More (1516). It described "a city of cooperatives, each consisting of 30 families who share common facilities and meals, and who organize child care and other practical functions" (McCamant and Durrett, 1988, p. 134).

A number of Danish projects provided additional inspiration. The Doctors' Association Housing, a row housing complex built in Copenhagen in 1853, encouraged active community life. As well, in the late 1800s and 1900s, the Workers' Building Association developed better housing through workers' initiative.

The Gudmand-Hoyer group put its ideas into action by designing a housing community of 12 houses set around a common house and swimming pool. The group purchased a site outside Copenhagen in the quiet town of Hareskov. Despite

support of the proposal by local officials, the group met
with intense opposition by the neighbors. They were
suspicious of the collective nature of the community.
However, they camouflaged their resistance by voicing a
concern about how the noise level would increase because
more children would be living in their quiet neighborhood.
The construction of the project was effectively blocked. As
a result, most of the families were discouraged and
abandoned the project.

Reflecting upon this experience and the ideas of the
group that prompted the Hareskov project, Gudmand-Hoyer
wrote an article called "The Missing Link Between Utopia and
the Dated One Family House." In 1968, the article was
published in a national newspaper (*Information*, June 26,
1968). It produced tremendous interest. Over one hundred
people responded positively about residing in a place as
described by Gudmand-Hoyer.

At the same time, the youth movement in Europe and
North America challenged the status quo. There was a
drastic shift in values. Although many people did not
participate in the student uprisings at many American and
European universities, they were influenced by the changing
attitudes and "a belief that a more cooperative living
environment would help build a more humane world" (McCamant
and Durrett, 1988, p. 135). Collective and communal housing
arrangements emerged across North America and Europe. These
new ways of living together were based on radical social,

political, and Eastern religious ideals that included new family structures as well.

The cohousing concept received further stimulus through another significant piece of writing by author, Bodil Graae. In her article "Children Should Have One Hundred Parents" (*Politiken*, April 1967), Graae described an environment where children belonged and where providing for their needs was a greater priority than providing for cars and parking. More than fifty people responded to the article. A group formed to discuss how to build such a community where children would be cared for by all of the adults.

The articles by Gudmand-Hoyer and Graae provided the inspiration for many Danish cohousers. A new core group was formed by these two writers (Graae and Gudmand-Hoyer) and the few families who remained from the Hareskov group. They joined together to build a cohousing community. The group split into two but continued to cooperate together. They eventually built two cohousing communities in the small village of Jonstrup outside of Copenhagen. In 1972, 27 families moved into Saettedammen, followed in 1973 by 33 families who moved into the Skraplanet community designed by Gudmand-Hoyer. In 1976, a third cohousing community, Nonbo Hede, was built on the Jutland peninsula in Denmark. Their efforts were initiated without knowledge of the first two projects. Subsequently, they consulted with these groups and gained encouragement from seeing their work.

Meanwhile, the Danish Building Research was examining the social implications of the physical environment and sponsored a national design competition in 1971. The proposal that won first place was designed by a new architectural firm called Vandkusten. The proposal called for "a cooperative society and humane communities that integrate work, housing and recreation" (McCamant & Durrett, 1988, p. 139). Five years later, the firm built Tinggarden, the first rental cohousing development. It was subsidized by the government and built by a nonprofit housing developer.

In 1981, new legislation in Denmark, The Cooperative Housing Association Law, made it easier and less expensive to finance cohousing. As well, groups were encouraged to incorporate a greater diversity in the composition of the households. With the new financing possibilities, the earlier groups with the residential composition of two-income families shifted to include single persons and single parent families.

The history of cohousing is relatively brief, covering only the last twenty years. However, it has been gaining in popularity, largely due to its community focus.

> Cohousing groups have been successful in Scandinavian countries for two decades, with more than 100 communities established in Denmark. At present, forty-eight separate projects that will house sixteen thousand Danish families are under construction. Many of these are government sponsored and are considered successful alternatives to high-rise public housing. (Porcino, 1991, p. 63)

It appears that cohousing is a viable option for many Europeans.

The North American Experience

The cohousing model was relatively unknown in North America before the landmark book written by McCamant and Durrett entitled *Cohousing: A Contemporary Approach to Housing Ourselves* (1988). During the year spent in Denmark, the architectural team visited several cohousing communities and lived in one community for an extended period of time. They studied cohousing as a type of alternate housing that addressed the social needs of families and individuals. They founded the consulting firm called The CoHousing Company in Berkeley, California to assist cohousing groups to translate the Danish model into American reality.

United States

A review of articles on cohousing in state newspapers and national magazines has shown a growing interest in the cohousing concept. Newspapers in American cities from coast to coast highlighted the work of McCamant and Durrett. They have been involved in a number of cohousing projects in California, including a nonprofit social housing development.

The *Sonoma Index-Tribune* (October 9, 1990) reported that there were currently 70 groups across the United States who were developing cohousing communities, including one in Sonoma Valley, California. *Rocky Mountain News* (October 8, 1990) described a group who were planning to build a cohousing community near Lafayette, Colorado.

The *New York Times* (September 27, 1990) highlighted the Winslow CoHousing Group in Washington. Members of this community are subjects of this research project.

Canada

The concept of cohousing has received attention in Canada. An article in *The Vancouver Sun* (October 5, 1990) also described the Winslow community. As well, the newsmagazine show *Market Place* that aired March 18th, 1992 on CBC Television featured a segment of the program on cohousing.

Interest has been created on the West coast and at least two Vancouver based groups have formed with the goal of building cohousing communities. Members of the WindSong CoHousing Association in Vancouver participated in this research project.

Motivation of Cohousing Group Members

The literature that is written on motivation for
cohousing is limited. The contributions of Fromm (1991) and
Porcino (1991) have provided some understanding of the
motivation of group members who have developed cohousing
communities.

> The motivation behind the first cohousing developments
> was to create a strong social network for the nuclear
> family: "few had thought in advance about the practical
> advantage" of cohousing (Anderson). (Fromm, 1991,
> p. 15)

Residents were motivated toward cohousing because of a
need for a supportive community that was not met in
currently available housing options.

> The primary reason some people choose to live in
> community is to avoid living alone, which is difficult
> and unappealing to people of all generations. As they
> discover new ways to escape the loneliness of everyday
> life, people are also finding the emotional and social-
> support networks they've found so difficult to
> establish in the outside world. (Porcino, 1991,
> p. xxvi)

Cohousing residents are a diverse group with a number
of common needs that have been met in the cohousing
community.

> Cohousing is a viable option for people who dream of
> having the privacy of their own home or apartment, as
> well as the advantages of living in a community. They
> are people with a wide variety of talents and career
> goals. They are young and old, married and single.
> They are willing to work with others, and they believe
> there is something to be gained from a community where
> people look out for one another. (Porcino, 1991, p.
> 64)

It seems that a wide variety of people are attracted to

cohousing who are seeking to meet their social needs.

Motivational Theories

A review of motivational theories provides a conceptual framework for analysis of the data. A motive is a general category of terms that includes needs, drives, and incentives. A further distinction can be made among these terms (Simons, Irwin, & Drinnin, 1987). Generally, needs relate to unmet biological and psychological needs. Drives refer to internal sources of motivation that *push* an individual towards a goal in an attempt to reduce tension. Drives are generally associated with psychological drives arising from biological needs. Incentives *pull* an organism toward a goal. An individual's expectation or reward is internal, but the source of that expectation lies in the external reward.

As outlined by Simons, Irwin and Drinnin (1987), Maslow's hierarchy of needs is a five level model. Lower level needs must be satisfied before the individual is motivated to meet higher level needs. An individual is motivated by D-needs or deficiency needs to meet biological and psychological needs. In contrast, an individual who strives for self-actualization is motivated by B-needs or being needs. Maslow saw needs for self-actualization as metamotives or literally "beyond" motives. An individual strives to grow beyond the current condition and reach for

self-fulfillment of one's potential. "People like to pursue B-needs and *if the environment is sufficiently supportive* [italics added] they will continue to express themselves in new and positive ways" (Simons, Irwin & Drinnin,1987, p. 363).

ERG theory of Alderfer (1989) is a framework of existence, relatedness and growth needs. It is consistent with Maslow's hierarchical construction and finds similarity with his first and last levels but departs in the mid-range of needs. There are a number of additional differences in the ERG model. First of all, Alderfer states that the lower level of needs do not have to be satisfied before an individual is motivated to the higher levels of needs midpoint range of needs. As well, positive, negative and mixed emotions are included while Maslow indicated that the basic need is for positive emotions.

The humanistic theory proposed by Carl Rogers is similar to Maslow's level of self-actualizing. "Human nature is good and all people possess an actualizing tendency to grow in positive ways *once circumstances are supportive* [italics added]." Rogers emphasizes that people are the best judges of what they should do with their lives and all have the capacity for self-improvement (Simons, Irwin & Drinnin, 1987, p. 363).

The existential theory of Rollo May's authenticity is equivalent to Maslow's self-actualization or Roger's fully functioning person. Being authentic means taking personal

responsibility for what happens in one's life, including both the good and bad. This theory advocated for constructive ways to act passionately which would result in a renewed self and an improved society. Existential theories emphasize commitment to behavior because ideas are useless unless they are acted upon. Taking responsibility for one's own actions becomes an expression of passion and joy.

Studies on motivation have focussed on a number of different populations and a variety of circumstances. While Mann (1989) included motivational factors in his study of how adolescents make decisions, Veroff and Veroff (1980) studied social goals in adult development. Their general framework for a theory of motivation was based on the concepts of incentives, expectancies and behavioral tendencies. Exploratory goals were included as part of adult motivation. Taking a developmental perspective, they identified a number of universal social incentives: curiosity, attachment, assertiveness, social relatedness, belongingness, consistency, interdependence and integrity (p. 29).

Veroff, Reuman and Feld (1984) identified four social motives of achievement, affiliation, fear of weakness, and hope of power. They discovered that age differences influenced the stability and change of the motives. "Women's achievement and affiliation motives decline in older ages; men's hope of power is distinctly higher at mid-life" (p. 1142).

Membership in social movements results from institutional deficits. There is a meaningful relationship between the type of problems that face a person and the kind of movements that attract him as demonstrated by Toch (1965).

The paucity of literature on why people join groups does not provide a solid background for this study. However, the information that is available does provide some perspectives that are pertinent.

Relevance to Social Work

The primary focus of this study was to explore why individuals and families were motivated towards cohousing. Because the phenomenon was new to North America, an exploratory study was conducted. This study was designed not to test hypotheses but to explore some general research questions: What prompted people to consider cohousing? What were the motivational factors involved in their decision to participate in the development process? What were the benefits of making decisions by consensus?

The goal of this study was to increase the understanding of what cohousing group members value and are seeking within the cohousing model. For Europeans, it has provided a sense of community and support. It is child-centered. The impact on the family unit promises to be

positive. It is possible that it offers the same benefits to North Americans.

It is important to examine the motives of cohousing group members to determine if the needs expressed are universal rather than idiosyncratic. Perhaps generalizations can be made about the merit of the cohousing model to meet universal human needs. There may be compelling reasons to initiate cohousing projects as a viable housing alternative. There may be indications that the cohousing model is a supportive environment that will provide for the needs of families and individuals. The study of motivation towards cohousing may predict a trend towards a return to village-like neighborhoods as a solution to the anomie and loneliness of dense urban life and its attendant problems.

Studying grass-roots movements is of particular importance to community practice of social work. The current reality of rapidly shrinking budgets for social programs has reduced institutional answers to social problems. As well, the capacity of formal agencies to respond has diminished. Responsibility is shifting back to communities, families and individuals to find their own solutions to their problems.

But families are in jeopardy. At a recent conference in Vancouver, B.C., Dr. Berry Brazelton, a well-known pediatrician and author from the Harvard School of Medicine, explained that society believes that the family should be

self-sufficient or suffer. However, the demise of the extended family has contributed to the stress of middle-class families. Brazelton believes that society must take on the role of an extended family (Kines, 1992).

In his keynote address to provincial conference delegates who had gathered to identify family issues and concerns, Garbarino (1990) stated that "family is not sufficient." Because families are not perfect but are fraught with problems, he believes that they have not been able to meet all the needs of their members, particularly the needs of children. To expect families to meet all these needs is unreasonable and unrealistic. The family needs to be supported in their responsibilities to care and nurture its members.

The work done by Garbarino (1982) in regards to studying children and families in the social environment is relevant to this study. He stated:

> The principal task for the community is to know how socially well-fixed their families are and to proceed accordingly. The community needs to recognize positive forces where they exist naturally (and then leave them alone) and to learn how to generate and sustain them where they do not exist already. Community development is inseparable from reducing sociocultural risk in this sense. A prochild ideology is the foundation for a caring community. (p. 57)

Garbarino's 1980 study of low-risk and high-risk neighborhoods asserted that there are neighborhood effects related to child maltreatment. He identified the contribution of a secure, nurturing and supportive setting in providing a positive context for child and family

development. Garbarino (1982) has defined neighboring as
"socially defined relationships that involves the duties of
exchanging resources, information, and help. Neighbors form
an informal support system that a family can look to in
times of need" (p. 163).

The definition by Garbarino (1982) of social support
systems is relevant to this study. "Social support systems
are networks of individuals that nurture and care for people
and serve as resources in time of physical and emotional
need" (p. 151). The supportive environment is beneficial in
the provision of nurturance, feedback, warmth, security,
guidance and direction for individuals; and to creating a
family network of support systems which are "the staff of
life in child rearing" (Garbarino, 1982, p. 240). "As the
mother and father are parents to the child, so the community
is parent to the family" (Garbarino, 1988, p. 11). He
explained:

> Families, as lifeboats for the human species, are at
> the center of our analysis of the economic and
> environmental foundations of social welfare systems.
> This focus on their needs and wealth provides a
> perspective with which to understand both the present
> and the various alternative futures that present
> themselves. It is a fulcrum with which we may move the
> problem of a sustainable future. (p. 9)

For purposes of this study, Hillery's (1955) definition
of community quoted in Garbarino (1982) is used: "Community
consists of persons in social interaction within a
geographic area and having one or more common ties" (p.
111). This position advocates for the development of

supportive environments which would be sustainable in the current atmosphere of restraint. The cohousing model was selected as an example of a community development strategy that addresses the problem of social isolation experienced by families where they live.

Porcino (1991) has offered the most cogent framework for the study of housing as it relates to mental health.

> Where we live and who we live with affect how we think, feel and believe. A sense of home is central to our psychological well-being. We are all looking for a living environment that supports our autonomy, empowers us by accentuating our potential, and nurtures us. No area offers greater potential for creative change that of housing and life-style. (p. xv)

The value of social networks and mutual aid in neighborhoods is highlighted by Swenson (1979). McCamant (1991) identified a major change in neighborhood life that has adversely affected family life.

> We used to have strong neighborhoods because women were home all the time--and they developed the networks. Now, most women work full-time, and extended families are no longer a reality. That's why supportive networks outside of the family, like cohousing villages, need to be built. (Porcino, 1991, p. 69)

The goal of the cohousing model is to establish and maintain a sense of community. It offers an innovative approach to provide natural helpers and informal social support networks. As an example of a collaborative housing, it appears to create a supportive environment for families and individuals.

Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The cohousing model is relatively unknown locally or
nationally in Canada. Cohousing communities that follow the
Danish model were not in existence in North America at the
time of this research project. Groups that have formed with
the purpose of building cohousing communities are
functioning in the early stages of development.

The focus of this study was to explore why individuals
were motivated towards the cohousing model. No research
studies have been done about the motivation of cohousing
group members or about how the model influences family life.
Conducting an exploratory study was most appropriate for a
new field of study in which little work had been done. This
qualitative research project could provide a beginning point
for becoming familiar with a new topic (Patton, 1991; Rubin
& Babbie, 1989). Due to the recency of the cohousing model,
exploring the motives of members of pioneer cohousing groups
will provide a backdrop against which future research may be
designed.

Individual interviews were conducted with selected
members of two groups. Because all respondents were
cohousing group members, it was assumed that there would be

a commonality in the motivation of respondents. The phenomenological focus of the analysis highlighted the meaning of the experience as it related to an individual's motivation for being a member in the pioneer group. A content analysis of the interviews revealed a number of main themes.

Sample

A purposeful sample was drawn from the two groups available to the researcher, one group from the United States and one from Canada. The Winslow group in Washington had been operating as a group for over 2 years. The Canadian group, in the Vancouver area in British Columbia, had been functioning for about 6 months.

Subjects were selected because of their experiences as active members of the cohousing groups. Fifteen respondents volunteered to be interviewed. This number represents a total of 10 households.

Nine respondents from 6 households participated from the Washington group. They represented about 14% of the total population of about 65 members. The 2 respondents who were involved in the pre-test phase were excluded from the sample. All members of the 4 households from the Vancouver group were interviewed. This number represents 100% participation.

Background of the Washington Group

The Winslow Cohousing Group was founded in January,
1989 (Fromm, 1991). The principal organizer, Chris Hanson,
a development consultant, organized the first information
meeting which was held in the town of Winslow, Washington in
December 1988. Of the 44 people that attended that first
meeting, 4 individuals are still with the project.

The Winslow Cohousing Group was the first North
American cohousing group to have progressed to the point of
construction in their project. At the time of the
interviews, they had begun building the residences and the
common house in Winslow. The town is located on Bainbridge
Island, a 30 minute ferry ride across Puget Sound west of
Seattle.

The group has environmental concerns. The sign posted
on the 5.25 acre site stated: "Future home of Winslow
Cohousing: an environmentally sensitive pedestrian village
of 30 private residences." As much as possible, the
original wooded site had been preserved. As an additional
concession to their environmental concerns, the group
abandoned the original plan of building a wood-burning
fireplace in each residence.

The parking area was placed around the perimeter of the
site. The group wanted to limit the number of vehicles to
one per household. It was felt that residents could take

the 15 minute walk to the ferry terminal to commute to
Seattle.

The project received media attention including
newspaper and magazine articles. A number of the group
members had been involved in publicity efforts regarding
their project. A national television broadcasting
corporation planned to cover their opening day. They had
scheduled their 'move in' date for January 1992.

Background of the Vancouver Group

The Windsong Cohousing Association was located in
Vancouver, British Columbia. In January 1991, the initiator
of the group, Howard Staples, placed an ad in a community
paper for interested persons to contact him about an
intentional community. Several individuals responded. At
the time of the interviews, the group had six active members
and had been meeting for about 6 months. The group was
operating in the earliest phase of development.

The cohousing project had received media attention with
newspaper articles and radio interviews. The group was
involved in public education as well as determining a
location for their cohousing community. Two public
information sessions were held to attract more members. Two
members from the Winslow group presented their story during
the first meeting. One hundred people attended and an
additional 50 people were turned away because there were no

more seats. People came from the Vancouver mainland and as far away as Vernon in the interior of British Columbia.

Demographic Profile of the Sample

A composite of demographic information provides a profile of the sample.

Gender and age

The sample was composed of 15 respondents. This included 6 men and 8 women ranging in age from 25 years to 58 years. In addition to the adults, one male youth who was 16 years of age also participated.

Household composition and marital status

There were 10 households represented in the sample. There were 5 households of single persons and 5 households of families. The family units included 4 two-parent families and 1 single-parent family.

Level of education

All adult respondents had post-secondary education. This ranged from some college courses, one year certificate,

undergraduate degrees to graduate degrees. The teenager was a high school student.

Occupation/trade/profession

Respondents were involved in predominantly white collar professions. The fields of work included management, technical writing, legal, administration, engineering, medical, astrology, and computer technology. One respondent worked part-time in the field of domestic labour.

Income

Income levels are reported for each group of American and Canadian respondents. There is limited comparability because of the value difference of the currency.

Income for the American households was reported as ranging from "low" (respondent did not reveal exact amount) to $61,000 for a single person. For a family of 4, combined family annual income was reported as ranging from $40,000 to $51,000.

For the Canadian households, combined family annual income ranged from $60,000 for a family of 4 to $100,000 for a family of 3. One single person reported an income of $20,000 for part-time employment.

Housing and level of satisfaction

The respondents lived in a variety of housing situations. Seven households lived in rental accommodations which included apartments, a duplex, a fourplex, and single detached houses. Two individuals shared accommodations in a house with other single persons. One member also owned a single detached house that was in the process of being sold to facilitate the move to the cohousing community. One family was living in a single detached home for almost twenty years.

When asked about their level of satisfaction with their current housing situation, respondents varied in their answers. The responses ranged from "somewhat satisfied" to "very satisfied with the physical setting" to "dissatisfied with community setting" and "dissatisfied with social isolation."

Measure

All respondents were asked open-ended questions by the researcher who followed the interview guide. The guide was developed from themes identified in the literature. It was was revised after it was pre-tested with two respondents.

The first part of the interview guide addressed 11 topic areas that attempted to explore why respondents were motivated towards cohousing. Several sample questions were:

"What were the kind of issues that influenced you to pursue cohousing as a housing arrangement for you and your family?" "In regards to friendships, how do you think your new situation in cohousing will be different than it is now?" "What are the benefits and limitations to family life in cohousing?" "How would you describe the people who are interested in cohousing--including yourself?" The first part of the guide is replicated in Appendix 1.

The second part of the interview guide posed questions regarding basic demographic information such as age, family composition, and educational level. Respondents were also asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with their current housing situation. The demographic information form is replicated in Appendix 2.

Interview Process

The researcher conducted all 10 individual interviews with the members of the household who had consented to participate. The number of respondents per interview ranged from 1 individual to 3 family members.

The interview was divided into 2 parts following the structure of the interview guide. All questions were asked verbally during the first part.

During the second part of each interview, the researcher displayed the form requesting demographic information to the respondents. Questions were asked

verbally with reference made to the form. The form was also used to record all relevant personal data.

Length of Interview

Individual interviews ranged in length from 1 to 3 hours including breaks. The longer interviews were held with groups of 2 or 3 respondents.

Location

The interviews were held in different locations. Respondents were asked to choose a specific date and time within specific timelines for the interview. Locations and times were determined upon mutual agreement with the researcher.

Locations in Seattle and Winslow were selected for the Washington group. Interviews for the Vancouver group were held in Vancouver and Ladner, British Columbia.

The ten interviews were held at different sites. Six interviews were held in the homes of the respondents. One interview was conducted in the office of one respondent during office hours. One interview was conducted in a restaurant close to the office of one of the respondents. It was held after office hours. One interview was conducted in the researcher's home at the request of the respondent.

Appropriately, the last interview was held at the construction site of the Winslow community. During the day of that interview, the researcher joined a number of group members who had gathered to begin the task of landscaping the site. The hours worked contributed towards their portion of the sweat equity of the project. The respondent left the work group to participate in the interview. It was conducted in the shell of one of the housing units that had been recently framed.

Time Frame

Initial contact with the Washington group was made in January, 1991. Contact with the Vancouver group was initiated in May, 1991. Face-to-face interviews were conducted during July and August of 1991.

Ethical Considerations and Informed Consent

The Board of Directors of the Winslow Cohousing Group reviewed the research proposal and granted approval to proceed with the study. The leader of the Windsong Cohousing Association was delegated the authority to provide approval for the study to proceed with the Vancouver group. All respondents signed a consent form. A copy is included in Appendix 3.

The respondents of each group were known to each other as well as among the two cohousing groups. It was common knowledge among the group that certain members had given their consent to be interviewed for the research study. However, to maintain required confidentiality, the researcher did not divulge the names or responses of the participants to other group members.

Considerations

Determining the most appropriate time to engage members in the interview process was an important consideration for each group. During a particular phase in the project, the Washington group was experiencing extreme difficulty in their process. Approaching members to participate in the study was ill-advised. Adjusting to the timelines was required.

The Vancouver group had only recently identified themselves as a cohousing entity. As their project was at the infancy stage, the members were dealing with a number of group dynamics and process issues which is characteristic of group formation. As well, it was important to allow a sufficient period of time and length of group involvement for the individuals to crystallize their views.

Analysis

Recording Data

All ten interviews were audiotape recorded. Five of
the interviews were transcribed. This total included 3 of
the 6 interviews conducted with the Washington group and 2
of the 4 interviews conducted with the Vancouver group.
Five interviews were transcribed by two independent typists.
One exchange regarding the demographic information was taped
and transcribed.

The researcher reviewed the balance of the audio tapes.
Based on initial analysis of the transcriptions, significant
points were noted. Verbatim quotes for inclusion in this
report were transcribed also.

Process of Analysis

A content analysis of each interview was completed.
Primary patterns in the data were identified, coded and
categorized (Patton, 1991). The interview guide was
organized by topics and thus provided a classification
system for the content analysis. Each interview was
analyzed line by line. Each paragraph was coded using the
topics covered by the interview guide. Several regularly
recurring themes emerged. The main themes were categorized
and dimensions of each category were identified.

Coding

Open coding was used to take the data apart into discrete parts (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Concepts were labelled. The concepts were grouped into categories. Axial coding was used to group the data. A number of main themes emerged.

Answers to common questions were provided by different respondents and grouped together by separate topics. Indigenous constructs generated by respondents were utilized (Patton, 1991). Cohousing members created a number of terms that captured the essence of the experience for them. In addition, sensitizing concepts formulated by the researcher were used (Patton, 1991). The results of the analysis are reported in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The cohousing community is a Danish model of
collaborative housing. The model employs a grassroots
approach to development. As cohousing group members, the
respondents had a vision of cohousing that maintained their
involvement in the project despite the high cost, both
financially and emotionally. What were their motives? This
question is the focus of this exploratory study. A number
of main themes emerged from the content analysis. All
quotes are presented verbatim from the transcripts without
editing for grammatical rules or English usage.

Major Themes

The content analysis of the data revealed five major
themes related to the respondents' motivations.   These
themes are:

1. The respondents wanted to live "in community." A
    number of sub themes emerged that related to this
    desire for community. The respondents wanted to
    have meaningful relationships, to feel connected
    and to experience a sense of belonging.

2. The respondents wanted a safe and enriched
    environment for their children.

3. The respondents wanted to "share the load" of daily living.

4. The respondents had a spirit of adventure. They were willing to risk, to try something new, and wanted to "push the boundaries."

5. The respondents were motivated by personal growth and self-development needs.

Each of these themes is described in more detail in the following sections.

A Desire to Live In Community

One of the major themes expressed by all respondents was a desire to live in community with others. They shared a number of similar experiences throughout their childhood and adult years that indicated that they had experienced a sense of community. They wanted to regain or recapture this sense of community and were receptive to the idea of living in a cohousing community.

One respondent recounted childhood memories of growing up in a rural community. The men rallied to help each other bring in the crops while the women cooked huge meals that were shared together. There was a sense of camaraderie and interdependence. However, as modern machinery and equipment were introduced on the farm, individual farmers became self-sufficient. He said, "there's no doubt in my mind that [I

am] harking back to that time and trying to recapture some of that sense of being a kid in a rural setting."

One respondent had lived and worked in a tourist village since his adolescence and indicated that because of this experience, the concept of cohousing fit for him. He said:

> It just seemed the natural course. I don't know why people don't do this more often. Why they go out and build one solitary house and never know their neighbor next door--I'll never understand that kind of thinking. To me it's just a natural way of looking at life.

Other respondents recalled living in group settings such as shared housing, a kibbutz in Israel, and a communal farm. One respondent had grown up on a kind of compound in South American that was home to thirty English-speaking families. The adults in the close community shared in the care of the children.

One respondent had lived in an apartment complex in which the units opened onto a common courtyard. The proximity of the units and the connecting pathways enabled the residents to watch out for each other. However, individual privacy was not invaded. The respondent indicated that this experience served as an intermediate step towards cohousing.

One respondent had been involved in planning a similar housing project but did not move in. She said, "it was kind of a dream that I had put aside and didn't think I'd ever get an opportunity to do again." Involvement in the

cohousing project became the fulfillment of an arrested

dream. In addition, this respondent's participation in a

global peace march influenced her decision to join the

cohousing group. It was through this experience that she

made the following conclusion:

> We're tribal people and that nuclear family situations
> and living separately is not normal, that what is the
> norm of our species is to be in community with each
> other. So in a real personal way I felt the need for
> community and kind of in a theoretical way, too, I
> could see it.

Another respondent felt that cohousing represented a

starting point for a model of a global community. He said:

> Another reason why I got involved--I like to live, in
> my lifetime, to be living in a global village and I
> would like to see communities all across Canada or the
> world where each one is trusting each other and we can
> assist each other through community development. And I
> feel there's no best place to start than right here--
> at home.

Many respondents had experienced varying degrees of

social isolation living in their current neighborhoods. For

several respondents, their homes provided for seclusion but

not for the sense of community. They were dissatisfied with

this aspect of their neighborhoods because their needs for

connectedness and a greater sense of community were not met.

They were motivated towards the cohousing model because it

is designed to meet these needs. One respondent captured

the essence of this motivation by saying:

> I think it [cohousing] sort of caught on. I mean that
> after we were in for awhile, it wasn't the houses--it
> didn't make much difference--it was this community and
> all the support you could get and things like that.

Within the major theme of a desire for community, several subthemes emerged. Respondents wanted meaningful relationships and a sense of belonging. They believed that this was possible in the cohousing model of community. The cohousing model is based on collaboration rather than competition. Greater interaction has contributed to the development of meaningful relationships among group members. Propinquity in the community was a contributing factor in realizing this objective. Respondents said:

> You discover this hole that was this emptiness that you didn't even--weren't even conscious of--until you sensed that this flood of emotion that you've been living in a starved environment or a starved social personal environment.

> I felt that community is the one antidote to isolation, and I think, an American loneliness. I think that actually creating communities is kind of a revolutionary activity and I'm really motivated by that thought actually.

> I think cohousing would allow individuals to live past one hundred years old--my personal belief--because the reason why people are dying these days earlier than they should is that there's no social group--network for people.

> The only quality of life that counts, I think, is human-to-human relationships.

> The experience so far of having meaningful relationships with a variety of people outside of my family has helped me a lot to be a healthier person inside my family.

> What is very important to me is just connecting with people.

> It will be much, much more easy to interact with the people that live in the same community and I certainly expect to find some really good, close friends right in the community. Ideally, that's what I want.

> I think it will really enhance just the feeling of belonging and the quality of life being, in my mind, interactions between people.

> The cooking aspect, the safety for the children, how they can learn to interact with other people--that's really important to me. A sense of knowing who other people are, having people to share things with that are close by, knowing your neighbours, these are the kinds of things that I really like about the cohousing idea.

One respondent likened the group process to a group marriage.

> And all at once I realized that it was something that I did actually feel really committed to. I knew the people, the process. I understood the process, I accepted the process, which is really difficult. It's ponderous. It can be just irritating and infuriating, and it's also more rewarding than any other thing I've probably done. It's like a group marriage, you know, in the sense that it requires enormous commitment.

This analogy of community being like marriage because of the degree of commitment is echoed in the literature by Peck (1987). The motivation for a sense of belonging is similar to social incentives of attachment, social relatedness and belongingness (Veroff & Veroff, 1980). It corresponds to Maslow's need for belonging and Alderfer's (1989) need for relatedness. It departs from the decline of older women's affiliation motives identified by Veroff, Reuman, and Feld (1984).

For several couples, only one partner was interested in the concept of cohousing initially. Through the one partner's influence, interest in cohousing emerged for the other partner. Respondents stated that being involved in the cohousing project became part of the commitment to the marriage.

A Desire for a Safe and Enriched Environment for Children

Although respondents were generally satisfied with
their physical quality of their housing, some of their
initial motivation was a desire for a more social kind of
neighborhood. They wanted a safe and secure neighborhood
and enriched environment for themselves and their children.
they might be "like an extended family." Respondents said:

> Young families are looking for a stable safe
> environment for their children where they don't have to
> go too far to find their children playing.

> I'm really looking forward to the fact that there will
> be other adults for our kids [teenagers] to interact
> with and use as - partly as role models. Actually, I
> think the interaction with other adults is one of the
> most important things I see.

> It's a warmth, a feeling of belonging, a feeling of
> knowing a lot of people and of just feeling it's a
> great place to grow up. To a child growing up, it
> might even seem like an extended family.

> Those of us who have children have the need to raise
> our children around many age groups, many people with
> different viewpoints. I think that's very healthy.
> It's not so much that we're seeking benefit on a
> material level. We want to expose our children so they
> will have a sense of being able to work with people as
> they grow.

Members of the cohousing groups shared in child care
activities. The teenagers baby-sat the young children
during meetings. The adults related to the children in
nurturing ways and provided supervision. The children
interacted with all members of the community and would go to
any person for comfort or assistance. Group members who

were child free, or whose family had grown, looked forward to relationships with the children. Respondents said:

I'm looking forward to interacting with kids more.

They [older people] didn't want to sit around and watch the sunset every night. They want to watch children play.

I'm looking forward to being another adult in these children's lives and offering them attention that maybe their parents are a little frayed and can't give it to them. I'm looking forward to those relationships a lot.

There was a sense that the children were a very important part of the community as evidenced by the site plan. The Winslow site was designed with the needs of children as a priority. Play areas were strategically placed between the units where parents and neighbors could keep visual contact with the children. Parking was separate from the walkways and children's play areas. The car lots were located at the perimeter of the site to ensure that vehicular traffic would not pose a danger to the children.

The desire for a child-safe and child-friendly environment is also found in the literature, particularly by Cooper Marcus and Sarkissian (1986). Residents in Danish cohousing communities were motivated towards these objectives as well.

However, some respondents were concerned about how the teenagers would fit into the group and whether they would feel that they belonged. One of the tasks of adolescence is to become independent and to forge a separate identity. In

contrast, one of the goals of cohousing is interdependence and reliance on others.

As well, some teenagers were concerned about the name of their community. They did not want to be perceived as being somehow different from their peers, nor did they want it known that they were living in a project or in low income housing.

During one family interview, the teenager said: "I didn't have much say in it. I didn't like it at first. I didn't want to move." Literature about European communities expressed a similar concern with how adolescents would be integrated into the community.

A Desire to Share the Load

The cohousing community was viewed as providing assistance to families and individuals. One respondent expressed a "total belief that no one should be stranded in a nuclear family." This is an interesting perspective because it challenges the notion that the family is sacred and exclusive. It runs counter to the commonly-held belief that the family *should* meet *all* the needs of its members or it has failed. Respondents believed that the cohousing community would be a valuable resource to the family. It was "taking the pressure off the nuclear family" and "broadening the base of support."

The recognition that families cannot do it all alone is voiced by Brazelton (1992) and Garbarino (1990). They have also taken the position that society or the community must take responsibility to assist families.

Respondents regarded sharing experiences of parenting as supportive. They said:

> It's pretty stressful if there are problems in the family. Having other people around can often provide families with new insight or can relieve the stress.

> I think it's a big benefit to a family to have important meaningful relationships outside the family.

> I've just got lots of support from people. It's amazing how many people with grown children have had similar problems. We began to see what it would be like to build a real closeness with people. We don't have any family in this area and neither of the other couples do.

> Women with children seek cohousing as an opportunity to share the load.

It appears that women were drawn to the cohousing model because of safety issues and the opportunity for assistance with raising children. This finding is consistent with work done by Hayden (1984), Franck & Ahrentzen (1989), Wekerle (1988), and Wekerle & Novac (1989) who identified communities that were developed by women to meet these same needs.

Through the group process and frequent contact with group members, supportive networks have emerged. One respondent said that cohousing people had "a large need and commitment to community - to be a supportive caring network around them." These connections resembled an extended

family or acted as a substitute family. However, there were no formal family roles. The networks provided benefits for individuals and families. There was an implicit expectation that members of the group would be helpful to each other. Specific examples of instrumental support included providing transportation and helping with household chores and office work during times of illness and injury. Due to the proximity of neighbors, respondents felt that there would be opportunities for interdependence and assistance on a daily basis. This included lending tools and helping with tasks related to house and yard maintenance. Respondents believed that sharing the evening meal in the common house was a very important benefit for working parents and singles. It would also provide an opportunity to connect with other residents.

Respondents also indicated a willingness to give and receive emotional support. They said:

> When you're having a hard time, you let each other know it. I think one thing that'll be really different is the ability to ask people for help.

> It will be easier to be more interdependent when living that closely with those people.

> I know if I really needed someone, they would be there.

> I think it's a pretty supportive group of people.

> There is a knowledge about what you can rely on people for as far as their patience, their thoughtfulness, their fairness, that I feel I know these people better than I've ever known any people anywhere in that regard. Because of the fact of working together on serious problems.

> I can't think of anything where people wouldn't be willing to help each other out.

These findings are consistent with the literature. The social motivations as identified in the study are analogous to the social motive of interdependence (Veroff & Veroff, 1980). The importance of social support networks as highlighted in the study is also recognized by Garbarino (1982, 1987, 1990, 1991) and Porcino (1991).

A Desire to Push the Boundaries

Respondents have a spirit of adventure. They described themselves in these ways: "ready for something new," "willing to risk," "take the challenge," "take a chance," "adventuresome," "courageous," "idealistic," "a lot of energy," "aliveness," "passionate people," "committed to an idea," "scared optimists," "leaders not followers," "self-sufficient," "self-sustaining," "reasonably whole," "reasonably balanced," "not perfect," and "growing." Respondents said:

> Most of us are pretty firmly planted in the ground in terms of taking care of ourselves but a little bit more willing to risk and try something new.

> The people that have joined this are people that will take kind of a challenge or a risk. Cohousing isn't something for people that just follow at this point. It may, in ten or fifteen years, it may be, but the people that have joined are all people that sort of go out of their way to do things, that look for something new and are innovators and the sort of 'take charge' type of people.

> What motivates me is that kind of experimental nature of it. I always like to push the boundaries a little bit of what's expected and see what happens.

I'll be very curious to see how this works.

It's [cohousing] new to North America and I'd like to experience it.

It's more interesting than anything I've ever done. That's why I joined. It wasn't just to have a place to live, you know. I'll always have a place to live. This is a social experiment. And I want to know what's going to happen next.

These exploratory goals as motivations correspond with the curiosity incentive of Veroff and Veroff (1980). Carl Rogers described persons who are authentic as taking risks beyond their typical natures and styles, to try new experiences and challenges. Respondents involved in the cohousing process can be seen as authentic persons in their motivation to push the boundaries.

A Desire for Personal Growth and Self-fulfillment

When respondents became involved in the participatory process of making decisions by consensus, they realized a number of benefits for their involvement. They were able to exercise more control and personal choice over their destiny. Through active participation, members of the group were able to clarify their own personal goals and objectives in terms of what they wanted for themselves. Respondents said:

As far as quality of life, there are all those things I've learned from being involved in this process. Learning about how consensus really works, learning just by struggling as a group, the best ways to deal with issues in a way that's fair to everyone.

I think that's what ultimately tipped me towards joining and not being an observer. And not because it was easy, but I'm just so impressed by the consensus model as a working model, a workable model. . . Those are difficult choices to make, but you're making them for the sake of something larger. In that sense it's a microcosm. It's a model. And I keep working at it because it has to work. If this can't work, then how the hell can they expect the rest of the world to work?

...the opportunity for growth and change, personally, and a group, you would be growing with one group. But overall, holistic outlook and quality of living, I assume would be much, much higher.

I think, not that it's easy, I mean, I think sometimes just the fact that it [the process] isn't easy is what helps develop it. You know, you go through so much together that when you finally move in together, it's not a matter of, 'oh, now we have to create a community' - you've already done it in the sense of you know these people. You see those ucky sides that you don't usually show each other, because you're tired, you're frustrated, you're afraid, whatever it is. I think those things are really critical for having a true community where you can trust each other and stuff because you've had to already.

I think the difficulties we've had, both financial and decision making and things, have taught us how to live together, how to really care about each other and to really be considerate of other people's ideas.

This development process does make people work together in a way they would never have been encouraged to do. You will have become close to people you would have never have gotten to know because you've worked with them day and night--literally.

What motivated me was essentially meeting with the people that were involved and the feeling of creating something, working together with people that I hadn't had for a long time.

I think this idea of working together with somebody towards a goal is something that's really important to me and it's an important part of cohousing. It's not just living together--I think you have to be working towards something.

The respondents engaged in a dynamic group process that was supportive. They felt safe to take risks, to move

beyond the routine, the usual and the ordinary. The group

process became a crucible for personal growth in which

individuals were able to try new experiences and face new

challenges. Their comments included:

> I learn a lot from seeing how people respond to the
> same thing that I respond to.

> The participatory process is important because I think
> it's a growing process. I mean I think everybody grows
> through that in working it out and solving the problems
> together and the give and take that it takes.

> I don't equate the quality of life with being
> frustration free. There's something to be gained in
> participating in this group in no matter what it's
> doing. Because I learn about myself, I learn about
> life, I learn about a lot of things because I have this
> opportunity to participate in whatever we are doing.

> We're going to be different people when we have lived
> in the way for some period of time, if we make a go of
> it.

Some respondents who were functioning in the initial

phases of a project had slightly different views regarding

the participatory process. They said:

> I think it's [the process] important but I'm not sure
> at this point how important. In other words, I'm not
> sure if the pain will result in the necessary gain so I
> guess my goal through the process is to structure the
> most efficient possible means to get to the end.

> I can see the participatory aspect of it as being very
> important to me just because that's where the real
> intimacy connection develops in working though and
> sharing dreams as well as also being willing to share
> differences.

> I think ultimately I'm going to go through a process
> and I'm either going to be happy with the end result or
> I'm not. That'll be okay. I think it will allow me to
> get a lot clearer about what I want. And if I don't do
> it here, I'll do it somewhere else.

Respondents indicated that the process of consensus ensured that everyone had an equal voice. Unlike communes or cults, there was no charismatic leader. Roles were egalitarian. Each member facilitated general membership meetings. There was little hierarchical structure. To meet legal requirements, members of the Washington group voluntarily served as officers. The power of the board was limited to those tasks most expediently dealt with by a smaller decision making body. In addition, each member participated in one or more committees to deal with specific issues. These committees included Membership, Public Relations, Finance and People committees. The process was most successful when there was full participation by all members.

The participatory development process was a long and arduous journey as members of the Winslow group testified. It appears, however, that the considerable investment of time and energy has been worth while and a strong sense of community has emerged. As a means for working out differences and solving problems that occurred, the participatory development process resulted in true community that is conflict-resolving as defined by Peck (1987).

As members of a grassroots movement, the respondents experienced a number of educational and psychological benefits (Haggstrom, 1984). Kaplan and Kaplan (1982) identified the importance of struggling to achieve results which contributes to a person's growth and happiness.

> It is a stubborn irony of human nature that humans
> cannot be given what they want. They are most
> effective, most constructive--yes, even happiest--when
> they are striving for what they want, when they are
> struggling to get where they want to go. Humans are at
> their best when they are coping and problem solving.
> They require an environment where this is possible.
> (p. 457)

When the environment and circumstances are supportive, an

individual will be facilitated to act on the tendency to

growth, self-fulfillment, or self-actualization (Maslow,

1967).

Chapter 4

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND SUMMARY

Implications for Community Practice

The results from this study have implications for

community practice and social policy. A number of selected

implications will be addressed.

Cohousing communities are a creative response to the

social isolation that has been experienced in many urban

neighborhoods in European countries. There are a number of

European examples of government sponsored social housing

projects that can be examined with the view of applying this

model to North America. The new legislation in Denmark, The

Cooperative Housing Association Law, made it easier and less

expensive in that country to finance cohousing. As well,

groups were encouraged to incorporate a greater diversity in

the composition of the households. With the new financing

possibilities, the mix of earlier cohousing residents

composed of two-income families shifted to include single

persons and single parent families.

Disadvantaged groups experience a lack of access to

cohousing communities on the Canadian scene. In considering

practice implications, involvement in social action

strategies may include pushing for social policy changes on

municipal, provincial, and federal levels.

In terms of social policy, governments must realize that housing is a primary concern for all households whether individuals or families. Because governments play a major role in housing, it is suggested that municipal, provincial, and federal housing departments provide grants or a loan structure for low-income groups to participate in cohousing projects.

Providing equal access to adequate housing for persons with disabilities has social policy implications. The cohousing community can be designed to meet the special needs of these residents. As an example, the Winslow site has been designed to be wheelchair accessible. Seniors and persons with disabilities can benefit from living with a cross-generational mix of residents. The burden of daily living can be lightened as neighbors who interact with them could be more aware of their needs and provide assistance.

The Winslow group has planned for a daycare on the property that would be open to families from the community. In regards to daycare policy, future cohousing projects that include a facility which provides for child care could receive additional government funding.

A clear role for local community organizations and community practioners could be the use of a public education strategy to provide information and facilitate community participation. In their enabling function, community practioners and organizations could provide the means and resources for people to come together and facilitate

discussion about the cohousing model. Populations that might benefit from living in a cohousing community could be identified and connected to resource people, such as architects, who would be willing to collaborate with cohousing groups.

A Strategy to Provide for Supportive Early Care

The Washington group has responded to the needs of its members in ways that are reminiscent of an extended family. Child care responsibilities have been shared by people who are free from immediate and pressing family responsibilities. This group includes single persons and older couples who have grown children. Children whose grandparents live in another part of the country are being "adopted" by seniors whose grandchildren live a distance away from them. These relationships are mutually beneficial in the giving and receiving of affection and a consistent attention to each other's well being.

As well, single parent families could receive support and assistance on a daily basis. Informal supervision of children by other residents in a secure setting would alleviate the total responsibility for child care on the single parent. In addition, there would be an available pool of adult male role models to be involved with children of father-absent homes.

In later years, as the need arises for elderly persons or individuals who might suffer a loss of ability resulting from disease or injury, homecare or medical assistance could be provided within the group setting. Perhaps the need for long-term placement of the elderly may be reduced or eliminated for some persons if they were to live in a cohousing community. The supportive environment that provides a balance of privacy and community is a healthier option than living alone or in an institution. This approach might also increase longevity and promote a healthy lifestyle.

This perspective is supported in the literature. "In conventional economic terms, every dollar invested in supportive early care saves four dollars in later rehabilitative and compensatory care" (Garbarino, 1988, p. 11).

An Opportunity to Promote Multiculturalism

The cohousing approach might also be explored as an opportunity to promote multiculturalism. The experience of learning about each other's traditions and customs could be enhanced through personal interactions during daily activities, such as preparing meals and doing yard work together in the community. With a constant exposure to rich cross-cultural experiences, an increased awareness and

greater understanding of cultural diversity may reduce racial tension and prejudice.

Limitations of the Cohousing Model

Affordability

Cohousing communities have become an established housing option in Europe over the past twenty years. With financial support through government incentives, living in a cohousing community was a viable option for many people. Europeans were able to make substantial savings and enjoyed additional benefits that they would be unable to afford on their own, such as photography darkrooms, pottery wheels, and music rooms.

At this point, North American participants in cohousing projects are limited to the middle class. Financial resources are a key factor. Additional funds are required over a long period of time to maintain current housing while making considerable investment in the project.

Respondents from the Washington group viewed cohousing as "barely affordable." Expensive land, construction budget over-runs, as well as costly mistakes, had pushed respondents to the edge of their financial resources. Financial strain was their greatest concern. This finding is contrary to Porcino's (1991) assertion that the reason

people live in community was a way "to ease financial
stress." (p. xxvi)

As a major step in the initial phase of their project,
determining a site was the primary concern for the Vancouver
group. Although exact figures were not available,
respondents felt that cohousing was affordable in comparison
with similar housing in similar locations.

Perhaps as residents live in the community for a number
of years, they will experience a reduction in their
household expenditures. As they pool their resources, such
as laundry facilities, tools and equipment (e.g. lawnmowers,
rototillers, wheelbarrows) as well as participate in bulk
buying for common household foods and commodities,
individual expenses will decrease.

Cultural and Racial Diversity

Although all respondents from the Washington group were
very desirous of having a racial mix of residents, this
cultural diversity was absent from their community. All
members of the group were white. Respondents indicated that
disadvantaged minorities were unable to participate because
of a lack of financial resources. Due to their own
limitations, the group was unable to subsidize housing on
their site in order to facilitate a diversity of residents.
As a compromise, the group sold a parcel of their land to

the local housing authority to develop into low income housing.

The Vancouver group also wanted cultural diversity in their community. At the time of the study, only one of the six group members was non-white (Asian). It is possible that this ratio could change because the multicultural population of Vancouver might increase the probability of a racial mix of neighbors.

Individual Privacy

Prospective cohousing residents may express concern about whether they would have individual privacy. Some persons might feel that living in close proximity with a group of people would be like living in a fishbowl. They may feel that there would be insufficient provision for solitary pursuits or making one's own decisions about one's life. Perhaps residents would need to develop a code of non-verbal signs or gestures, such as pulling the kitchen drapes closed, thus indicating: "I want to be alone right now. Please don't approach me. It doesn't mean I don't like you. It just means I need time by myself."

Common Values

The model is limited to participants who have common values about sharing and collaboration rather than

competition. The effectiveness of community life relies heavily on consideration of each other. It is intended to be self-monitored. Living in a cohousing community requires a high level of compromise and tolerance for individual differences. This may not be easily attainable in the heterogeneous society of North America. As well, the prevailing attitude of "do your own thing" may preclude this occurring.

To facilitate the effectiveness of community life and the sense of working as a team, individual desires must be compromised occasionally in deference of the collective good of the group. Some individuals and families may be unwilling or unable to make these adjustments to their lifestyle or pattern of relating to others. For example, the Washington group had planned that all households would access the laundry facilities built in the commonhouse for use by the entire community. However, some families insisted on installing washers and dryers in their private residences.

The currently held ideal of rugged individualism that is defined by Peck (1987) may be so firmly entrenched that it may be premature for North Americans to follow the model's framework of interdependence, sharing, and making consensual decisions. Perhaps the drive to control one's own destiny may present a conflict when it is so closely intertwined with the destiny of others.

Participants may also experience a sense of failure if they are unable to follow the kind of ideals embodied in the purist version of the model which was founded within a homogenous society. There may need to be a number of intermediate projects before the model is fully accepted.

Including Adolescents as Community Members

In their search for their own identity, teenagers need an arena that is safe for them to try a myriad of behaviors and receive helpful feedback. Oftentimes families experience the brunt of this exploration. Perhaps adolescents who live in a cohousing community might feel restricted in that they cannot be themselves in their home because it is extended to the entire community. As well, because of their status as minors, they may feel that they are not full participants in making decisions.

Support for Families in Transition

The cohousing community offers an option for couples who experience marital stress. The guestrooms provide temporary respite. One partner could have some space away from the home yet not leave the community while the couple is sorting out the difficulties.

If a couple with children was to separate or divorce, both parents could continue to live in the community. The

disruption to the children's lives may be minimized. Access to both parents could be maintained as well as keeping other aspects of their lives unchanged. The children could attend the same school, play with the same friends and continue community activities with other residents. This kind of arrangement may meet the children's needs for security, stability, and continuity of relationships. However, it may not meet the needs of the adults. It is doubtful that the parents would be able to develop other primary relationships within the same community with complete tolerance or acceptance of the former partner or other residents.

Complete Resident Management

To ensure that complete resident management is possible, a commitment to community life, group activities and responsibilities to the on-going maintenance of the yard and common facilities is required. This includes committee work and group meetings which can add additional responsibility to primary relationships within the family. These demands may become burdensome at times and may tend to compound the stress of a busy family and work life.

Although cohousers claim no particular ideology, a kind of "groupthink" may develop among persons who live closely with each other in a similar fashion to an extended family. Constraints may be imposed upon individual expression, for example, on how the exterior of homes are to be finished and

decorated. As well, families might experience pressure to
follow a prescribed community version or style of parenting.
One respondent from the study felt that her family would
have to curtail yelling to each other which was a common and
accepted communication pattern for them. There might be the
sense that there would always be someone looking over your
shoulder.

Participatory Process

The arduous process of designing and developing the
community through the participation of all its members is
not for the faint-hearted. It demands the most tenacious of
souls. It requires a high tolerance for lengthy meetings
and dealing with ambiguity as issues are clarified, views
are expressed, and decisions of varying degrees of
complexity and impact are made through consensus. As well,
making decisions by consensus is generally an unfamiliar
process for most North Americans where the majority vote
pattern prevails. It takes considerable effort, energy, and
commitment to persevere with this model of making decisions.

Respondents have become discouraged and grown weary
with this ponderous process. Despite the drawbacks, the
Washington group felt that this process was a critical
element for building a sense of community and creating a
shared history among the members. There was some concern
that members who joined the group later, when this process

was completed, may not have the same bonding experience as those first members. Respondents also revealed that they had to put the rest of their lives on hold while they spent all their time on the cohousing project. They felt that they had made enormous personal sacrifices for their dream.

The design and development phases require skills and knowledge in specific fields such as legal, engineering, architecture, and project management. Accessing this expertise, often resident within the group, can pose problems when these individuals do not perform satisfactorily. One of the groups experienced a crisis point in their project when conflict and dissension resulted around this issue.

However, hiring the required experts may be prohibitive because the cohousing concept is relatively unknown in North America. The required professionals may be unaware of the principles of the model and may not be sympathetic to the goals of the group. For example, an architect may be unwilling or unable to work with group or committee decisions about an entire community. This participatory design process presents a range of dynamics and constraints that are not found in the customary way of dealing with a single individual or a couple in regards to one houseplan.

Limitations of the Study

Determining an individual's motivation through self-report is tenuous at best. An individual's motives shift over time and one's understanding and recollection of how decisions were made often change.

There are a number of issues that impact on the validity of the study. Respondents may have felt that they should be positive in their comments because negative remarks would have reflected badly on themselves, the group, and the entire project. They may have wanted to present their decisions in the best light. The results, therefore, may reflect an overly optimistic portrait of the cohousing model. Additionally, because the respondents have not yet experienced living in the cohousing community, they may not be fully cognizant of all the problems therein.

The interviews were conducted over a short time period. Individuals' responses to the questions are affected by a number of factors, such as: the phase of the project, the progress made to date, the level of satisfaction with the process, and the relative strength of the individual's resolve to persevere with the project. At best, the study can serve to shed some light on the phenomenon of cohousing and how individuals are motivated towards it.

The interview guide as a measure has limited validity. It is not known whether the interview guide is comprehensive. There is a possibility that all areas were not explored in sufficient breadth or depth. As well, some important issues may have been inadvertently overlooked.

The sample size is too small for confident or rigorous generalizations across time and space. Although members from two groups were included, one from the United States and one from Canada, the perspectives of the respondents cannot be generalized to all cohousing group members in North America. As only one respondent was a teenager, his remarks cannot be regarded as representative of all adolescents. The qualitative research design generated soft data about respondents which cannot be viewed as statistically representative.

The exploratory design of the study is an appropriate approach to attempt to describe the motivation for the actions of an individual. It begins to uncover pertinent issues that are useful and understandable for speculating about the motivations of cohousing group members.

Future Research Possibilities

As an exploratory study, this research project examined the motives of group members who had taken personal initiative to pioneer a housing model that is new to North America. Several questions were answered but many more

questions were raised. Replication studies would increase
the validity and reliability of the study and reveal further
insights into motivation.

Conducting interviews with individuals and families who
had actually lived in the cohousing community for a period
of time would add weight to the study and may determine the
dynamic or static nature of their motives. Many respondents
expressed an interest in having the researcher return in ten
years time to determine if their expectations had been met.

A longitudinal study to determine outcomes of living in
a cohousing community would be informative. Investigating
the impact of this model on individual and family life in
regards to the stability of relationships and community
initiative would provide insights into the benefits of the
cohousing model. It may also serve as an example of how a
close-knit community might respond to the changing needs of
families and individuals.

Summary

Respondents were motivated towards cohousing because of
a number of universal human needs. They had needs for
belonging and for support. They wanted to live in community
and have a safe and enriched environment for their children.
The respondents chose to meet these needs in an unusual
manner. They joined with other like-minded individuals and
organized themselves. Their goal was to design and develop

a cohousing community. While the traditional approach to housing maintains the integrity of the family unit by reducing external influences, the cohousing model expands the sphere of influence.

A desire to push the boundaries propelled respondents through the participatory process of making decisions by consensus. They experienced personal growth not realized in other ways. In addition, a caring and supportive atmosphere was created. Housing as a physical structure became almost secondary. Although the initial attraction was for a specific kind of setting, as respondents became engaged in the development process, they expressed stronger motivation for the sense of community and the support that would be realized by living in a cohousing community.

Individuals did not appear to be drawn to cohousing as a solution to any major problems or difficulties that they might have been experiencing. They were not coming from a deficit position but were motivated by the challenge of developing their own community. They took a grass-roots approach to finding alternate housing that would meet their needs for community. They engaged with others who were committed to making a difference in their lives and in the lives of their families.

Some motivational theories advance a particular approach to counselling in which taking personal responsibility for one's life is the central focus.

Respondents had similar goals as they took control of their lives within a group setting, rather than through a therapeutic intervention. The experiences of individuals who were involved in the development of a cohousing community have affirmed the value of supportive environments in facilitating personal growth.

Respondents were hopeful about the future of their community. Because of the experiences they had shared together, they felt positive about how they would resolve differences in living closely with each other. They had faith in the process and in the good will of the members.

The cohousing model is a new concept in terms of planning housing developments for urban settings. However, the model is actually based on an old idea of living in a village in which neighbors were natural helpers.

This study provides a starting point for discussion about the cohousing model. It examined why individuals were motivated towards the model. Cohousing group members wanted to live in a child-friendly and child-safe community that was supportive. Through the participatory process, they experienced personal growth and self-fulfillment.

Findings suggest that the cohousing community has the potential to create a supportive environment. Research of the European examples which have been established for a much longer period of time or longitudinal studies of the new North American experiments may lead to a greater

understanding of how the model impacts the social and
personal lives of families and individuals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamson, N., Briskin, L. A., & McPhail, M. (1988). Feminist organizing for change. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Alderfer, C. P. (1989). Theories reflecting my personal experience and life development. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 25(4), 351-365.

Arnold, J. A. (1978). The art of decision making: Seven steps to achieving more effective results. New York: AMACOM.

Babbie, E. R. (1973). Survey Research Methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Biddle, W. W., & Biddle, L. J. (1965). The community development process: The rediscovery of local initiative. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Bloom, M., & Fischer, J. (1982). Evaluating practice: Guidelines for the accountable professional. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Brooks, R. (1988). New towns and communal values: A new approach to the search for communal ideals. In R. Warren & L. Lyon (Eds.). New perspectives on the American community (5th ed.). (pp. 426-432). Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Campbell, C. (1991, July 12). Cohousing promises the best of both worlds. The Vancouver Sun, p. G1.

Castrone, L. (1990, October 8). A sense of community: Group plans neighborhood of the future. Rocky Mountain News. pp. 57, 59.

Connaway, R. S., & Gentry, M. E. (1988). Social work practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cornfield, N. (1983). The success of urban communes. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45(1), 115-126.

Foster, C. (1989, May 24). A do-it-yourself extended family. The Christian Science Monitor, p. 14.

Franck, K. A., & Ahrentzen, S. (Eds.). (1989). New households, new housing. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Franken, R. E. (1982). Human motivation. Monterey, CA:
    Brooks/Cole.

Fromm, D. (1991). Collaborative communities: Cohousing,
    central living, and other new forms of housing with
    shared facilities. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Garbarino, J. (Speaker). (1990, February). The future as if
    families really mattered (Cassette Recording No. 23).
    Keynote address at the Lieutenant-Governor's Conference,
    Edmonton, AB, Canada: Alberta Family and Social Services.

Garbarino, J. (1988). The future as if it really mattered.
    Longmont, CO: Bookmakers.

Garbarino, J. (1982). Children and families in the social
    environment. New York: Aldine.

Garbarino, J., & Stocking, H. S. (Ed.). (1979). Supporting
    families and protecting children. Nebraska: The Boys
    Town Center for the Study of Youth Development.

Germain, C. B. (Ed.). (1979). Social work practice: People
    and environments. New York: Columbia University Press.

Giese, J. (1990, October 5). Housing project pioneers
    commune concept. The Vancouver Sun, pp. E1, E20.

Giese, J. (1990, September 27). A communal type of life and
    dinner's for everyone. The New York Times, pp. C1, C6.

Grosser, C. (1979). Participation and practice. In C. B.
    Germain (Ed.). Social work practice: People and
    environments. New York: Columbia University Press.

Haggstrom, W. C. (1984). For a democratic revolution: The
    grass-roots perspective. In F. M. Cox, J. L. Ehrlich,
    J. Rothman & J. E. Tropman (Eds.). Tactics and
    techniques of community practice. (pp. 222-231).
    Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Hayden, D. (1984). Redesigning the American dream: The
    future of housing, work and family life. New York:
    W. W. Norton & Co.

Hoyenga, K. B., & Hoyenga, K. T. (1984). Motivational
    explanations of behavior. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (1987) Joining together:
    Group theory and group skills. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:
    Prentice-Hall.

Kahn, S. (1982). Organizing: A guide for grassroots leaders.
    New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kantner, R. (1988) Communes and commitment. In R. Warren & L. Lyon (Eds.). New perspectives on the American community (5th ed.). (pp. 420-425) Chicago, IL: Dorsey Press.

Kelley, P., & Kelley, V. R. (1985). Supporting natural helpers: A cross-cultural study. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work. 66(6), 358-366.

Ketchum, D. (1990 June) Kathryn McCamant & Charles Durrett: Neighborhoods for the nineties. SF: The Magazine of Design and Style, pp. 60, 62, 105.

Kines, L. (1992, February 21). Stress on middle-class families becoming too much, author warns. The Edmonton Journal, p. A3.

Lamoureux, H., Mayer, R., & Panet-Raymond, J. (1989). Community action. Montreal, PQ, Canada: Black Rose.

Leavitt, J. (1989). Two prototypical designs for single parents: The congregate house and the new American house. In K. A. Franck & S. Ahrentzen (Eds.). New households, new housing. (pp. 161-186) New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Lyon, L. (1989). The community in urban society. Lexington, MA: Lexington.

Mann, L. (1989). Becoming a better decision maker. Australian Psychologist, 24(2), 141-155.

Marcus, C. C. & Sarkissian, W. (1986). Housing as if people mattered. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Maslow, A. (1967). Self-actualization and beyond. In J. Bugental (Ed.). Challenges of humanistic psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mazey, M. E., & Lee, D. R. (1983). Her space, her place: A geography of women. Washington, DC: Association of American Geographers.

McCamant, K., & Durrett, C. (1989). Cohousing in Denmark. In K. A. Franck & S. Ahrentzen (Eds.). New households, new housing. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

McCamant, K., & Durrett, C. (1989, May/June) Good housekeeping: Cohousing can reincorporate community into the American dream. Utne Reader, pp. 68-72.

McCamant, K., & Durrett, C. (1988). <u>Cohousing: A contemporary approach to housing ourselves</u>. Berkeley, CA: Habitat Press.

Meenaghan, T. M., Washington, R. O., & Ryan, R. M. (1982). <u>Macro practice in the human services</u>. New York: Free Press.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). <u>Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods</u>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mulady, K. (1990, April 3). A community of neighbors: Design for living brings families together. <u>The Idaho Statesman</u>, pp. 1D, 6D.

Pastalan, L. (1982). Privacy as an expression of human territoriality. In. S. Kaplan & R. Kaplan (Eds.). <u>Humanscape</u>. (pp. 324-330). Ann Arbor, MI: Ulrich's Books.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). <u>Qualitative evaluation and research methods</u>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Peck, M. S. (1987). <u>The different drum: Community-making and peace</u>. New York: Touchstone.

Petri, H. L. (1991). <u>Motivation: Theory, research, and applications</u> (3rd. ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Polansky, N., Ammons, P., & Gaudin, J., Jr. (1985). Loneliness and isolation in child neglect. <u>Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work</u>, <u>66</u>(1), 38-47.

Porcino, J. (1991). <u>Living longer, living better: Adventures in community housing for those in the second half of life</u>. New York: Continuum.

Porteous, D. J. (1977). <u>Environment behavior: Planning and everyday urban life</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Rothman, J. & Tropman, J. E. (1987). Models of community organization and macro practice perspectives: Their mixing and phasing. In F. M. Cox, J. L. Erlich, J. Rothman & J. E. Tropman (Eds.). <u>Strategies of community organization</u>. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. (1989). <u>Research methods for social work</u>. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Simons, J., Irwin, C., & Drinnin, B. (1987). <u>Psychology: A search for understanding</u>. St. Paul, MN: West.

Shawlinsky, E. (1990, October 9). A new way to life: Sonoma group among 70 in U.S. trying to build cohousing. The Sonoma Index-Tribune, pp. B1-B3.

Shey, T. (1977). Why communes fail: A comparative analysis of the viability of Danish and American communes. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39(3), 605-613.

Short, J. (1989). The humane city: Cities as if people matter. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Smith-Kim, C. (1990, July 15). Cohousing concept catches on in California. San Francisco Examiner, pp. F-1, F-11-14.

Stinnett, N., & DeFrain, J. (1985). Secrets of strong families. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Straus, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Streib, G. (1978). An alternative family form for older persons: Need and social context. The Family Coordinator, 27(4), 413-420.

Swenson, C. (1979). Social networks, mutual aid, and the life model of practice. In C. Germain (Ed.). Social work practice: People and environments. New York: Columbia University Press.

The better community catalog: Partners for livable places. (1989). Washington, DC: Acropolis.

Toch, H. (1965). The social psychology of social movements. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Veroff, J., Reuman, D., & Feld, S. (1984). Motives in American men and women across the adult life span. Developmental Psychology, 20(6), 1142-1158.

Veroff, J., & Veroff, J. B. (1980). Social incentives: A life-span developmental approach. New York: Academic Press.

Warren, R. (1988). The good community - what would it be? In R. Warren & L. Lyon. (Eds.). New perspectives on the American community (5th ed.). (pp. 412-419) Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Wekerle, G. R. (1988). Canadian women's housing
    cooperatives: Case studies in physical and social
    innovation. In C. Andrew & B. Milroy (Eds.).
    Life spaces: Gender, houshold, employment.
    (pp. 102-140). Vancouver, BC, Canada: University of
    British Columbia Press.

Wekerle, G. R., & Novac, S. (1989). Developing two women's
    housing cooperatives. In K. A. Franck & S. Ahrentzen
    (Eds.). New households, new housing. (pp. 223-242). New
    York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Whittaker, J., Garbarino, J., & Assoc. (1983). Social
    support networks: Informal helping in the human services.
    New York: Aldine.

Yancy, W. (1982). Architecture, interaction, and social
    control. In S. Kaplan & R. Kaplan (Eds.).
    Humanscape: Environments for people. (pp. 293-307).
    Ann Arbor, MI: Ulrich's Books.

Zastrow, C. (1989). The practice of social work (3rd. ed.).
    Chicago, IL: Dorsey.

APPENDIX   1

INTERVIEW   GUIDE

1. Motivating Factors

What were the kind of issues that influenced you to pursue cohousing as a housing arrangement for you and your family?

Probe: What was it about cohousing that attracted you to it?

2. Commitment

What were the key factors that influenced your final decision to commit resources (time, energy, finances) to become full-time members and buy into the cohousing project?

3. Description of Cohousing Model

I understand a cohousing community is a unique housing arrangement that combines the autonomy of private homes with the advantages of community living. A community is created through a unique combination of four characteristics. I would like your perspectives about each of the four characteristics of the cohousing model.

a. Intentional Neighborhood Design

First, the site plan is designed intentionally to create a neighborhood through the layout of the clustered housing, doorways that face onto the pedestrian oriented connecting pathways, and separated parking.

What feature of this neighborhood design do you see as most important to you and your family?

a.   Extensive Common Facilities

Secondly, extensive common facilities are planned for use by the group together as a group. This includes the common house which contains a large kitchen and dining room for common meals, children's play areas and rooms for hobbies and recreation.

What facilities (common areas, play areas, daycare, laundry) will you or you family/children use?

How much value do you place on these facilities?
eg. high / medium / low / uncertain / no value

What additional services/facilities/ resources would you like to have in your community that have not been selected or planned?

a.   Participatory Development Process

Thirdly, the cohousing community is planned, designed, and developed through the active participation of all the group members using a consensus model.

How important do you feel this kind of process is in the development of the community?

Why?

d.   Complete Resident Management

I would like to hear your views about the fourth characteristic: complete resident management by which the residents are responsible for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the community.

How do you feel about living within the guidelines and expectations that have been determined by the group?

e.   Of the four characteristics that define the cohousing model, what feature do you value most?

Why?

4.   Mobility

How long have you been pursuing this kind of housing situation?

Probe: As a vision / dream?

What other living arrangements have you experienced that were attempts to reside in a similar setting?

How do you think your new situation in cohousing will be different?

5.   Friendships / Sense of Community

One of the objectives of the cohousing model is to increase social interaction.   It appears to provide opportunities for friendships to develop.

In regards to the relationships/connections that you have established already with cohousing group members, how well do you know them?   eg. really well / quite well / not at all

How frequently do you have contact with each other?

What do you want to happen in regards to developing friendships with other group members?

In regards to friendships, how do you think your new situation in cohousing will be different than it is now?

What are your views/feelings about the cohousing group/community as a substitute family or an extended family?

6. Natural Helping Networks

The cohousing model appears to have a potential for natural helping networks to be established and maintained.

Briefly, a social support network is defined as a set of interconnected relationships among a group of people that provides nurturing and assistance to cope with life on a day-to-day basis (Garbarino, 1983).

a.   Instrumental Support

Is there someone in the group that you could call on if you needed help?

b.   Emotional Support

Is there someone in the group that you could turn to for emotional support?

c.   Reciprocity / Mutuality

What kind of help would you be willing to give to other members of the group?

Probes: eg. members helping each other out...
- with household repairs
- loaning food items (borrow a cup of sugar)
- loaning small amounts of money ($5 - $20)
- running errands (dropping off a letter at the post office, picking up a prescription)
- shopping for groceries
- help with childcare

7. Affordability

How affordable is cohousing?
eg.   barely affordable / comfortable / easily affordable

How will affordability be different in cohousing?

Do you think that cohousing will raise your current standard of housing?

What impact will cohousing have on your quality of life?

8.   Raising Children

What are your views regarding cohousing as a place in which to raise your children?

Probes: eg. physical layout, general attitude of group towards children, benefits and limitations

What features of cohousing are important to you in raising your children?

In regards to raising your children, how will your new situation in cohousing be different than the one in which you are living in now?

What are the benefits to family life in cohousing?

What are the limitations to family life in cohousing?

How do your children feel about living in the cohousing community?

9.   Diversity of Residents

Cohousing appeals to a diversity of people i.e. people of all ages with different backgrounds / interests / religions / family compositions.

How will your life / your children's lives be influenced through the experience of living with a diversity of people?

How will the new situation be different than what you are experiencing now?

10.   Description of Cohousing People

How would you describe the people who are interested in cohousing - including yourself?

How are cohousing people different than other people you know or are acquainted with?

11.   Unresolved Issues

Do you have any unresolved issues - unfinished business - about living in the cohousing community? What are they?

APPENDIX 2

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

1. Please describe your current housing situation.

    single detached home
    apartment
    shared accommodation (describe)
    condominium
    cooperative housing
    other (describe)

2. How satisfied are you with your current housing
    situation?

    very satisfied / somewhat satisfied / satisfied/
    very satisfied / very dissatisfied / other

3. Please describe the composition of your household.

4. What is your marital status?

    single (never married)
    married
    separated
    divorced
    common-law

5. Education

    Please indicate the highest level of
    education / training achieved.

6. Occupation / trade / profession

7. Combined family annual income (range)

8. Male / female

9. Age

APPENDIX 3

The University of British Columbia
School of Social Work

CONSENT FORM

    I give my consent to participate as a subject in the
study entitled: "Developing a CoHousing Community as a
Housing Alternative: Motives and Perspectives of CoHousing
Group Members." The interview will be conducted by Marilyn
Jeske, a graduate student at the School of Social Work, The
University of British Columbia, who is doing research for
her thesis in partial fulfillment of the Master of Social
Work degree under the supervision of a faculty member,
Mr. Roopchand Seebaran, Ph. (604) 228-3185.

    I understand the purpose of the interview will be to
provide information on my motivation and rationale for
choosing a cohousing community as my residence as well as to
provide basic demographic information. The interview will
be completed in approximately one and a half hours. I
understand that the interview will be audiotaped as a method
of data collection for analysis. The tape will be erased
after completion of the research project.

    I understand that my participation is voluntary. My
involvement with the cohousing group will not be affected in
any way by my participation, or lack thereof, in this
project. I retain the right to refuse to answer any
questions or to request that any answer that I provide be
omitted from the record. I have the right to refuse to
participate or withdraw at any time.

    I understand the procedures as explained by the
researcher, Marilyn Jeske, Ph. (604) 228-0860. She has
offered to answer my questions concerning the procedures and
to provide debriefing if appropriate.

_____   _____
(name of subject)   (name of researcher)

_____   _____
(signature of subject)   (signature of researcher)

_____   _____
(date)   (date)

I have received a copy of the consent form.

_____
(signature of subject)

The University of British Columbia   B91-207
Office of Research Services

BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES SCREENING COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH
AND OTHER STUDIES INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

C E R T I F I C A T E   of   A P P R O V A L

INVESTIGATOR: Seebaran, R.

UBC DEPT: Social Work

INSTITUTION: Winslow Cohousing Group

TITLE: Developing a cohousing community as a
                 housing alternative: Motives and
                 perspectives of cohousing group members

NUMBER: B91-207

CO-INVEST: Jeske, M.

APPROVED: JUL 22 1991

The protocol describing the above-named project has been
reviewed by the Committee and the experimental procedures were
found to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research
involving human subjects.

Dr. R.D. Spratley
Director, Research Services
and Acting Chairman

THIS CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL IS VALID FOR THREE YEARS
FROM THE ABOVE APPROVAL DATE PROVIDED THERE IS NO
CHANGE IN THE EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES