

HD
7293
.S55
1980

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Policy Development and Research

Families and Housing Markets

Obstacles to Locating
Suitable Housing



The cover design is an adaptation of the logo for the White House Conference on Families, which itself is based on the UN symbol for a child.

FAMILIES AND HOUSING MARKETS:
Obstacles to Locating Suitable Housing

by

Margaret C. Simms
The Urban Institute

September 1980

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

AUG 20 1980

LIBRARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

Office of Policy Development and Research
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Contract No. H-2882
Project Code 4.1.02. A12

The research forming the basis of this report was conducted pursuant to a contract with The Urban Institute and the Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The statements and conclusions contained herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Urban Institute, HUD, or the United States Government.

PREFACE

In 1980, HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research mounted a special research effort: a study of the special housing situations of families with children. This was our contribution to the White House Conference on Families. Housing Our Families, a major paper covering the findings from the research, was the product of this effort. We now proudly publish the supporting research papers because they contribute significantly to our knowledge of the complex situations faced by many of our families with children when they seek housing.

Families and Housing Markets: Obstacles to Locating Suitable Housing by Margaret C. Simms of The Urban Institute is one of the supporting papers in the series. It provided not only the conceptual framework for Housing Our Families but also the background material for several of its chapters.

Other papers in the series now available from HUD are:

- How Restrictive Rental Practices Affect Families with Children by Jane G. Greene and Glenda P. Blake of National Neighbors, Inc.
- Measuring Restrictive Rental Practices Affecting Families with Children: A National Survey by Robert W. Marans and Mary Ellen Colten of the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
INTRODUCTION	1
A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	19
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	28
A RESEARCH AND POLICY AGENDA	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY	49
APPENDICES	53

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Composition of Households, 1960 to 1978	3
2	Composition of Households, 1978	5
3	Two-Parent and One-Parent Families by Race: 1978	6
4	U.S. Households, By Type and Tenure, 1976	9
5	Adequacy of Housing, 1976	10
6	Affordability of Housing, 1976	12
7	Households Reporting Housing Expenses as Percent of Income, 1976	14
8	Probability of Being Inadequately Housed, 1976	15
9	Households With Children Living in Inadequate Housing, 1977	17
10	Households With Children Living in Inadequate Housing, by Family Status, 1977	18
11	Poverty Status of Families, by Sex of Householder and Presence of Family Members Under 18 Years Old: 1977	31

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Housing is considered to be an essential service for all Americans. Numerous acts of Congress have affirmed this by providing government support for the housing industry, by forbidding housing suppliers from denying anyone equal access to housing markets, and by providing housing to families in need. Yet evidence indicates that some families are still denied access to some housing markets and are disproportionately located in inadequate housing.

As data from the Annual Housing Survey show, being a member of a minority household, a female-headed household, or a large household increases one's chances of being poorly housed. Households with black, Hispanic, or female heads are less likely to own their own homes than the total population. Black and Hispanic households are approximately twice as likely to live in flawed housing. Over eleven percent of all households with children were living in inadequate housing in 1977, a proportion slightly higher than the population as a whole. While the largest number of children in inadequate housing are members of households headed by married men, the incidence of inadequate housing is much higher among one-parent families.

A conceptual framework was devised which categorizes the determinants of family housing quality in terms of demand and supply factors. A review of the literature indicates that lack of income is a major obstacle on the demand side. Income is heavily influenced by family composition. Female-headed families have lower incomes than dual-headed or male-headed families. The high proportion of female-headed families among black families is a partial determinant of their relatively poor income positions.

Discrimination adds to the housing problems of families. In spite of the

existence of the Fair Housing and Equal Credit Opportunity Acts, there is some evidence that some mortgage lenders and real estate agents continue to discriminate against minority groups and women.

The formulation of appropriate policies to deal with the housing problems of families cannot be completed without additional research. A set of research questions is outlined in the last section of the paper.

INTRODUCTION

Housing is considered to be an essential service for all Americans. Numerous acts of Congress have affirmed this by providing government support for the housing industry, by forbidding housing suppliers from denying anyone equal access to housing markets, and by providing housing to families in need. Yet evidence indicates that some families are still denied access to some housing markets and are disproportionately located in inadequate housing.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has a number of housing programs that help alleviate housing problems. However, many families are still unable to find adequate housing at affordable prices. This study attempts to identify the determinants of housing choice and the constraints on exercising that choice. It reviews the literature on unequal access in order to identify the problems families face in housing markets. Another Urban Institute paper assesses the extent to which HUD programs have helped these families.¹

The rapid rate of household formation and the changing household composition have brought about changes in housing demand and supply. These factors have combined with two traditional obstacles to deny many families access to a decent home and a suitable living environment. The paper summarizes recent studies that detail the problems created by a lack of income and by discrimination against certain types of families in the rental and sale of housing and the granting of mortgages.

Household Composition and Housing Costs

Over the past twenty years significant changes have been taking place in

¹Sue Marshall and James P. Zais, "How Selected HUD Programs Serve Low and Moderate Income Families With Children," Urban Institute Working Paper #1481-1, April 1980.

household and family structure. Before analyzing the trends, it is helpful to make distinctions between households and families. A household consists of one or more persons occupying one dwelling unit. Individuals may or may not be related. A subgroup of households are those that are considered to be families. The Census definition of families is "two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption." This study focuses on those family households which include children.¹

The figures in Table 1 show the changes that have been taking place in household composition. The number of households increased by 20 percent between 1960 and 1970 and again between 1970 and 1978. This increase has taken place in spite of the fact that the population increased only seven percent between 1970 and 1978. A major part of the growth in number of households can be attributed to the increase in one and two-person (adult) households, which constituted over 50 percent of all households in 1978. Although these households are not considered to be "families" in this study, their growth is of interest because of the demand they place on the housing stock.

The "traditional" family household with a wage-earning husband and a full time homemaker wife is shrinking as a proportion of all households. Among families, the figures to note are the growth of single-parent families and two-parent families where both parents are in the labor force. In March of 1978, 7.3 percent of all households were one-parent households compared to 5.0 percent in 1970. However, this figure underestimates the growth of single-parent households. Because the figures present a view of family composition at a particular point in time, they do not give one a sense of what is happening over time. In recent years the divorce rate has been approximately one-half of the

¹Because these statistics are based on household or dwelling unit, there is no way to account for inter-household families. Extended families that occupy the same dwelling unit are included.

Table 1

Composition of Households: 1960 to 1978

<u>Type of Household</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1978</u>
All Households (thousands)	52,799	63,401	76,030
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonfamily Households	14.7%	18.8%	25.1%
Persons Living Alone	13.1	17.1	22.0
Other Nonfamily Households	1.6	1.7	3.1
Family Households	85.3	81.2	74.9
Married Couple with No Children	30.3	30.3	29.9
Married Couple with Children	44.1	40.3	32.4
One Parent with Children	4.4	5.0	7.3
Other Family Households	6.4	5.6	5.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

marriage rate of 10.3 per 1,000 population. On this basis, the Census Bureau estimates that 40 percent of all marriages will end in divorce. As a result, it is estimated that 45 percent of all children born in 1978 will be members of one-parent families for some period of time before they reach age 18.¹ In that year over 11.6 million children (19.2 percent of all children under 18) were living in one-parent households. Most (17.6%) were living with their mothers and fewer than one million lived with their fathers.

Two-earner households are also a growing phenomenon. In 1978, 21 percent of all households consisted of families with both husband and wife in the labor force. Over 55 percent of all married women with husbands present were in the labor force, including 41.6 percent of those with children under age six.²

These trends are expected to continue into the future. By 1990, husband-wife households are expected to drop to between 53.8 and 59.7 percent of all households.³ The number of two-earner households can be expected to increase. Labor force participation for married women with husbands present is expected to rise to 66.7 percent of the total group, with 55.3 percent of those with children under age six working.⁴

These changes in household composition will undoubtedly have an effect on the demand for housing. Two-earner households and single-parent households may have different preferences for housing type and housing location than one-earner families. The overall impact of these changes on families with children will depend on the extent to which the housing market responds to the growth in non-traditional families.

¹U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Divorce, Child Custody and Child Support, Current Population Reports, Special Studies, Series P-23, No. 84, p. 1.

²Ralph E. Smith, ed., The Subtle Revolution (Washington: The Urban Institute, 1979).

³John C. Weicher, et. al., "Projections of Housing Needs," unpublished memorandum, The Urban Institute, November 1979.

⁴Smith.

Table 2

Composition of Households, 1978

<u>Type</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
One-earner Husband-Wife Families	13.0%
Two-earner Husband-Wife Families	21.0
Single-parent Families	8.0
Childless Couples	30.0
Single Person Households	21.0
Cohabiting Couples	1.5
Other Households	5.5

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Table 3

Two-Parent and One-Parent Families by Race: 1978

<u>Type of Family</u>	<u>Number (in thousands)</u>	<u>Percent of Group</u>
All families with own children under 18	30,369	100.0
Two-parent families		81.1
One-parent families		18.9
Maintained by a woman		17.1
Maintained by a man		1.8
White families with own children under 18	26,168	100.0
Two-parent families		85.0
One-parent families		15.0
Maintained by a woman		13.3
Maintained by a man		1.7
Black families with own children under 18	3,641	100.0
Two-parent families		52.2
One-parent families		47.8
Maintained by a woman		45.0
Maintained by a man		2.7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Another factor that has affected the housing market in the past decade is the rapid increase in housing costs. Housing costs have increased more rapidly than income. An increasing number of households are spending more than 25 percent of their income on housing. In 1976, over forty percent of renter households reported spending over 25 percent of their income in rent, with about three-fifths of them committing over 35 percent of their income to shelter costs.¹ While almost all households have to cope with higher housing expenses, some groups have been disproportionately affected. A majority of low income renter households spend more than 35 percent of their income on housing. Groups that are denied access to housing markets because of discrimination are also likely to pay more in housing expenses. It is these groups that are the focus of this paper.

The Nature of the Housing Problem

Any assessment of housing needs should begin with a determination of the current position of individuals and families in the housing market. There are two ways of assessing the magnitude of the problem. One is to determine the number of households who are living in inadequate housing. Inadequate housing is defined here as housing which has one or more flaws.² The other measure is housing costs in relation to family income. The standard of housing affordability has been that housing expenditures should not exceed 25 percent of household income. If these two standards -- adequacy and affordability -- are used as measures, what is the nature and size of the housing problem?

Of the total of 74,080,000 households in the United States in 1976, 10.3 percent were headed by blacks and 4.5 percent were headed by Hispanics.³ Nearly one-quarter of all households were headed by women. Among female-headed households,

¹ Average costs for homeowners are somewhat lower since that group includes people with mortgages obtained before the price of housing escalated.

² The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development defines adequacy as the availability of heating and plumbing, structural soundness, the availability of sewage-disposal systems, the maintenance of the living unit, the unit design, electrical system and kitchen. A list of flaws can be found in Appendix A.

³ Figures taken from the HUD Series How Well Are We Housed?

78 percent were headed by white women, 17 percent were headed by blacks, and 4 percent were headed by Hispanics.¹ Forty percent of all black households were headed by women and 25 percent of all Hispanic households were headed by women. Just over 7 percent of all households contained six or more people. Nineteen percent of all black households were large households (containing six or more people) and 10 percent of all Hispanic households had more than five people in them. As these figures indicate, minority households are more likely to be female-headed and/or large households, factors that negatively affect their housing situation.

As other data from the Annual Housing Survey show, being a member of a minority household, a female-headed household, or a large household increases one's chances of being poorly housed. Table 4 shows that households with black, Hispanic, or female heads are less likely to own their own homes than the total population. Female-headed households are also more likely to be in multifamily structures. To the extent that home ownership is the ideal, these groups are less well off. Large households, on the other hand, are more likely to own their own homes (75.5 percent vs. 64.8 for the total population) and over 87 percent of them are in one family units. However, homeownership, as the following data show, does not necessarily insure that the household is living in standard housing.

In 1976, almost ten percent of all households had flaws or defects, but less than three percent were severely flawed (had two or more flaws). Various subgroups of the population had much higher flaw rates. The flaw rate for black and Hispanic households was approximately twice the rate for the entire population. However, the rates among different Hispanic groups vary widely. While

¹Among female-headed households, 32 percent of the heads were widowed, 31 percent were divorced, 23 percent were separated, and 13 percent were never married. Blacks were more likely to be in the separated or never married category, while whites were more likely to be widowed or divorced.

Table 4

U.S. Households, By Type and Tenure, 1976

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Female Head</u> [*]	<u>Large (6 or more)</u> [*]
Number of Households	74,080,000	7,640,000	3,298,000	17,854,000	5,279,000
Percent of Households	100.0	10.3	4.5	24.1	7.1
Homeowners	47,972,000	3,352,000	1,372,000	8,451,000	3,983,000
Percent of Household Type	64.8	43.8	41.6	47.3	75.5
Renter -- Cash Rent	24,375,000	4,062,000	1,815,000	9,010,000	1,151,000
Percent of Household Type	32.9	53.2	55.0	50.5	21.8
Renter -- No Cash Rent	1,773,000	227,000	111,000	393,000	145,000
Percent of Household Type	2.3	3.0	3.4	2.2	2.7

* These groups overlap with each other and with ethnicity of head.

Source: How Well Are We Housed?

Table 5

Adequacy of Housing, 1976

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Blacks</u>	<u>Hispanics</u>				<u>Female</u>	<u>Large</u>	
			<u>Total</u>	<u>Mexicans</u>	<u>Cubans</u>	<u>Puerto Rican</u>			<u>Central & South Am.</u>
Units without Flaws (thousands)	66,906	6,008	2,689	1,362	212	313	144	15,705	4,386
Percent of all Units	90.3	78.6	81.5	79.8	93.4	67.3	78.7	88.0	83.1
Units with Flaws (thousands)	7,174	1,632	609	344	15	152	39	2,149	893
Percent of all Units	9.7	21.4	18.5	20.2	6.6	32.7	21.3	12.0	16.9
Severely Flawed (2 or more) (thousands)	1,890	605	173	77	1	29	7	544	265
Percent of all Units	2.6	7.9	5.3	4.5	0.4	6.2	3.8	3.1	5.0

Source: How Well Are We Housed?

Cubans were only half as likely as the total population to live in flawed housing, Puerto Ricans were three times as likely to live in housing with flaws.

Since the types of flaws included in the Annual Housing Survey vary from minor flaws such as toilet access (which are inconvenient) to major flaws such as heating or electrical deficiencies (which are hazardous), it is useful to isolate those groups that live in severely flawed housing. When that is done, the data show that blacks and Puerto Ricans are more than twice as likely to live in severely flawed housing, with rates 2.4 to 3 times as high as the total population. Large households are nearly twice as likely to be in severely flawed housing.

Another test of possible housing problems is the proportion of one's income needed to purchase standard housing. Calculations from the Annual Housing Survey indicate that the target groups we have identified are not as capable of affording standard housing as the population as a whole. Using average housing costs and household income measures, it is possible to estimate the proportions of various groups that could afford adequate housing. If they devoted 25 percent of their income to housing (the traditional standard), 80 percent of all households could have paid for standard housing in 1976. In comparison, about 70 percent of Hispanics and 63 percent of black households could have obtained standard housing if they spent only 25 percent of their income on housing. For female-headed households the overall rate was 53 percent, but when single-person households are excluded, the percentage of households rose to between 65 and 70 percent of the group, depending on age of head.

If we raise the income limit to 35 percent of income, a rate not considered too uncommon in urban areas, the percent of all households that could have afforded standard housing rises to 87.5 percent. Black, Hispanic,

Table 6

Affordability of Housing, 1976*

	<u>Under 25%</u> <u>of Income</u>	<u>Under 35%</u> <u>of Income</u>	<u>Under 50%</u> <u>of Income</u>
Percent of All Households	80.3	87.5	92.9
Percent of Black Households	63.0	76.2	87.3
Percent of Hispanic Households	70.7	82.6	90.7
Mexican	72.9	84.9	91.0
Cuban	79.7	86.6	94.4
Puerto Rican	48.0	67.7	85.5
Central & South America	78.2	84.4	92.7
Percent of Female-Headed Households	53.0	67.7	81.2
Multiperson, Head under age 65	64.7	77.5	88.7
Multiperson, Head over age 65	69.0	82.8	93.0
Percent of Large Households	80.9	90.2	94.9

* Percent of households that could afford standard housing if they spent x percent of their income on housing.

and female-headed households lagged behind, with blacks in the worst position. Just over three-quarters of blacks could have obtained standard housing at the 35 percent cutoff. Even with an expenditure of 50 percent of income, less than 90 percent of black, Puerto Rican, and female-headed households could have obtained adequate housing.

Actual housing costs for low income groups are much higher than the hypothetical measure would suggest. A majority of all rental households with incomes under \$10,000 spend more than 25 percent of their income on housing with nearly one quarter spending more than 35 percent. The proportion of homeowners (with a mortgage) who spend more than 25 percent of their income on housing is somewhat lower, but is still substantial.

If one wanted to pinpoint the factors that increase the likelihood of a family being inadequately housed, one can disaggregate the probability of being ill-housed for each type of household. Table 8 presents information for various sex, age, and ethnic groups. If white, male-headed households are used as the standard, both sex and ethnicity of head make a substantial difference. Male-headed households of black and Hispanic heritage in the prime family years were 50 percent more likely to be inadequately housed than white, male-headed households in 1976.

If, a household was female-headed, the probabilities were almost double. Among large households the probability differentials between white male and black and Hispanic female-headed households were lower, but the differentials for white female-headed households and black male-headed households were larger than they were for smaller sized families of the same type. As can be seen from the table, large families of all races fared worse than smaller households in an absolute sense. While the probability of being inadequately housed was highest for large black female-headed households, size increased the probability of being inadequately housed for all groups. While the rate increased 25 percent for white males,

Table 7

Households Reporting Housing Expenses as Percent of Income, 1976

<u>Income</u>	<u>More than 25% of Income</u>			<u>More than 35% of Income</u>		
	<u>All</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
<u>Renter Households</u>						
Less than \$3,000	78.0%	74.6%	84.1%	68.3%	64.0%	76.5%
3,000-6,999	57.5	65.5	76.3	47.8	42.1	53.8
7,000-9,999	46.2	42.4	42.6	12.9	9.2	10.1
10,000-14,999	16.9	12.1	15.9	3.1	1.2	2.5
15,000-24,999	4.9	2.7	3.6	0.6	0.5	0.5
Over 25,000	1.1	—	—	—	—	—
All Households	43.9	49.0	49.8	27.0	31.3	32.1
<u>Homeowner With Mortgage</u>						
Less than \$3,000	64.6	76.5	*	63.3	74.8	67.6
3,000-6,999	77.0	77.7	76.6	54.8	57.3	44.7
7,000-9,999	53.6	45.6	56.4	23.6	17.8	26.3
10,000-14,999	31.7	26.7	31.7	7.9	7.6	6.6
15,000-24,999	13.2	10.1	14.9	1.5	1.2	3.1
Over 25,000	2.9	2.0	2.3	0.3	—	—
All Households	23.0	34.5	33.2	9.4	19.9	14.3
<u>Homeowners Without Mortgage</u>						
Less than \$3,000	54.1	53.4	37.9	36.7	33.8	13.8
3,000-6,999	23.3	15.5	6.3	9.0	3.7	—
7,000-9,999	4.8	6.1	—	0.7	—	—
10,000-14,999	0.6	—	2.8	0.1	—	—
15,000-24,999	0.1	—	—	—	—	—
Over 25,000	—	—	—	—	—	—
All Households	12.4	19.1	5.9	6.3	9.5	1.4

*All households reporting housing as a percent of income, reported spending over 35 percent of income.

Source: Annual Housing Survey, 1976. Part C: Financial Characteristics.

Table 8

Probability of Being Inadequately Housed, 1976

	<u>White</u>		<u>Black</u>		<u>Hispanic</u>	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<u>Head Over 65</u>						
2-5 Persons	.13	.16	.27	.33	.21	.24
<u>Head Age 30 to 64</u>						
2-5 Persons	.17	.17	.25	.26	.25	.24
6 or More Persons	.21	.31	.36	.37	.31	.35
<u>Head Under 30</u>						
2-5 Persons	.20	.18	.27	.28	.23	.29

Source: How Well Are We Housed?

the relative penalty was largest for white females. A large family with a white female head was nearly twice as likely to be ill-housed as a comparable family with fewer than six members.

Although information on the housing conditions of American Indians is not as detailed as that on other ethnic groups, their housing situation appears to be worse than most. For example, a study of housing conditions among Indians in five Oklahoma counties indicates that in 1973 over 50 percent of the Indian families in the areas surveyed were living in substandard housing, with excessive overcrowding.¹ On the reservations conditions were even worse, with 68 percent being in substandard housing in 1969 and an additional 22 percent living in overcrowded conditions. Many units lacked the basic utilities -- water, heat, and electricity.

Since this study is concerned with the housing conditions of families with children, information on those households was examined separately.² In 1977, there were 30,438,699 households with children under age 18. In all, there were 62,113,900 children in these households. Over eleven percent of these households were living in inadequate housing, a proportion slightly higher than the population as a whole. The proportion of the minority population that is inadequately housed is nearly twice the rate for the population as a whole. In all, over eight million children were inadequately housed in 1977.

The probability of a child living in inadequate housing is very sensitive to family composition. While the largest number of children in inadequate housing are members of households headed by married men, the incidence of inadequate housing is much higher among one-parent families. Households headed by a woman, especially one who has never been married or is separated from her spouse, tend

¹Arn Henderson and James Bohland, Housing and Community Alternatives for American Indians, National Science Foundation Report No. GI-29841, 1974.

²Information obtained from special runs of the 1977 Annual Housing Survey

Table 9

Households With Children Living in Inadequate Housing, 1977
(Numbers in thousands)

	<u>Households With Children</u>	<u>Families in Inadequate Housing^a</u>	<u>% of Families in Inadequate Housing</u>	<u>Children in Households</u>	<u>Children in Inadequate Housing</u>	<u>% of Children in Inadequate Housing</u>
Total						
Number	30,439	3,503	100.0	62,114	8,119	100.0
Percent	100.0	11.5		100.0	13.1	
Whites						
Number	24,190	2,159	61.6	47,697	4,619	56.9
Percent	100.0	8.9		100.0	9.7	
Blacks						
Number	3,609	764	21.8	8,274	2,047	25.5
Percent	100.0	21.2		100.0	24.8	
Hispanics						
Number	2,126	458	13.1	5,110	1,229	15.1
Percent	100.0	21.5		100.0	24.1	
Other						
Number	512	123	3.5	1,032	224	2.8
Percent	100.0	24.0		100.0	21.7	

^aFamilies with Children only.

Table 10

Households with Children Living in Inadequate
Housing, by Family Status, 1977
(Numbers in thousands)

<u>Household Head</u>	<u>Number of Households in</u>			<u>% of Families in</u>		<u>Number of Households in</u>			<u>% of Children in</u>	
	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Renter</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Inadequate Housing</u>	<u>Inadequate Housing</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Renter</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Inadequate Housing</u>	<u>Inadequate Housing</u>
Male Married	1,305	1,233	2,538	72.5		3,032	2,806	5,838	71.9	
Male Widowed	10	10	20	0.6		11	22	33	0.4	
Male Divorced	16	23	39	1.1		33	46	79	1.0	
Male Separated	3	15	18	0.5		6	21	27	0.3	
Male Never Married	2	8	10	0.3		2	8	10	0.1	
Female Married	22	20	42	1.2		49	59	108	1.3	
Female Widowed	56	62	118	3.4		118	144	262	3.2	
Female Divorced	88	159	247	7.1		184	363	547	6.7	
Female Separated	32	271	303	8.7		73	727	800	9.9	
Female Never Married	12	156	168	4.8		28	389	417	5.1	
Total*	1,545	1,958	3,503	100.0		3,534	4,585	8,119	100.0	

* May not add due to rounding

to have a much higher probability of being inadequately housed. If a child is a member of a white family headed by a married male, the probability of being inadequately housed is just over eight percent. If, on the other hand, the child is in a family headed by a married Hispanic female, he or she has a 43 percent chance of being inadequately housed.¹

A review of the information available indicates that some groups are more likely to be ill-housed than others. However, further analysis is necessary in order to determine the primary causes of families being in inadequate housing.

A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

An assessment of the housing problems of various types of families should begin with the construction of a conceptual framework for analysis. This framework includes a summary of determinants of demand on the part of families and the range of housing options available to them. Figure 1 presents some of the major determinants of housing demand and supply along with the various housing bundle components that would be of interest to families of different types.²

Demand Determinants

Income is a major constraint on a family's ability to bid for housing. This factor, in combination with the relative price of alternative housing units, is a prime determinant of the subset of housing units the family will be able to choose from. The composition of the household will determine the amount of space and the types of structures the family will prefer. In addition, the family members' skills in repair and maintenance will be a factor in the type and cost of housing services selected.

These determinants of housing choice are translated into a series of housing

¹See Appendix B for Tables on the percentage of families and children who are inadequately housed by family status and ethnicity.

²Adapted from Raymond J. Struyk, "Housing for the Elderly: Research Needs for Informed Public Policies," Urban Institute Working Paper #229-04, June 1976.

Figure 1

Interactions in the Market for Housing Services

<u>Demand Determinants</u>	<u>Components of Housing Bundle</u>	<u>Supply Determinants</u>
o Income	o Tenure	o Cost of Housing
o Household Composition	o Space and Structure	o Relative Price of Housing
o Relative Price of Housing	o Neighborhood Quality	o Number of Consumers of Various Types
o Occupant Management Skills	o Accessibility	

bundle options. All of the factors can affect the choice of renter versus owner status (tenure) and size and type of structure. Because most housing units are fixed in space, two other attributes of the housing bundle are important. The quality of the neighborhood, in terms of safety and quality of public schools and other facilities, can be a major determinant of the housing unit actually selected. Its accessibility to jobs, health facilities, and public transportation will be weighed differently by different families.

Housing decisions are made at various points in the family life cycle.¹ Changes in age, marital status, and family structure all affect mobility. "Just married" couples have a high mobility rate, as do just divorced couples. In the case of just divorced couples, the marital dissolution frequently throws the woman into a much lower income bracket where she finds herself unable to keep the family house. In other cases, the emotional strain of the divorce leads both parties to opt for new living quarters.²

Other changes in family structure revolving around the addition of children lead to mobility decisions. Mobility experts have traditionally divided these into five stages:

Prechild
Childbearing
Childrearing
Childlaunching
Postchild

Couples frequently move at least once in the prechild or childbearing period to accommodate changes in family size. Once families are completed, mobility rates are low until the postchild period.

A recent article on life cycle mobility by Clare Stapleton argues that the

¹Alden Speare, Jr., Sidney Goldstein, and William A. Frey, Residential Mobility, Migration, and Metropolitan Change, (Cambridge: Ballinger, 1974).

²Susan Anderson-Khlief, "Strategies, Problems, and Policy Issues for Single Parent Housing," Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard University, August 1979.

linear progression of the traditional cycle stages does not conform very well to reality.¹ She proposes an expanded life cycle model that incorporates the single-headed family and the primary individual and allows for "lateral" movement as well as linear movement. Mobility would be likely to occur as households change through marital dissolution and marriage or re-marriage, which could take place at various points in the "child" cycle.

Stapleton also argues that the locational decision making process will be different for different household types. The traditional family (male earner, homemaker wife) makes its housing decisions based on the husband's journey-to-work and uses his income as the major factor in affordability. Two-earner households, on the other hand, can be expected to substitute low maintenance housing units for space and will probably place more emphasis on accessibility, based on journey-to-work decisions for both husband and wife. The single-headed household will tend to move more frequently in order to balance affordability and access to jobs and services such as child care.

An example of how these factors interact in decisionmaking will facilitate an understanding of the concepts. For comparison's sake, assume there are two families of the same size but different composition. The first family consists of a husband-wife, one-earner household with one child. This family will probably consider school access and husband's job location important factors in the location of housing. If they have two automobiles (or can purchase a second one) public transportation and other neighborhood services may not be very important. If the husband (or wife) is "handy with tools," maintenance is not a problem and therefore the family can be more flexible about choice of units based on maintenance requirements. This type of family will probably opt for a single family detached home, which would provide yard space for play. In all likelihood, this

¹Clare M. Stapleton, "Impact of Changing Demographics on Intra-Urban Residential Mobility Theory," Environment and Planning, forthcoming.

family will choose homeownership, if household income is high enough.¹

The second family consists of a divorced mother with one child who works full-time, and her own mother, who is over 65. This family may have different location preferences. A working mother may give more weight to having job, home and services located in close proximity so that errands can be taken care of on the way to or from work or during lunch hours. It may be important to live close to public transportation, health services, and recreation centers for the elderly so that the grandmother is not housebound during the day. With only one prime age adult in the house, ease of maintenance may be more important, with the household looking for less yard space, and lower occupant maintenance requirements.

Households are, of course, constrained in their choice of housing units by the number and types of housing units available in different locations and by the relative prices for these types of housing. Therefore, any analysis must match up the demand side with the supply side.

Supply Determinants

The number of housing units of various types and in various locations is the result of supply side decisions. The number of units available is determined by construction, maintenance, and conversion decisions on the part of suppliers of housing services. These decisions are a function of cost and price factors. The cost of housing is a broad term that includes the cost of construction, based on technology and prices of input materials. It also covers the cost of maintenance and repair of existing units. Against these cost factors suppliers must compare the relative price of all housing (based on demand) with other investment or production options. They must also weigh the relative prices of various types of housing units. When all cost and price factors are considered, suppliers

¹The homeownership decision will be affected by the tax code provisions which allow taxpayers to deduct home ownership expenses such as mortgage interest and property taxes.

can determine whether to add units, subtract units, convert them from ownership to rental status or, as has been the case recently, convert them from rental to ownership status.

When demand changes because of changes in income, household size, locational preferences, etc., adjustments will be made in the stock. Likewise, changes in cost and price factors will tend to influence the composition of the housing stock. An increase in the interest rate will tend to make owner-occupied housing less attractive by decreasing demand and lowering the sales price of units.¹ It will also affect housing construction by increasing housing costs and lowering profit rates. Demand for rental units will tend to increase, which will cause the rate of return on existing rental housing to increase. On the other hand, rent controls tend to lower the rate of return on rental housing, making condominium conversion more attractive to owners of multi-unit structures.

Because the purchasers of housing services are not homogeneous in either need or characteristics, the housing suppliers are influenced in their decisions by their expectations of the profit attached to the rental or sale of units to different types of households. For example, if a landlord expects a particular type of household to increase maintenance costs then he will either refuse to rent to that household or charge a premium for doing so. If a lending institution believes that a household has a higher probability of default on a mortgage, it will either refuse to make a loan or apply more stringent terms to "high risk" households. Suppliers can engage in this type of behavior only to the extent that there is competition among buyers of housing services for the types of units available. Consequently, as the proportion of households in various categories changes, those households whose numbers increase will carry more weight in supply

¹The effect will be dampened by the fact that the deductibility of mortgage interest rates reduces the net cost to households. The advantage of deductibility is greatest for families in the upper income brackets, which would suggest that increases in interest rates will have a greater effect on demand for housing by those in lower income brackets.

decisions and those whose numbers decline will carry less weight. Groups with higher income will be in a better position to bid for housing services than those with lower incomes.

Housing Outcomes

Given the composition of the family and its income, the family enters the housing market in search of the dwelling unit that most closely approximates the housing bundle that it prefers. However, the market is not structured in a way that will allow a family to combine the various attributes of the housing bundle in any way it would like. If the family chooses a certain neighborhood, it may be restricted in choosing the space and structure. On the other hand, if it has a strong preference for a particular type of structure, it may be limited in location choice. If the family cannot afford or chooses not to become homeowners, it may be limited in both its location and space/structure options. In addition, if the family is of a particular ethnic background and/or has a non-traditional composition, it may not have free access to the market.

Economic constraints are partially but not totally responsible for the limitations on housing choice. Location theory lays out the tradeoffs that families must make between space and accessibility.¹ Land is very expensive in economic centers because it is in close proximity to business, transportation, commerce, entertainment, etc. Therefore, housing units tend to be closer together with only relatively small units available. If a family wishes to buy a single family detached home on a large lot, it must be willing to locate away from the center of activity.

However, economic constraints do not prevent small housing units, either

¹Richard F. Muth, Urban Economic Problems (New York: Harper & Row, 1975) p.59ff.

detached or multi-unit, from being located in outlying areas. The primary reason for the lack of heterogeneity in the suburbs appears to be government intervention. Municipal and county ordinances which dictate minimum lot size or minimum amounts of floor space, prevent builders' from making small, inexpensive housing units available in many communities. This, in turn, bars families who cannot afford or do not want larger units from locating in these communities, denying them access to the schools and other neighborhood amenities.¹

These factors, and others, have led some to argue that "a good deal of urban development has shown a conventional bias favoring independent nuclear families..."² And, moreover, it is a bias toward home ownership. These biases have worked a hardship on large families and extended families. Dwelling units with a large number of rooms are available for purchase but not for rent. Analysis of data from the Census of Housing indicates that most owner-occupied units have five to six rooms, while rental units average three to four rooms.³ This helps to explain the higher than average homeownership rate among large families. It is not necessarily an indication of a preference for ownership, but in part a result of a lack of choice. Large families must buy homes, spend an inordinate amount of time searching for the few single units for rent, or resign themselves to living in overcrowded conditions.

The paucity of large rental units works a particular hardship on those ethnic groups which have traditionally lived in extended families. A study of the housing needs of American Indians points out the importance of the extended family in determining housing needs for Indians. Over 30 percent of

¹James Heilbrun, Urban Economics and Public Policy (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974), p. 308ff.

²Gerda R. Wekerle, A Woman's Place is in the City, (Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 1979) p. 2.

³Earl W. Morris and Mary Winter, Housing, Family and Society, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978).

the Indian families surveyed in the study were living in extended families at the time of the interviews.¹ Large units are not available for rent and even when the family may opt to tolerate overcrowded conditions, it is not allowed to do so.

Evidence exists, for example, that the rental market is not readily open to larger extended families. Restrictions by landlords on the number of people permitted to reside in a rental unit are important constraints on extended families seeking housing.

Consequently

for those of lower incomes, they are placed in the position of being forced to choose² between a given family composition and the quality of their housing.

These restrictions work a hardship not only on Indians but on other ethnic groups that choose to, or because of economic constraints are forced to, live in extended families. Black and Hispanic families also have long histories of extended family relationships. For example, in 1975, 39 percent of all black children living with their mothers were part of an extended family relationship.³ These relationships are often helpful by providing emotional support and low cost child care for these families, but may adversely affect the family's housing situation.

Unfortunately, government subsidized housing programs are not always responsive to the needs of large families. Public housing units have relatively few large units and seldom have vacancies. Even when special units are built, as in the case of the Mutual Help Home Ownership program for Indians, government agencies do not seem to be sensitive to the peculiar needs of large families. A survey of program participants highlights the problem.⁴ The government officials took care of family size by adjusting the

¹Henderson, op cit.

²Henderson, p. 108.

³Robert B. Hill, "Black Families in the 70's" in The State of Black America (New York: National Urban League, 1980).

⁴Henderson, p. 11.

number of bedrooms without changing the amount of space allocated to the communal living area. Consequently, there were many families that had to eat in shifts because the eating area was not large enough for everyone to use at the same time.

These housing outcomes may be undesirable from society's standpoint because some households may not be able to obtain adequate housing in an appropriate living environment. Determining which attributes of demand and supply are most important in producing the observed outcomes is the first step in devising public policies that will change the situation.

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There are very few studies which deal with the housing problems of families as families. While there is a rather extensive literature on housing consumption and household characteristics, very few have family composition as a focus. This paper does not attempt to review all of the literature on housing consumption, but draws from literature on housing and locational choice those studies that are representative and have some implications for the housing of families. Studies of family income and housing discrimination are included. Since housing conditions are related to race, sex and marital status of household head, this review focuses on these factors in its survey of the literature.

Income and Household Composition

The major constraint on a family's ability to obtain standard housing is the amount it can afford to pay in monthly rent or mortgage payments. While rising housing costs have made housing more expensive for all households, some groups have greater problems because of their significantly lower incomes. The groups which suffer the most include blacks, Hispanics, and female-headed households of all races. In 1977, the median income of black households was \$9,563 compared to \$16,740 for white households. This black/white ratio of .57 was the lowest since the 1960s. Hispanic families were better off, but only slightly so. With

a median income of \$10,647, Hispanics had a household income that was 64 percent of the white family median.¹ Poverty rates were also much higher with 31.1 percent of black households and 24.7 percent of Hispanic households in poverty, compared to 9.1 percent of white families in 1976.²

A recent study on black-white income differences suggests that one factor in the failure of black families to make relative gains in the past decade is the relative change in family composition.³ An examination of the ratio of black-white income for specific types of families (including those maintained by a woman) reveals that the position of blacks in each group increased between 1971 and 1977, but the ratio for all families combined declined. The authors state that the anomaly is the result of the differences in the proportions of family types within each racial group.

For the first time, the proportion of white families that were two-earner husband-wife families was larger than the proportion of black families that were in the same category (39 percent as opposed to 33 percent). Moreover, even though the number of single-parent families has increased for all races, the proportion of all families that were headed by single parents increased much more rapidly for blacks than for whites. Therefore, the rapid rise in black female-headed households was a major factor in the decline in relative income among black families.

Female-headed households of all races are particularly constrained in

¹U.S. Bureau of the Census, Money Income in 1977 of Households in the United States, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 117.

²U.S. Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1976, Series P-60, No. 115.

³Gordon Green and Edward Welniak, "Measuring the Effects of Changing Family Composition on Black-White Differences in Income," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, April 10-12, 1980.

housing choice by the availability of income. In an article prepared for the Monthly Labor Review, Beverly Johnson reviewed the status of these families.¹ Using 1977 data from the Current Population Survey, she presents a bleak picture. Female-headed households are more likely to have children under age 18 than husband-wife families and they are also more likely to have low income. In 1977, one of every three families headed by a woman lived in poverty, as compared to 1 in 18 for husband-wife families and 1 in 9 for single-parent, male-headed families. For female-headed households with related children under 18 the poverty rate was 41.8 percent, over six times the rate for other types of families with related children under 18.

In 1977, 56 percent of these women were in the labor force and they had an unemployment rate of 10.3 percent. They were highly concentrated in low-skill, low-paying occupations with 7 of 10 in clerical, service, or operative positions. Lack of education was a major deterrent to labor force participation. Among women with less than an eighth grade education, labor force participation was only 28 percent. For those with over 16 years of schooling, labor force participation was 77 percent. Statistics for 1976 show that female-headed families with children had only one-third of the income of husband-wife families. Twenty-seven percent of them had no wage earners compared to ten percent for husband-wife families. In cases where there was more than one earner in the family, female-headed families had incomes that were two-thirds of husband-wife families. However, the proportion of these families with multiple earners has been declining.²

¹Beverly L. Johnson, "Women Who Head Families: Their Numbers Rise, Income Lags," Monthly Labor Review, (Vol. 101, #2) February 1978, pp. 32-37.

²In a male-headed household, if the man loses his job, there is likely to be another earner in the household. This is less likely to be true for a female-headed household. In 1976, 51 percent of unemployed husbands had another earner in the family. For unemployed women heading families the comparable figure was 18 percent. By 1979 the gap had widened with 53 percent of families with unemployed husbands having one employed family member and only 17 percent of families maintained by a woman having an employed member. (Bureau of Labor Statistics Press Release March 27, 1980).

Table 11

Poverty Status of Families, by Sex of Householder and Presence of Family Members Under 18 Years Old: 1977

(Numbers in thousands. Families as of the following year. Noninstitutional population excluding members of the Armed Forces living in barracks)

Sex of householder, poverty status, and presence of family members under 18

1977

FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER, NO HUSBAND PRESENT

Total families	8,236
Below poverty level	2,610
Poverty rate	31.7
With related children under 18 years	5,709
Below poverty level	2,384
Poverty rate	41.8
With no related children under 18 years	2,527
Below poverty level	225
Poverty rate	8.9

OTHER FAMILIES¹

Total families	48,979
Below poverty level	2,701
Poverty rate	5.5
With related children under 18 years	25,928
Below poverty level	1,697
Poverty rate	6.5
With no related children under 18 years	23,051
Below poverty level	1,004
Poverty rate	4.4

RATIO OF FAMILIES WITH FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER TO OTHER FAMILIES

Total families	0.17
Below poverty level	0.97
Poverty rate ²	5.76
With related children under 18 years	0.22
Below poverty level	1.40
Poverty rate	6.43
With no related children under 18 years	0.11
Below poverty level	0.22
Poverty rate	2.02

¹ Married-couple families and families with male householder, no wife present

² Ratios of poverty rates

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, Nos. 116, 106, and 81.

A recently released study by the Census Bureau indicates that the position of these families is not likely to be improved by child support payments.¹ Only one-fourth of all divorced, separated, remarried and never married women with dependent children received child support in 1975. For them the average amount received was \$2,433, with the median payment being less than \$1,500. Those with higher educational attainment and greater labor force participation were more likely to receive child support payments. Their median income was \$6,860 compared to \$4,750 for those who did not receive support.

Minority women and their families fare even worse than their white counterparts. Three-fifths of all black families headed by women were in poverty in 1977. Black and Hispanic women who head families are also less likely to have multiple earners. Only 11 percent of all black women family heads received child support payments in 1975. When blacks and Hispanics did receive child support, payments tended to be lower than those received by white women. There are a number of factors contributing to these differences. Because minority women are more likely to be separated than divorced, they are less likely to have formal settlements. Their former (or absent) spouses are also more likely to be low-income.

The seriousness of the problem of female-headed families is related to the length of time families remain in this state and the improvement or deterioration of their economic well-being while female-headed. Studies which have examined the remarriage rate for divorced women indicate that the probability of remarrying is related to race, age, educational level and number of children. The average number of years to remarriage is 3.2,

¹Divorce, Child Custody, and Child Support, op cit.

with women under age 30 being twice as likely to remarry.¹ White women have a higher probability of remarrying than black women. The difference in these remarriage rates grows over time. Hispanic women have remarriage rates that are very similar to whites.² In general, those women who are least likely to remarry are black women, older women, better educated women, and women with large families.

For women who remain unmarried, there is some evidence that their position improves slightly over time. A study done using National Longitudinal Survey data on Mature Women indicates that women who remain unmarried are able to improve their economic position over time.³ Looking at women whose marriages ended before 1967 who had not remarried before 1972, the author concludes that these women (average age 40) were somewhat less likely to be in poverty in the second period than in the first. However, the poverty rates were still high. For white women whose marriages had been disrupted before 1967, 33 percent were poor in 1967, but only 21 percent were poor in 1972. For black women, the comparable figures were 64 percent and 55 percent. The labor force participation rate for whites had increased but that for blacks had not.

This brief review of income statistics indicates that family composition is a major determinant of family income. Two-earner husband-wife families have the highest incomes and single-parent female-headed families have the lowest average income. Within each family category, white families have more income than minority families. In 1977, the family income for white female-headed families was only 49 percent of the family income for white husband-wife families. Black female-headed families had only 41 percent of the income of black husband-wife families. Black family income ranged from 63 to 83 percent of white family income in a given family status.⁴ It is clear

¹Divorce, Child Custody, and Child Support, op cit.

²Findings from a recent study by the National Center for Health Statistics reported in Women Today, Vol. X, Issue #5, March 7, 1980.

³Lois B. Shaw, "Economic Consequences of Marital Disruption," in Women's Changing Roles at Home and On the Job, National Commission on Manpower Policy, Special Report #26, September 1978.

⁴Green, op cit.

from this evidence that female-headed and minority households have fewer economic resources with which to purchase housing. Therefore, part of the housing problem for these families can be attributed to a lack of income.

Discrimination in Housing

While low income is a major contributor to the position of female-headed and minority households in the housing market, supplier obstacles are also important. Discrimination in housing markets has been a topic of great concern among housing economists, but the studies have primarily examined the effect of race on housing consumption.¹ Only a few have looked explicitly at the effect of family structure on access to housing markets. This section reviews a few studies in the area of racial discrimination and summarizes studies that present evidence on discrimination against women. These are used in combination with case studies on discrimination against children to draw some implications of the impact of discrimination on housing families.

Three key groups in the area of discrimination are real estate agents, mortgage lenders, and landlords. Real estate agents provide the majority of homebuyers with information on housing options. By controlling the flow of information they can steer potential buyers toward certain neighborhoods or certain types of dwelling units. They can also discriminate by providing different information on mortgage availability and requirements to different groups. Similarly, landlords control the rental of apartments through the provision of information on rents and apartment availability. By adjusting such factors as rental rates, security deposit requirements, and requirements on minimum numbers of bedrooms for different size families, landlords can influence the characteristics of tenants in a given building.

¹See Ann B. Schnare, "Equal Opportunity in Housing: Some Options for Evaluation Research," Urban Institute Working Paper #229-02-01, April 1976, or John Yinger, et al., "The Status of Research into Racial Discrimination and Segregation in American Housing Markets," Department of Housing and Urban Development, October 1978 for reviews of recent literature on racial discrimination.

Two recent studies document the continued existence of discrimination in housing markets. A study of discrimination in housing markets in six rural communities indicates that segmented or dual housing markets exist in at least half of the areas.¹ Although real estate agents claimed to have no preference in terms of race, their actual behavior, in combination with buyer's perceptions of agent discrimination, resulted in few blacks looking for housing in white neighborhoods, and vice versa. Identical housing was selling for more in black neighborhoods than in white neighborhoods in three of the areas studied. This price differential was maintained because blacks did not have access to (or felt they did not have access to) lower priced housing in white areas. In areas where Hispanics or Indians were the dominant minority group, ethnic or racial segregation was low. Although both Hispanics and Indians tended to live in very poor quality housing, their housing problems appeared to be income related. On the other hand, very little of the racial segregation in the South could be explained by income differences. Although the evidence indicated that female-headed households were more likely to live in substandard housing and in rental housing, race was the larger explanatory variable. While the study provides some insight into discrimination in these six rural areas, the authors caution the reader not to generalize the results.

A recent study by HUD reveals that discrimination continues to be a substantial factor in urban housing markets. By using teams of black and white auditors, similar in every respect but race, the behavior of landlords and real estate agents was observed. The results show that:²

¹Janet Marantz, Karl E. Case II, and Herman B. Leonard, Discrimination in Rural Housing, (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1976).

²Ronald E. Wienk, Clifford E. Reid, John C. Simonson, and Frederick J. Eggers, Measuring Racial Discrimination in American Housing Markets: The Housing Market Practices Survey (Washington: Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1979).

Blacks were systematically treated less favorably with regard to housing availability, were treated less courteously, and were asked for more information than were whites.¹

Although the audit study is a well-structured test of the treatment of blacks and whites in the initial stage of the housing search, it did not include the treatment of potential buyers when they reached the point of viewing units and signing leases or contracts.

Mortgage Discrimination

Since few families are in a position to pay cash to purchase a home, mortgage lenders can influence the rate of home ownership by their rules and regulations. Some of the practices which can be discriminatory in nature are the redlining of neighborhoods that have higher concentrations of certain ethnic groups; the systematic underassessment of certain types of property; the differential treatment of income by source.

Historically, differential treatment for certain groups was not only practiced but was supported by government policy. The most blatant example was the treatment of women's income in calculating loan/income ratios. The income of married women was discounted according to their age, occupation, and length of time in the labor force. The view of lenders was that women had only a casual attachment to the labor force and were likely to quit their jobs, particularly if they became pregnant. Such assumptions led to formulas for discounting based on the woman's age and reproductive capacity, with the following statement typical of the manuals used by lenders:²

Only the net income of the family as stated above should be taken into consideration, and the income of a wife under thirty-five years of age should not be considered.

¹Ibid, p. ES-2.

²Quote from W. Bryant's text on Mortgage Lending found in Dennis Kendig, "Discrimination Against Women in Home Mortgage Financing," Yale Review of Law and Social Action 3 (Winter 1973): 167.

This practice was supported by the underwriting guidelines of two major government insurance programs -- the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration -- until 1973.¹ The net effect was to discriminate against families in which a substantial portion of the income was earned by the wife. This worked a particular hardship on black families because of the large proportion of these families which have traditionally been two-earner families.

Although countless examples could be given, one which shows the "Catch-22" nature of the old regulations involves a woman with a long attachment to the labor force. When she and her husband applied for a VA mortgage they were told that the wife's income could only be counted if she would sign an affidavit stating that she would practice birth control and have no more children. When she refused, the loan application was turned down. The couple then applied for a Section 235 loan, but were turned down because the wife's income was counted, making them ineligible for a 235 loan.²

Single and divorced women were also discriminated against in mortgage applications. Various reasons were cited.³

1. Single women would marry and repudiate the debt.
2. Divorced women had no credit rating. (Since all credit had to be in the husband's name during the marriage.)
3. "Divorced women were emotionally unstable."
4. Alimony and child support could not be counted as income.
5. Insurance companies would not issue homeowners' policies in a woman's name.

These practices persisted in spite of evidence that families in which

¹ See Kendig and National Council of Negro Women, Women and Housing A Report on Sex Discrimination in Five American Cities (Washington: Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1975) for accounts and citations.

² Kendig, p. 168.

³ See Jane Roberts Chapman, "Women's Access to Credit," Challenge, Jan./Feb. 1975 and National Council of Negro Women, op cit.

women contributed to the family income were not more likely to default on loans. Some studies even showed lower delinquency rates and income profiles over time for two-earner and female-headed households that were very similar to male-headed, one-earner households.¹

In 1974 the Fair Housing statutes were amended to prohibit mortgage lenders from discriminating against women in applications for mortgage loans. This was followed by the comprehensive Equal Credit Opportunity Act in October 1974, which took effect in 1975. Both laws were intended to eliminate discrimination in the extension of credit.

Even though these Acts made it illegal for banking institutions to discriminate against borrowers on the basis of irrelevant personal characteristics such as age (as long as the individual has the right to contract), race, religion, national origin, sex, or marital status or property characteristics such as age or location of property (but not condition), evidence indicates that differential treatment continues in some situations. One study which involved an analysis of mortgage application information in New York and California shows that discrimination is still a part of mortgage lending.² After standardizing for income and other valid risk factors, the researchers discovered that female-only households (with no women of childbearing age) in California were more likely to have their applications denied or modified downward. In seven of the eight areas investigated properties being purchased by these households were underappraised, resulting in an average increase of 6.4 percent in the downpayment required. In New York, unmarried and separated households were more likely to have their applications denied. While two-earner couples were favorably treated in California, New York couples with a working wife of childbearing age were

¹ Kendig, op cit and KETRON, INC., Women in the Mortgage Market, (Washington: Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1976).

² Robert Schafer and Helen F. Ladd, Equal Credit Opportunity: Accessibility to Mortgage Funding by Women and by Minorities, (Washington: Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1980).

more likely to have their applications modified (higher downpayments required, higher interest rates and loan fees charged).

The study also present evidence of discrimination against minority groups. In a majority of communities in both New York and California, blacks received unequal treatment by being denied loans at rates one-and-a-half to seven times the rates for comparable whites and by being forced to pay higher interest rates and loan fees. In California, savings and loan institutions consistently discriminated against Hispanics through under-appraisal of property, more frequent denials, and higher interest rates and loan fees.

Lending institutions also appeared to discriminate on the basis of property location. In California, properties in neighborhoods with high concentrations of blacks or Hispanics were more likely to be turned down or underappraised.

Another recently completed study presented a somewhat different set of findings. This study examined mortgage applications submitted to savings and loan institutions in three SMSAs during a three month period in 1978.¹ Analysis of the data showed no evidence of systematic differences in property appraisals or mortgage terms according to the personal characteristics of the applicants. Nor did there appear to be any indication of redlining. However, blacks and Hispanics were more likely to have their applications denied than comparable whites. The denial ranged from one-third higher to twice as high as those for white applicants. There was no evidence of discrimination in denial of mortgage credit on the basis of sex or marital status.

Other patterns varied from city to city. In Miami, there appeared to be a slight preference for applications with co-applicants. In Toledo, younger applicants were more likely to have their applications denied than other applicants. In one city, property in low-income or minority Census tracts was

¹ A. Thomas King, "Discrimination in Mortgage Lending: A Study of Three Cities," Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Office of Policy and Economic Research, Research Working Paper #91, February 1980.

more likely to be denied a mortgage. While the tract may be an indicator of property condition, which is a valid discriminator, there was no evidence to support or refute that connection. In two cities the maturity terms were shorter for some minority groups, but actual terms were correlated with the terms requested by the applicants. The information upon which the applicants based their requests is not known.

While these studies give partial evidence of continuing discrimination in mortgage markets, the amount of discrimination may be even larger. The studies do not include the cases where women or minorities are discouraged from submitting an application by the lender or the real estate agent. This can occur when the lender or the agent assumes that the loan will not be approved because of the applicant's ascriptive characteristics.

Discrimination in the Rental Market

Since female-headed and minority households are more likely to be excluded from homeownership because of low income and/or mortgage discrimination, the condition of the rental market is very important for their housing situation. Unfortunately in some areas the rental market is changing in ways that are not favorable to families. In some cities, the rental market is disappearing, as landlords seek to improve their position through condominium conversion. In other cases, landlords are establishing "adults only" policies. Both of these changes are made possible by the growth of one and two-person households. These households have exhibited a preference for close-in, high density living, often bidding up the price of rental apartments and condominium units.

Two studies have been done in the past two years which document the growing problem of adult only apartment buildings. The first study, done in Dallas in 1978, shows the impact of "no children" policies on the housing choice of renter families.¹ Through a phone survey, the researchers canvassed 432 apartment

¹Jane G. Greene, An Evaluation of the Exclusion of Children from Apartments in Dallas, Texas, J. G. and Associates, December 1978.

complexes and found that 52 percent refused to accept children, 12 percent accepted them with certain reservations (not above or below a certain age, no more than one child per household, etc.) and only 36 percent would accept children without reservations. When the surveyed units were plotted on a map, it became apparent that renter families with children were restricted to the southern part of the Dallas metropolitan area. Only 11 percent of the apartment complexes in the south refused to rent to families with children, compared to 68 percent in the north. Families with two or more children had even greater problems. When landlords would rent to them, they were only allowed to rent large apartments, which may have been beyond the affordability limit for many families.

The second study was conducted in California by the Fair Housing for Children Coalition of Santa Monica.¹ Using existing information and new survey data in five cities -- Los Angeles, San Francisco, Fresno, San Diego, and San Jose -- the Coalition was able to make comparisons of rental costs and living conditions for renters with and without children. They discovered that, with the exception of San Francisco which has a law prohibiting the exclusion of families with children, a majority of the apartment complexes in the five cities had "no children" policies. In Los Angeles, for example, 71 percent of the complexes excluded children and another 15 percent allowed children within certain age ranges only. That meant that only 14 percent of the rental units in the city were open to families with children of all ages. The exclusion rate is higher for new complexes, with 74 percent of those in Los Angeles prohibiting families with children.

In all cities except for San Francisco, the median rents for equivalent units were higher in units that allowed children, thus forcing families with children to pay a rent premium. Families with children were more likely to

¹Doris Ashford and Perla Eston, The Extent and Effects of Discrimination Against Children in Rental Housing: A Study of Five California Cities, (Santa Monica: Fair Housing for Children Coalition, 1979).

be inadequately housed, even when family income was held constant.¹ Minority and female-headed households were even more likely to be negatively affected than white male-headed families with children.

Landlords concerns for overcrowding and repair bills do not seem to be reflected in the evidence. Even in buildings with three or more bedrooms, less than half of them allow children. In these complexes, overcrowding cannot be a rationale for excluding families of all sizes. The researchers were unable to gather any evidence on the extent to which landlords who rent to families with children have higher maintenance or other operational costs.

These two studies are useful in assessing the state of the rental market in growing areas with tight housing markets. It is difficult, however, to extrapolate from this evidence to an assessment of the problem in the nation as a whole.

Locational Issues

As a result of some of the factors discussed above, minorities and women are more likely to be renters, are more likely to reside in central cities and are more likely to live in public housing. In addition to the impact that these restrictions may have on housing quality, there is the additional question of the impact they may have on two other aspects of the housing bundle -- accessibility and neighborhood services.

Analysis of Annual Housing Survey data shows that recently widowed, separated, or divorced suburban dwellers tend to move into the city when they make a housing adjustment. In a sample of eight large metropolitan areas, fifty-nine percent of all marriage related moves from the suburbs into the city involved marital dissolution.² Since marital dissolution usually results in a

¹Statewide 45 percent of renters with children were inadequately housed compared to 32 percent of renters without children. Ninety-five percent of low-income families with children were inadequately housed, compared to 87 percent of low-income renters without children.

²John L. Goodman Jr., "Reasons for Moves Out of and Into Large Cities," APA Journal, October 1979.

sharp drop in the income status of the wife, she is forced to move to lower cost housing.¹ The need for low cost housing will draw these divorced women and their families into the city, but it is not clear whether the central city will satisfy their general neighborhood and accessibility needs.

A small survey of recently divorced women in four cities indicates that the factors these women look for in housing are:²

1. Ability to maintain social and school settings for children
2. Ability to maintain social status
3. Help with child care and/or proximity to relatives
4. New social contacts
5. A reasonable commute to work

The study indicated that women were unable to obtain all of these factors within their housing budget and often moved frequently after divorce in order to maximize their satisfaction. The appropriate question is: does concentration in the central city meet most of these housing needs?

Most of the literature on housing segregation and its impact on central city residents has focused on the effect it has on black households. Here the findings are somewhat ambiguous. The early studies of John Kain indicated that blacks suffer substantial job losses because their physical isolation prevents them from gaining access to growing suburban job markets. Critics of the Kain hypothesis point out that even when job growth in the central city has exceeded the needs of central city residents, they did not obtain jobs. This fact would seem to indicate that proximity to jobs does not necessarily increase the

¹A survey of divorced women revealed that while upper middle class women are usually able to keep the house as a result of the settlement, middle class wives usually have to give up the house and working class women were living in apartments before the divorce or separation. (See Anderson-Khleif, op cit.)

²Anderson-Khleif, p. 1.

likelihood of employment.¹ Two segregation studies which gave particular attention to women showed that black women in suburban areas fared worse in the job market than either central city blacks who lived in non-poverty areas or suburban white women.²

Most studies on women and job location are part of the literature on women's transportation patterns.³ These studies indicate that women do not travel as far to their jobs as men. However, the reasons for this shorter commute are not known. One theory assumes that the residential location is fixed and suggests that women work closer to home because the wage gradient for female labor is not sufficiently steep to induce women to commute long distance; that is, the increased wages are not high enough to offset the increased commuting cost. Economic theory would suggest that if this is the case, employers who hire women in large numbers will adjust by moving plants and offices closer to the labor supply. If the result is that firms which traditionally hire women are now located in the suburbs, the lack of housing opportunities for female-headed families in the suburbs will hamper the employment prospects of the household head. However, alternative explanations can produce the same outcome. One such explanation would be that women do not travel as far because they must combine work trips with household errands such as taking children to day care or school. If these services are readily available in central city neighborhoods, the working mother may be able to adjust her travel patterns.

To what extent does residential concentration deny families access to

¹For the full range of the debate see George M. von Furstenberg, et al. (ed) Patterns of Racial Discrimination. Volume I: Housing (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1974).

²Duran Bell, "Residential Location, Economic Performance, and Public Employment" and Peter Hutchinson, "Effects of Accessibility and Segregation on Employment of the Urban Poor" in von Furstenberg.

³For a review of the literature see Janice F. Madden and Michelle J. White, "Spatial Implications of Increases in the Female Labor Force: A Theoretical and Empirical Synthesis," Land Economics (October 1980).

quality services? Here again opinions vary. One important issue for families is the schools. For female-headed families who resided in suburban jurisdictions prior to divorce or separation, an argument can be made that continuity in education may be sufficiently important to make low cost suburban housing a desirable option. However, the literature on school quality is not definitive in terms of the ability of suburban schools to meet the needs of all students.¹ While many suburban governments do spend more per capita on some public services, that is not consistently the case. Moreover, the mix of services both in education and in other services may not be the one most needed or desired by female-headed and minority families.²

Several recent studies have documented a preference for central city living on the part of unmarried women.³ The entertainment, day care facilities, and other amenities of the city are preferred to suburban activities. Central city density decreases the travel time needed to complete household errands. It also allows them to make new social contacts more easily than they would be able to in the suburbs.

If the evidence does support the argument that single-parent and minority households have better access in the central city, then an issue of concern for the future will be the extent to which these households will be able to remain in these locations. The growth in one and two person households, especially two-earner couples, with their higher income and preference for centrally located housing could price these families out of the central city market. Although the "back to the city" movement and the growth of the condominium market have received a great deal of publicity, their overall impact on the housing market has not been well documented.

¹See for example James S. Coleman and Sara D. Kelly, "Education," in The Urban Predicament ed. by William Gorham and Nathan Glazer (Washington: The Urban Institute, 1976).

²Bernard J. Friedan, "Blacks in Suburbia: The Myth of Better Opportunities," in Minority Perspectives ed. by Lowdon Wingo (Baltimore: Resources for the Future, 1972).

³Wekerle, op cit.

A RESEARCH AND POLICY AGENDA

A review of the literature on the housing problems faced by families has resulted in the identification of two factors that have a significant impact on housing quality. On the demand side the income constraint is probably the most important obstacle to securing appropriate housing. Analysis of recent statistics on family income reveals that household composition is an important determinant of income. Female-headed households have much lower average incomes than either dual-headed or male-headed households. Black women have the lowest average household income and their prominence among black families explains part (but not all) of the difference in income between black and white families.

Government policy directed toward neutralizing the effect of income on housing quality can take a number of forms. Income subsidies, housing allowances, and non-cash transfer programs which alleviate income problems can be utilized. So can supply expansion programs such as public housing or Section 8 new construction or substantial rehabilitation. However, a program designed to focus on target families should take account of the preferences of households in terms of location and structure and the duration of their need for housing assistance.

Income Constraints

The literature on the length of time between marriages indicates that a substantial proportion of women head families for only a brief period of time. For these households, more information is needed on the impact of transitions into and out of single-headedness on the family housing situation. Does marital dissolution result in a sharp decline in housing quality (from adequate to inadequate) and, if so, what proportion of this subgroup does it effect? Does remarriage reverse the process? If it turns out that the housing problem is only temporary, a policy can be devised which is tailored to a temporary need.

Not all women with children marry or re-marry. A parallel study which looks at the nature and duration of their housing problems is needed. Does their economic position improve over time? What effect does this have on their housing situation? If there is a group of families that is permanently consigned to inadequate housing, rather than a stock whose members keep changing, then a different policy might be devised for this group.

Studies of marital dissolution and its effect on housing quality can be structured along the lines of the Shaw study on the economic condition of women whose marriages dissolved. To the extent possible, they should make use of longitudinal data sets such as the Michigan Panel of Income Dynamics and the National Longitudinal Survey at Ohio State University.

Discrimination Studies

On the supply side, one of the chief obstacles for families is discrimination. Recent studies have provided some information on discrimination by real estate agents and by mortgage lenders. These analyses give some insight into the first and last stages of the homebuying process. The missing piece is the period of selection and contract negotiation. No records are kept on applications that are not completed. One study that would be useful would be one which focused on the mortgage application process. Are certain groups more likely to be discouraged from applying for a mortgage? Are they treated differentially in terms of information on mortgage/income ratios? This type of study would provide information which would allow the government to devise a remedy such as establishing new mechanisms for distributing information on mortgage selection criteria and buyer rights.

In the rental market information is needed on landlord motivation. To what extent do landlords exclude families with children because they result in added costs? To what extent are their rationales justified by the evidence,

adjusting for differences in building type and age? Do landlords take these added costs in the form of higher maintenance costs or lower building quality? To what extent are "no children" policies based on landlords perceptions that childless tenants prefer "childless" buildings and that this group represents a more profitable rental market? Do childless tenants have a strong preference? More information is also needed on the extent to which families are differentially treated under child exclusion policies. Are one-parent families more likely to be excluded than two-parent families?

Family Preferences

A number of policy issues revolve around the assumption that households prefer certain locations or housing conditions, but little is known about the validity of these assumptions. What are the tenure preferences of different types of families? Are female-headed households renters because of low income or because of discrimination? Does it reflect their preference for low maintenance units? Is it the result of the fact that these women expect to remarry soon and do not want to incur the transactions costs of buying and selling in a short period of time.

What is the impact of central city concentration on accessibility? Most important, what effect does it have on employment? While a great deal of work has been done along racial lines, little has been done along sexual lines. Where are the jobs that women traditionally hold located? What are women's transportation patterns, standardizing for marital status? What are the preferences of families in terms of their service and transportation needs? Do they act on these preferences? If not, why not?

Dissaggregating the Effects

Because income, race, and family status are correlated, it is difficult to determine the appropriate policy mix. Analysis which would attempt to separate income effects on housing quality from family status and ethnic effects would be useful.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson-Khleif, Susan. "Strategies, Problems, and Policy Issues for Single Parent Housing." Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard, 10 August 1979.
- Ashford, Doris and Eston, Perla. The Extent and Effects of Discrimination Against Children in Rental Housing: A Study of Five California Cities. Santa Monica: Fair Housing for Children Coalition, 1979.
- Calvan, Rita A. "Children and Families -- the Latest Victims of Exclusionary Land Use Practices, Part II." Challenge, December 1979, pp. 14-19.
- Chapman, Jane Roberts. "Women's Access to Credit." Challenge, January/February 1975, pp. 40-45.
- Coleman, James S. and Kelly, Sara D. "Education." The Urban Predicament. Edited by William Gorham and Nathan A. Glazer. Washington: The Urban Institute, 1976.
- Duker, Jacob M. "Housewife and Working-Wife Families: A Housing Comparison." Land Economics, 46 (February 1970): 138-45.
- Friedan, Bernard J. "Blacks in Suburbia: The Myth of Better Opportunities." In Minority Perspectives, pp. 31-49. Edited by Lowdon Wingo. Baltimore: Resources for the Future, 1972.
- Friedan, Bernard J., et al. The Nation's Housing: 1975 to 1985. Cambridge: Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard, 1977.
- Goodman, John L. Jr. "Reasons for Moves Out of and Into Large Cities." APA Journal, 45 (October 1979): 407-16.
- Green, Gordon and Welniak, Edward. "Measuring the Effects of Changing Family Composition on Black-White Differences in Income." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Denver, Colorado, 10-12 April, 1980.
- Greene, Jane G. "An Evaluation of the Exclusion of Children from Apartments in Dallas, Texas." J. G. and Associates, December 1978.
- Harrison, Bennett. Urban Economic Development. Washington: The Urban Institute, 1974.
- Heilbrun, James. Urban Economics and Public Policy. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974.
- Henderson, Arn and Bohland, James. Housing and Community Alternatives for American Indians. National Science Foundation Report No. GI-29841, 1974.

- Hill, Robert B. "Black Families in the 70s." The State of Black America: 1980. New York: National Urban League, 1980.
- Johnson, Beverly. "Women Who Head Families: Their Numbers Rise, Income Lags." Monthly Labor Review, 101(February 1978): 32-7.
- Kendig, Dennis. "Discrimination Against Women in Home Mortgage Financing." Yale Review of Law and Social Action, 3(Winter 1973): 166-80.
- King, A. Thomas. "Discrimination in Mortgage Lending: A Study of Three Cities." Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Office of Policy and Economic Research, Research Working Paper #91, February 1980.
- Madden, Janice F. and White, Michelle J. "Spatial Implications of Increases in the Female Labor Force: A Theoretical and Empirical Synthesis. Land Economics, 56 (November 1980).
- Marantz, Janet, Case, Karl E. II, and Leonard, Herman B. Discrimination in Rural Housing. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1976.
- Marshall, Sue and Zais, James P. "How Selected HUD Programs Serve Low and Moderate Income Families With Children." Urban Institute Working Paper #1418-1, April 1980.
- Morris, Earl W. and Winter, Mary. Housing, Family and Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- Myers, Samuel L. Jr. and Phillips, Kenneth E. "Housing Segregation and Black Employment: Another Look at the Ghetto Dispersal Strategy." American Economic Review, 69 (May 1979): 298-302.
- Norton, Arthur J. and Glick, Paul C. "What's Happening to Households." American Demographics, March 1979, pp. 19-23.
- Phares, Donald. A Decent Home and Environment: Housing Urban America. Cambridge: Ballinger, 1977.
- "Remarriage of Women." Women Today, 10(March 7, 1980): 38.
- Roistacher, Elizabeth A. and Young, Janet Spratlin. "Working Women and City Structure: Implications of the Subtle Revolution." SIGNS, (forthcoming).
- Ross, Heather L. and Sawhill, Isabel V. Time of Transition. Washington: The Urban Institute, 1975.
- Schafer, Robert and Ladd, Helen F. "Equal Credit Opportunity: Accessibility to Mortgage Funding by Women and by Minorities." Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard, 1980.
- Schnare, Ann B. "Equal Opportunity in Housing: Some Options for Evaluation Research." Urban Institute Working Paper #229-02-01, April 1976.
- Shaw, Lois B. "Economic Consequences of Marital Disruption." In Women's Changing Roles at Home and on the Job. National Commission on Manpower Policy Special Report #26, September 1978.

Smith, Ralph E. (ed). The Subtle Revolution. Washington: The Urban Institute, 1979.

Speare, Alden Jr., Goldstein, Sidney, and Frey, William A. Residential Mobility, Migration, and Metropolitan Change. Cambridge: Ballinger, 1974.

Stapleton, Clare M. "Impact of Changing Demographics on Intra-Urban Residential Mobility Theory." Environment and Planning (forthcoming).

Struyk, Raymond J. "Housing for the Elderly: Research Needs for Informed Public Policies." Urban Institute Working Paper #229-04, June 1976.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. "New Data Relate Workers Earnings to Families in Which They Live." Press Release, 7 March 1980.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Annual Housing Survey: Financial Characteristics of the Housing Inventory. Current Housing Reports, Series H-150-76. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.

_____. Annual Housing Survey: General Housing Characteristics for the United States and Regions. Current Housing Reports, Series H-150-76. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.

_____. Annual Housing Survey: General Housing Characteristics for the United States and Regions. Current Housing Reports, Series H-150-77. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979.

_____. Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1976. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 115. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.

_____. Divorce, Child Custody, and Child Support. Current Population Reports, Special Studies Series P-23, No. 84. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979.

_____. Money Income in 1977 of Households in the United States. Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 117. Washington: Government Printing Office; 1978.

U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. How Well Are We Housed? Large Families. forthcoming.

_____. How Well Are We Housed? Female-Headed Households. HUD-PDR-344(2). Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979.

_____. How Well Are We Housed? Blacks. HUD-PDR-366. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979.

_____. How Well Are We Housed? Hispanics. HUD-PDR-333(2). Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979.

_____. Measuring Racial Discrimination in American Housing Markets: The Housing Market Practices Survey. Prepared by Ronald E. Wienk, et al. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979.

- _____. Women and Housing: A Report on Sex Discrimination in Five American Cities. Prepared by the National Council of Negro Women. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1975.
- _____. Women in the Mortgage Market. Prepared by KETRON, INC. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1976.
- U. S. Department of Transportation. Women's Travel Issues: Research Needs and Priorities. Conference Report. September 1978.
- von Furstenberg, George M., et al. (ed). Patterns of Racial Discrimination Volume I: Housing. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1974.
- Wekerle, Gerda R. A Woman's Place is in the City. Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 1979.
- Weicher, John C. et al. "Projections of Housing Needs." The Urban Institute, 1979 (memorandum).
- Yinger, John, et al. "The Status of Research into Racial Discrimination and Segregation in American Housing Markets: A Research Agenda for the Department of Housing and Urban Development." October 1978.

APPENDIX A

FLAWS USED TO MEASURE HOUSING ADEQUACY*

Plumbing

unit lacks or shares complete plumbing (hot and cold water, flush toilet, and bathtub or shower inside the structure)

Kitchen

unit lacks or shares a complete kitchen (installed sink with piped water, a range or cookstove, and mechanical refrigerator -- not an icebox)

Sewage

absence of a public sewer, septic tank, cesspool, or chemical toilet

Heating **

there are no means of heating, or
unit is heated by unvented room heaters burning gas, oil, kerosene, or
unit is heated by fireplace, stove, or portable room heater

Maintenance

it suffers from any two of these defects:
leaking roof
open cracks or holes in interior walls or ceiling
holes in the interior floor
broken plaster or peeling paint (over 1 square foot) on interior walls or ceilings

Public Hall

it suffers from any two of these defects:
public halls lack light fixtures
loose, broken, or missing steps on common stairways

Toilet Access

access to sole flush toilet is through one of two or more bedrooms used for sleeping (applies only to households with children under 18)

Electrical

unit has exposed wiring and
fuses blew or circuit breakers tripped 3 or more times in last 90 days and
unit lacks working wall outlet in 1 or more rooms

* The defects listed here are selected from those enumerated in the Annual Housing Survey.

** Does not apply in the South Census Region.

APPENDIX B

ADEQUACY OF HOUSING BY FAMILY STATUS: 1977

Table B-1	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: All Households with Children, 1977
Table B-2	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: White Households with Children, 1977
Table B-3	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: Black Households with Children, 1977
Table B-4	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: Hispanic Households with Children, 1977
Table B-5	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: Other Households with Children, 1977
Table B-6	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: Children in All Households, 1977
Table B-7	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: Children in White Households, 1977
Table B-8	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: Children in Black Households, 1977
Table B-9	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: Children in Hispanic Households, 1977
Table B-10	Adequacy of Housing by Family Status: Children in Other Households, 1977

Table B-1

Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
All Households with Children, 1977

Household Head	Adequately Housed			Inadequately Housed		
	Owner	Renter	Total	Owner	Renter	Total
Male Married	71.76%	18.16%	89.92%	5.18%	4.90%	10.08%
Male Widowed	71.79	10.16	81.95	9.08	8.97	18.05
Male Divorced	52.32	31.38	83.70	6.72	9.58	16.30
Male Separated	36.93	44.57	81.50	3.30	15.20	18.50
Male Never Married	36.52	39.24	75.76	4.17	20.07	24.24
Female Married	49.45	36.00	85.45	7.64	6.91	14.55
Female Widowed	59.34	22.37	81.71	8.68	9.60	18.28
Female Divorced	38.01	49.12	87.13	4.59	8.28	12.87
Female Separated	20.27	55.37	75.64	2.55	21.81	24.36
Female Never Married	7.11	68.29	75.40	1.74	22.87	24.61
All Families	65.28	23.21	88.49	5.08	6.43	11.51

Source: Annual Housing Survey

Table B-2

Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
White Households with Children, 1977

Household Head	Adequately Housed			Inadequately Housed		
	Owner	Renter	Total	Owner	Renter	Total
Male Married	75.86%	15.79%	91.65%	4.78%	3.57%	8.35%
Male Widowed	79.55	9.60	89.15	6.92	3.93	10.85
Male Divorced	53.41	30.33	83.74	6.46	9.80	16.26
Male Separated	41.84	47.56	89.40	5.32	5.28	10.60
Male Never Married	55.70	27.10	82.86	0.00	17.20	17.20
Female Married	58.17	31.64	89.81	6.12	4.06	10.18
Female Widowed	68.23	18.23	86.46	7.46	6.08	13.54
Female Divorced	41.53	47.16	88.69	4.55	6.75	11.30
Female Separated	32.01	51.64	83.65	3.24	13.10	16.34
Female Never Married	11.86	75.56	87.42	2.19	10.39	12.58
All Families	71.92	19.15	91.07	4.80	4.13	8.93

Source: Annual Housing Survey

Table B-3

Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
Black Households with Children, 1977

Household Head	Adequately Housed			Inadequately Housed		
	Owner	Renter	Total	Owner	Renter	Total
Male Married	54.45%	27.47%	81.92%	6.89%	11.19%	18.08%
Male Widowed	49.26	9.49	58.75	23.01	18.24	41.25
Male Divorced	29.61	24.01	53.62	22.52	23.86	46.38
Male Separated	35.38	28.68	64.06	0.00	35.95	35.95
Male Never Married	32.41	45.10	77.51	0.00	22.50	22.50
Female Married	28.69	52.88	81.57	5.13	13.30	18.43
Female Widowed	40.27	30.12	70.39	12.21	17.40	29.61
Female Divorced	27.48	56.36	83.84	4.35	11.81	16.16
Female Separated	12.42	59.11	71.53	1.72	26.75	28.47
Female Never Married	6.00	67.60	73.60	2.02	24.39	26.41
All Families	38.54	40.30	78.84	5.55	15.61	21.16

Source: Annual Housing Survey

Table B-4

Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
Hispanic Households with Children, 1977

Household Head	Adequately Housed			Inadequately Housed		
	Owner	Renter	Total	Owner	Renter	Total
Male Married	45.97%	34.33%	80.30%	7.06%	12.64%	19.70%
Male Widowed	66.85	0.00	66.85	0.00	33.15	33.15
Male Divorced	54.38	45.62	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Male Separated	14.79	70.56	85.35	0.00	14.64	14.64
Male Never Married	0.00	55.95	55.95	22.12	21.93	44.05
Female Married	26.94	42.30	69.24	13.33	17.43	30.76
Female Widowed	39.08	37.16	76.24	2.43	21.34	45.70
Female Divorced	29.44	53.67	83.11	6.36	10.53	16.89
Female Separated	7.21	56.26	63.47	2.11	34.42	36.53
Female Never Married	4.94	63.41	68.35	0.00	31.65	31.65
All Families	39.71	38.79	78.50	6.29	15.21	21.50

Source: Annual Housing Survey

Table B-5

Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
Other Households with Children, 1977

Household Head	Adequately Housed			Inadequately Housed		
	Owner	Renter	Total	Owner	Renter	Total
Male Married	50.45%	28.65%	79.10%	9.90%	11.00%	20.90%
Male Widowed	20.54	39.31	59.85	0.00	40.16	40.16
Male Divorced	60.75	39.25	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Male Separated	32.79	0.00	32.79	0.00	67.21	67.21
Male Never Married	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Female Married	46.74	16.15	62.89	37.11	0.00	37.11
Female Widowed	25.82	37.96	63.78	20.39	15.83	36.22
Female Divorced	49.68	5.59	55.27	0.00	44.73	44.73
Female Separated	3.88	54.12	58.00	8.47	33.53	42.00
Female Never Married	5.92	44.23	50.15	0.00	49.85	49.85
All Families	46.39	29.62	76.01	9.96	14.03	23.99

Source: Annual Housing Survey

Table B-6
Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
Children in All Households, 1977

Household Head	Adequately Housed			Inadequately Housed		
	Owner	Renter	Total	Owner	Renter	Total
Male Married	71.83%	16.85%	88.68%	5.88%	5.44%	11.32%
Male Widowed	72.91	9.38	82.29	5.77	11.95	17.72
Male Divorced	49.63	31.04	80.67	8.08	11.25	19.33
Male Separated	37.73	45.45	83.18	3.63	13.19	16.82
Male Never Married	37.82	42.46	80.28	3.39	16.33	19.72
Female Married	45.85	35.20	81.05	8.55	10.40	18.95
Female Widowed	56.61	21.87	78.48	9.69	11.83	21.52
Female Divorced	38.51	47.08	85.59	4.85	9.56	14.41
Female Separated	18.78	53.14	71.92	2.55	25.53	28.08
Female Never Married	6.06	61.92	67.98	2.13	29.89	32.02
All Families	65.19	21.74	86.93	5.69	7.38	13.07

Source: Annual Housing Survey

Table B-7
Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
Children in White Households, 1977

<u>Household Head</u>	<u>Adequately Housed</u>		<u>Inadequately Housed</u>	
	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Renter</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male Married	76.49%	14.35%	5.35%	9.16%
Male Widowed	82.78	9.39	4.23	7.83
Male Divorced	51.38	30.65	7.56	17.96
Male Separated	43.32	47.63	5.79	9.05
Male Never Married	53.24	31.51	0.00	15.25
Female Married	56.70	33.20	4.65	10.10
Female Widowed	67.60	18.79	7.98	13.61
Female Divorced	42.77	44.81	5.20	12.42
Female Separated	34.35	47.92	3.33	17.73
Female Never Married	11.47	76.29	1.75	12.23
All Families	72.91	17.41	5.33	9.68

Source: Annual Housing Survey

Table B-8
Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
Children in Black Households, 1977

<u>Household Head</u>	<u>Adequately Housed</u>		<u>Inadequately Housed</u>	
	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Renter</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Renter</u>
				<u>Total</u>
Male Married	54.68%	24.95%	79.63%	7.43%
Male Widowed	44.07	8.54	52.61	12.48
Male Divorced	17.10	16.91	34.01	26.96
Male Separated	38.53	27.25	65.78	0.00
Male Never Married	44.39	37.10	81.49	0.00
Female Married	28.25	44.26	72.51	7.47
Female Widowed	37.28	26.49	63.77	13.87
Female Divorced	27.83	53.85	81.68	4.06
Female Separated	10.97	56.35	67.32	1.85
Female Never Married	5.43	59.92	65.35	2.65
All Families	38.14	37.12	75.26	5.96

Source: Annual Housing Survey

Table B-9
Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
Children in Hispanic Households, 1977

Household Head	Adequately Housed			Inadequately Housed		
	Owner	Renter	Total	Owner	Renter	Total
Male Married	46.45%	31.60%	78.05%	9.04%	12.91%	21.95%
Male Widowed	80.13	0.00	80.13	0.00	18.87	19.87
Male Divorced	53.94	46.06	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Male Separated	8.62	74.32	82.94	0.00	17.06	17.06
Male Never Married	0.00	70.43	70.43	14.85	14.72	29.57
Female Married	19.72	37.26	56.98	21.72	21.30	43.02
Female Widowed	43.06	31.09	74.15	1.87	23.98	25.85
Female Divorced	31.23	50.90	82.13	4.67	13.20	17.87
Female Separated	4.50	55.17	59.67	2.51	37.82	40.33
Female Never Married	2.73	60.76	63.49	0.00	36.50	36.50
All Families	40.02	35.93	75.95	7.95	16.10	24.05

Source: Annual Housing Survey

Table B-10
Adequacy of Housing by Family Status
Children in Other Households, 1977

Household Head	Adequately Housed			Inadequately Housed		
	Owner	Renter	Total	Owner	Renter	Total
Male Married	54.01%	27.08%	81.09%	8.69%	10.22%	18.91
Male Widowed	20.54	39.32	59.86	0.00	40.16	40.16
Male Divorced	64.20	35.80	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Male Separated	32.79	0.00	32.79	0.00	67.21	67.21
Male Never Married	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Female Married	58.45	12.93	71.38	28.62	0.00	28.62
Female Widowed	28.38	25.28	53.66	24.48	21.86	46.34
Female Divorced	47.49	10.49	57.98	0.00	42.02	42.02
Female Separated	1.86	70.10	71.96	4.06	23.98	28.04
Female Never Married	14.18	34.05	48.23	0.00	51.77	51.77
All Families	50.17	28.14	78.31	8.91	12.78	21.69

Source: Annual Housing Survey

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

AUG 20 1980

LIBRARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410

728.1 S45f c.2

Families&housing markets

HUD LIBRARY



T 22300

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

451 Seventh Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20410

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, \$300

HUD Library



00003669

Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development
HUD-401

FIRST CLASS MAIL



December 1980
HUD-PDR-654