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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Housing is associated with culture; it responds to the predominant cultural context and to societal institutions and policies. Second, housing is a "package of goods and services" which "is a major determinant of the quality of life experienced" (Wedin and Nygen 1979). These features become particularly significant for international students who move from their country of origin for educational purposes.

For these students, who find themselves transplanted from one culture to another, the environment on a foreign campus, particularly housing, can be a source of alienation and stress. A number of students arrive with their primary focus on education, giving little or no thought to the housing experience they are about to encounter. Yet, in their contact with the new environment, their previous housing experiences, situations, and patterns begin to surface. Once this happens, the experience may begin to influence the expectations of and satisfaction with the new housing situation. The focus of this study is, therefore, on student "cultural transplants" and their response to university student housing.

For the purposes of the study, "cultural transplant" refers to any member of a household who is residing in a housing situation that may be culturally different from that in his/her country of origin. Members of a household that have moved from their home country to another country can be defined as an international transplants. (For brevity,
henceforth the term "household" will refer to the group of people living together. It could, therefore, refer to single individuals as well.)

Any time a household moves away from an environment that is socially and/or culturally familiar the household is defined as a cultural transplant. The current study is largely concerned with international transplant populations.

Universities attract numerous international transplants; this is especially true of graduate students, who often move with their families. In such cases, expectations of, and satisfaction with, housing are based on previous housing experiences, cultural background, and the household's perceptions of family need.

Many international students have moved from settlements of origin, stopped in large cities, and then moved on to new countries. Such cultural transplants respond to new settings either by 1) amalgamating with the new culture or 2) maximizing those aspects of the new culture that tend to reinforce their own cultural orientation. The ability to adapt to new settings and to be flexible within the setting, and the ability to manipulate housing interiors to approximate cultural preferences, is vital to housing satisfaction among cultural transplants.

Satisfactory delivery of a housing package depends on the mission and purpose of the educational institution. Its housing policy has the opportunity to take cultural and societal influences into account. This researcher believes that both the university and international student users should become aware of the factors necessary for housing
satisfaction. By doing so, users may have the opportunity to adjust their household patterns to their new housing unit. Similarly the provider, or institution, has the opportunity to diversify the manner in which housing services are delivered. Through this process, two-way communication can be established and awareness and sensitivity to the needs of the user and provider, can be acquired. The outcome for the user is a more positive and satisfactory housing experience as well as alleviation of possible stress in the housing environment. For the provider, a feed-back process can allow improvement of housing services delivered in the future. The provider can use this exchange of communication as a monitoring device for specified periods of time. Given the percentage of international students living in American university housing, evaluation of the housing situation is essential.

University married student housing communities tend to be homogeneous in their design. Often, no attempts are made to reflect or to accommodate cultural differences in living styles. How, then, do international students cope? Are they satisfied? Is satisfaction linked to either culture or experience? If so, to what specific elements of culture or experience? Do the transplants adapt to the setting, or do they adapt the setting to their specific cultural orientation and needs? The purpose of the study is to assess university housing with respect to whether cultural differences are being accommodated and to suggest ways to respond more fully to these needs. Fundamental to the study is an understanding of the cultural background of international students who find themselves as cultural transplants in university housing.
The study has a dual focus. The first is on students as cultural transplants, to determine whether their response to their new setting is to 1) adapt to it, or 2) maximize aspects of it that are "most like home." The second focus includes recommendations for a more culturally responsive and flexible housing environment.

The site of the study is the Iowa State University Student Apartment Community, or USAC. Four living areas make up the USAC community: Pammel Court, Hawthorn Court, University Village, and Schilletter Village. Each of the areas has its own unique style. The Pammel Court units are single story and arrayed along a street grid. Hawthorn Court units are also single story units, but they are arrayed around an open court, which is used as a play area. University Village, however, has two story townhouse units with a small private fenced in garden at each entrance. The newest units in Schilletter Village are in two-story four-plexes, which are clustered around green space. Each area has its own area manager as well as its own individual design.

USAC provides an excellent backdrop for housing research because 1) it has four distinct types of living areas, 2) Iowa State University has a large international student population and a relatively long history of married student housing and 3) Iowa State University is in the process of reassessing its housing responsibilities now that Pammel Court, the oldest settlement of the four, is being phased out.

An estimated 1517 students currently reside in USAC. Of these 51.54 percent are international students, almost half (49.1 percent) of whom are from China, Korea or Taiwan. These students from China,
Korea and Taiwan represent the largest group of international students residing in the USAC system, and for this reason they have been selected as the study group.

Extensive literature exists on the needs and interest of these groups. This is especially reflected in the literature related to large urban centers, since there are established enclaves where traditional cultural migrants from these countries have tried to retain their cultural identity, through housing. Nevertheless, the east Asian groups are a logical focus for this study for another reason. By focusing on the east Asian community living in USAC and examining their views, insight may be gained on housing satisfaction with regard to other international students who reside in the USAC system.

The site: married student housing at ISU

A recent unpublished thesis by Jason Chang documented both the history and the physical description of the Iowa State University married student housing facilities.

According to Chang, Iowa State University has consistently maintained the objective of providing a "non-institutional setting" for married students--one that appropriately reflects traditional community life. This attempt to imitate traditional community life has been centered around an organization comparable to a city governmental system. In fact, the married student community at Iowa State University represents a thirty-year experiment in self-
government (Chang 1991). Charles Frederiksen, Director of Residence at Iowa State University, stated that "...the patterns of government are different but the belief is the same. It (married student housing) is an attempt to teach citizenship, to teach a sense of responsibility to community" (Chang 1991).

Chang noted that before World War II, marriage for university or college students was discouraged, and married individuals were often barred from enrollment throughout the United States (Chang 1991). It was estimated that, before 1945, only 3 percent to 6 percent of all university and college students were married (Flores 1975). With the return of thousands of married servicemen after World War II and the introduction of the G.I. Bill, attitudes towards married students began to change. Married student enrollment jumped to 20 percent of total enrollment in 1946 (Flores 1975).

This influx of married students necessitated rapid construction of temporary housing. This housing for veterans and their families often took the form of surplus Army and Navy barracks. By the early 1960s, with the influx of Korean War veterans into the college system, married students accounted for 22 percent of the student population (Chang 1991). What was assumed to be a "temporary situation" at the end of the war became a permanent one. Universities began to respond to family housing needs with more permanent living units.

In 1970, total college enrollment in the United States was approximately 7,413,000. Of these 1,758,000 or 23% were married students (Lattore 1975). The increase in the married student
population was a result not only of returning former servicemen, but also of the emphasis by American society on higher education for the masses, as well as the presence of factors favorable to early marriage in contemporary American society (Lattore 1975).

A study conducted at the University of Florida (Clarke 1969) found that 60 percent of married student couples had at least one child. When applied to the national statistics stated earlier, the 1,758,000 married students combined with their spouses and a minimum of 1,050,000 children produced a total estimate of 4,566,000 people in married students' families in 1970. This trend has continued to provide a sizable number of married students.

According to Chang, the university has traditionally not been directly concerned with non-students in the family unit. Nevertheless, college and university administrators have recently become quite interested in how a spouse and children affect a student's motivation and academic responsibilities. Most institutions now assume educational responsibility for the student as a whole person. Facilities and services such as student housing, personal and academic counseling, social and recreational activities, financial aid, daycare for children, and educational-cultural betterment programs are currently being established to assist married students in many areas of growth and development.

Long waiting lists for college and university apartments continue to plague housing administrative departments even after thirty years. Iowa State University, like other universities, experienced a critical
shortage of married student housing when married students enrolled in large numbers following World War II. In response four housing communities: Pammel Court, Hawthorn Village, University Village and Schilletter Village have been provided.

Pammel Court

Pammel Court was developed as an immediate response to the influx of married students, primarily World War II veterans and their families. The University purchased Quonset huts, trailers, and demountable and aluminum barrack units. The barrack units were primarily two-bedroom and one-bedroom units. In 1947 administrators at Iowa State projected that there would be only ten veterans left to be housed by 1951. The trend of increasing numbers of married students continued, however, and 520 of the original 734 barrack units identified for decommissioning remain in use.

Hawthorn Court

The deterioration of temporary housing at Pammel Court, along with a growing demand for married student housing, clearly indicated the need to expand the existing married student community. After considerable discussion and several trips to inspect apartments for married students at other universities, housing plans were developed for a site adjacent to Pammel Court, close to the campus. Twenty-four one-story buildings were erected, each with four apartments erected;
all were occupied by the fall of 1957. In the next year, one hundred more units were added to Hawthorn Court.

University Village

Although construction of Hawthorn Court reinforced the commitment by university administrators to house the rising numbers of married students, these units still did not meet the demand. Hence the university purchased eighty acres of land east of the university golf course, a location close to city storm and sanitation sewers, city water mains, a new high school and a shopping center. On this site, University Village was constructed in two phases. When completed, it contained a total of five hundred units, a laundry facility, an administrative building, and a maintenance facility.

Schilletter Village

According to Chang the University Village project was expected to proceed to a third phase, but when the bid was rejected, the idea of the third phase was abandoned in April of 1970. In its place, the university purchased four-plex modular structures to study the feasibility of using factory-built units for married students. This project was named Schilletter Village.

The first units of Schilletter Village were occupied in the fall of 1974. In May of 1975, university administrators proposed the construction of seven additional four-plex units at Schilletter Village to house single students. However, demand for additional housing for
single students increased and led to the purchase of an additional thirty-two four-plexes, to be occupied by September 1977. Housing single students at Schilletter Village was intended to be only a short-term solution. The original purpose of the project remained that of providing housing for Pammel Court residents, thereby permitting decommissioning of that development. This was the first time, however, that Iowa State University had housed single and married students together in one project.

Since its inception in 1946, married student housing at Iowa State University has undergone change and growth. The early years were represented by short-term solutions to what were thought to be temporary after-effects of World War II. By the 1950's and 60's permanent solutions to what had by then proved to be a lasting cultural pattern—the married student family—were instituted. The residence department at Iowa State University has made its commitment to married housing clear by providing a growing financial investment in administration, social and recreational programs, and housing units.

In summarizing his historical overview Chang noted that housing patterns at Iowa State have responded to the changing needs represented by the student body. In physical terms, the lessons from the past have shown the degree to which housing projects can adapt, adjust, and expand to meet new housing criteria. These characteristics will have a significant effect on the success of any proposed married student housing development.
Significance of the site and its history to the study

Married student housing at Iowa State University was born in the aftermath of World War II. An institutional response was called for and answered. In response, Iowa State University set policies focusing on the needs of a population that had not been addressed in the past. The university's financial investment led to further study and consideration of student housing in a more comprehensive manner. The university was further encouraged to re-evaluate the manner in which housing services were delivered. The result was the housing project of what is now called University Student Apartment Community. Not only the student but also student's family was considered along with the impact of this comprehensive unit on the motivation of the student to study.

Just as World War II brought a change in the student body at Iowa State University, so has the demographic composition of the student body changed in the years since then. Students now occupying the remaining barracks, four-plexes and townhouses come from all parts of the world, and their housing experiences and cultural views are diverse. Those returning from war were all Americans, assumed to share a common world view, similar housing experiences and shared cultural goals and values. This is the population the married student housing was designed and planned for. However, the current occupants are largely international.
For international students this new environment may have a stressful impact not only on the students and on their study habits, but also, on their families. Especially significant to these individuals is the lack of cultural responsiveness and ability to adapt their internal housing space to their particular needs. Policy is often filled with unspoken or assumed cultural implications which may not be understood by those outside of the culture.

Therefore, sensitivity to those whose housing experience is different from that of others in the environment in which they are living is of great importance. In the planning of housing that will accommodate a diverse population, it is important to establish and re-evaluate policy so that it is flexible in the delivery of housing services. In this way the user will, perhaps, have a more satisfactory housing experience. This study attempts to promote responsiveness to the housing needs of married student by first conducting a household survey of current student residents and then making recommendations based on the findings of this survey.

The survey was conducted through personal in-depth interviews with the students, which allowed for direct observation of the household as well as personal contact and discussion. The expectation was that attitudes and opinions of students would differ based on cultural background and personal experience. Hence, the study dealt expressly with three east Asia student groups-Korean, Chinese (mainland) and Taiwanese. The groups are representative of cultural
transplants and were, at the time of the study, the largest international student user group in the USAC community.
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the relationship between culture and "built environment", housing is most important because it is a universal human need (Rapoport 1986). According to Amos Rapoport, this is the basis of Environmental-Behavior Studies or EBS. Rapoport identifies four aspects that must be organized in the built environment 1) space, 2) time, 3) meaning and 4) communication. Humans, within the built environment, perform daily activities that require organization of those aspects.

Rapoport contends that culture must be a cornerstone in EBR framework because culture is what makes humans human (Rapoport 1986). Using this framework, he asks what characteristics of people are significantly related to built form and what mechanisms link people and settings. These questions are related to what Rapoport refers to as Environment-Behavior Relations, or EBR. In further explaining the rationale for the consideration of culture in the study of housing, Rapoport contends that culture needs to be considered because it is culture that distinguishes groups (Rapoport 1986). It may be assumed that he acknowledges the diversity within human culture or within individual groups. This is alluded to by the assumption that similar needs, even those as simple as cooking, going to the toilet, storing objects, sleeping, or going upstairs, lead to different solutions in different settings. (Rapoport 1986). He proposes that any study of housing must include a consideration of culture, as it is crucial to a
comparative approach (Rapoport 1986). In this view, it could be said that housing is a way for groups to identify themselves and distinguish themselves from others. Irwin Altman, in his article "A Perspective on the Study of Culture and Housing," suggested the use of a heuristic framework developed by Bruce Tuckman (1964) as an approach to the study of home and culture (Altman 1986).

Tuckman's model suggests "four sequential stages through which groups progress: forming>storming>norming>performing." (p7) The first stage involves decision making, in terms of joining a group. The storming stage suggests that, once the decision is made to join, conflict occurs within the individual, until his/her place within the group is found. Norming involves an establishment of unity within the group, via establishment of norms, values, cohesion and esprit. In the performing stage the primary reason for the existence, and performing of assigned tasks, is the focus (Altman 1986).

Altman applies these four developmental states to the study of home and culture. He suggests, in the end, how this process can be applied to "create better homes in which people can be born, grow, live and die" (Altman 1987). In the forming state, Altman refers to the study of home and culture as a small group of individuals from various disciplines and countries interested in the area. This, he noted, occurred at the meeting of the Environmental Design Research Association, EDRA, at the University of Kansas in 1986. He suggests that movement from the "forming stage" of this type of study must be
made to the "storming stage" but he urges that at least "a superficial level of [cohesion] is maintained" (Altman 1987).

During the storming stage, conflicts occur. Issues arise involving leadership and the manner of conflict resolution is the focus. Philosophical issues also arise and are primarily due to the interdisciplinary nature of the research. Some questions that surface during this stage include: 1) the definition of and meaning of concepts, 2) the unit of analysis, 3) approaches to temporal factors and change and 4) methodological strategies (Altman 1987).

Norming focuses on group identity, cohesion and commonality of purpose (Altman 1987). Altman again points to the necessity in this stage of involving various disciplines. Because of the complexity and variation in the "home setting," it becomes necessary to "place our own data and theories in a broader context" (Altman 1987). Although some theoretical approaches are being developed in research of home and culture, e.g., contributions from environmental design, planning, anthropology there is still a lack of a conceptual framework, to guide the research (Altman 1987). However, some conceptual framework is beginning to emerge, i.e., phenomenological, anthropological, historical (Altman 1987).

The final stage, performing, focuses on working on the groups' tasks. Once the previous stages are attained, then work can begin. The assumption remains "...research and theory on culture and home is performed continuously" (Altman 1987). However, it seems that the
The study of home and culture, as alluded to by Rapoport and Altman, is to be found in the work of Larry S. Bourne's "The Geography of Housing." Bourne, in his work, refers to housing as a "real artifact...a central component in our daily lives," and in a broader context he views housing as "immensely diverse and complex..." (Bourne 1981, 1). In this context it appears he views housing as not only diverse but also universal. This supports the notion of Altman that despite the diverse cultural perspectives on housing and its central function within various cultural contexts, its role as a central place in daily activities is universal.

Bourne goes on to view housing in a historical perspective, putting it into a cultural context. As an example, he refers to the U.S. experience and to events that occurred during the time of the industrial revolution. "It is only since the industrial revolution...and particularly since the late 19th century, that housing conditions have risen to prominence...." He goes on to state, "...Societal action on housing problems date effectively from...the social reform movement of the late 19th century" (Bourne 1981, 1).

From this statement it may be assumed that any housing environment or delivery of housing services or planning of housing and its policies, is not independent of the cultural patterns that exist at a given time. In fact, those very cultural patterns influence housing, at all levels, and more importantly influence the users of the services and
shape their housing experiences. These experiences, further, shape how
individuals make decisions on housing, how they determine what
constitutes satisfactory housing and the daily activity patterns they
are able to carry out. Another important impact the housing experience
has on individuals is psychological. In this area the concepts of safety,
security and sense of belonging to a community or neighborhood become
important.

Bourne emphasizes the "importance of studying housing in its
appropriate context." (Bourne 1981, 251) Examples of this are
historical, political, socio-cultural, economic and local environmental.
The latter defines the external relationships through which housing is
processed and consumed (Bourne 1981). Bourne expands on this notion
as follows: "Housing 'space' is one of the components by which social
areas and communities...are created and either lost or maintained." (19)
He makes reference to the ecological approach, put forth by the Chicago
School of Sociology of the 1920s, as follows: "In their view,
neighborhoods change through a process of invasion and succession in
which new institutions and populations gradually penetrate (invade)
areas occupied by other groups and eventually come to dominate those
areas displacing members of the initial group (succession)". (22)

The Chicago School is based on an Urban Ecology perspective on
the development of communities and neighborhoods. With Robert E.
Parks as its Dean, the Chicago School focused its research efforts on
demographic, census and historical information, used in conjunction
with interviews, to develop a theoretical base (Basham 1978). Park
was most interested in the tendency of cities to form natural areas, i.e., ethnic neighborhoods. Out of the same school, E.W. Burgess, in a collection of essays, drew the ecology analogy (Basham 1978).

The premise of the analogy, as introduced by Burgess, was that "cities were considered ecosystems which required energy to maintain their structure and which are segmented into natural areas subject to laws of residential succession" (Basham 1978, 12). The four stages of residential succession, outlined by Basham, are as follows: 1) penetration, 2) invasion, 3) consolidation, and 4) piling up (Basham 1978). However, assuming that these stages are followed, Basham points to certain characteristics that may not necessarily change and that include socio-economic and educational. An example of the establishment of ethnic enclaves in an urban setting is that of the Chinese and Korean immigrants who settled in the urban centers of the west coast, e.g., California, of the United States.

Chinese immigrants came to the United States in large numbers in the 1850s (Chinn, Young and Chin 1990). More specifically, according to Helen Virginia Cather in a thesis written in 1932 for the University of California, "...the first Chinese to settle at San Francisco were two men and a woman who arrived from Hong Kong on the Brig Eagle in February, 1848" (Cather 1932). According to Cather soon after that "...about fifty men arrived...in San Francisco on their way to the gold mines" (Cather 1932). It was during this time that Chinatown in San Francisco was established. The Chinese in this area were engaged primarily in mining and railroad building (Chinn, Young and Chin 1988).
Many of the Chinese were ousted from the rural areas of the West as the result of racial harassment during the 1870s and 1880s. The workers migrated to San Francisco's Chinatown, where clan, district and community organizations existed, providing them with supportive services (Chinn, Young and Chin 1988).

Like members of other groups, the Chinese tended to settle in areas where friends, relatives and neighbors settled. For example, "Wongs, Lees and Chans from South China tended to concentrate in San Francisco, Moys in Chicago and so on" (Chinn, Young and Chin 1988, 5). The development of each Chinatown was dependent on the support services that existed in a given city. Thus, institutional support of the family and clan association was very important in determining the ability of the communities to survive or withstand attempts to uproot them (Chinn, Young and Chin 1988).

Chinatowns served, and continue to serve, several functions for their inhabitants. These include: 1) neighborhood, 2) capital cities for Chinese Americans and, 3) tourist attractions. Perhaps the most important function these enclaves serve is that of a stable refuge and stepping stone in America that preserves a cultural way of life. However, one of the most pressing problems is housing.

Some demographic information about Chinatowns and immigration patterns within these enclaves are as follows: Chinatowns tend to 1) be low-income neighborhoods, 2) ... have a high proportion of elderly residents, 3) ... include large families, and 4) .... be extremely sensitive to immigration flows (Chinn, Young and Chin 1990). In terms of
immigration patterns to these enclaves Chinn, et al. state that Chinatowns are major centers of immigration. Immigration into the New York Chinatown was estimated to be 2,000 people per month, and into the San Francisco area 1,200 to 1,800 immigrants per month by 1988 (Chinn, Young and Chin 1988).

These enclaves are reflective of a type of clustering and close association among Chinese people. The issue of whether Chinese students sought close proximity to each other in student housing is a subject not yet examined in the literature.

The first shipload of Korean immigrants, some 101 individuals, arrived in Hawaii on January 13, 1903 (Yang 1982). Between 1903 and 1905, 65 ships brought in 7,226 immigrants consisting of 6,048 men, 637 women and 541 children...between the ages of 20 and 30, according to Yang (B. Kim 1934) (W. Kim 1959).

Unlike the Chinese immigrants, who were predominantly peasants, the first Korean immigrants came from diverse social backgrounds. For example, one-third were minor government officials, ex soldiers, scholars, evangelists, Buddhist monks and political refugees. One-seventh were laborers, coolies, farm servants and common peasants (Yang 1982). Except for a handful of interpreters, the immigrants had no knowledge of English (Hyun 1908).

Upon arrival in Hawaii, groups of ten or fifteen were sent to various plantations (Yang 1982). Despite harsh conditions Korean laborers were able to save money that would enable them to move to Honolulu or other towns to start their own businesses (W. Kim 1959).
Yang reports that the 1910 census indicated a decrease in the Korean population in Hawaii to a little over 4,000 (Yang 1982). About 2,000 moved to the mainland and about 1,000 went back to Korea (Yang 1982).

As was the case for Chinese immigrants, San Francisco was port of entry for Korean immigrants. Associations such as the Korean National Association and The Korean Mutual Assistance Association provided support services for the Korean Immigrants (Yang 1982). Examples of these services include 1) lodging, 2) companionship and 3) financial guarantees necessary for U.S. entry (Yang 1982). After the brief stopover in San Francisco, most of the immigrants moved on to places such as Sacramento, Los Angeles and Riverside in California (Yang 1982).

As a new immigrant group with few existing kinship ties, Koreans appear to have had more latitude in deciding where in the U.S. to live (Yang 1982). Los Angeles, California, was a favorite destination for Korean immigrants. The reason for this lies in the absence of established "Korea towns" elsewhere in the U.S. (Yang 1982). However, difficulties in cultural transition and adaptation are reflected in problems of unemployment, housing and family crises (Yang 1982).

It is clear from the literature that both the the Chinese and the Korean immigrant groups chose to live in areas that provided social, cultural and familial support once they entered the U. S.. Perhaps this was an attempt to lessen the stress of relocation to a strange culture, land, and people, vis-a-vis organizations that reinforced cultural
norms, language and daily activity patterns and provided a sense of protection, both physically and psychologically. This sense of protection can influence satisfaction with housing and neighborhood. Settling in these areas, for this and many other reasons, leads to the development of what Parks would term "natural area" or "ethnic enclaves".

Chalsa Loo offered, in her work on Chinatown and community and residential mobility, some observations regarding ethnic enclaves. Loo, using the "class-based theory, built on the work of Park (1923, 1936) and Burgess (1928), argued that ethnic groups follow an irreversible settlement process of contact, competition, accommodation, and assimilation" (Loo 1991). Loo builds on this theory in the following manner. "Ethnic enclaves result from the competition among various racial groups for urban spatial location. The economically,...and socially advantaged locate in the more desirable locations" (Loo 1991). This being the case the process of competition would result in a certain "homogeneity within urban neighborhoods" (Loo 1991). For ethnic groups, this means first "segregation into the lowest grade areas of the city. Once they adapt to the new order, they break from their isolation and begin moving into the larger community" (Warner and Srole 1945).
How much of this experience would carry over to students remains to be explored. The key point is, however, that traditionally people with these cultural backgrounds have been attracted to settings which are predominantly made up of others from the same background. Such settings serve, one could say, as "cultural magnets."
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

The diversity and complexity of housing and the effect it has on individual households and related activity patterns are important concepts in housing research (Bourne 1981). More specifically, perhaps, is the importance of studying housing "in its appropriate contexts" (Bourne 1981, 251). The context may include any number of elements; however, cultural elements are the focus of this study.

Bourne makes reference to neighborhood environment as an element that defines the external relationships through which "housing is produced and consumed" (Bourne 1981, 251). He suggests that "housing is not the sole province of any single approach or discipline. It does not submit to an all embracing research paradigm, nor to a deterministic methodology or ideological stance" (Bourne 1981, 251). Rather, Bourne suggests a study of housing through the view of the people who reside in the units. Using Bourne's views on housing and housing research, the methodology for the current research was determined.

Data was gathered through a household survey, which was approved by the ISU Human Subjects Review Committee. A prepared questionnaire was administered to 28 student households. This researcher conducted all interviews, which took an average of 60 minutes.

The selection of the interview site was left to the individual, so that the environment in which the interview took place was neutral and
comfortable for the individual. The additional value of this process was a positive response to the interviewing process and the questionnaire items. Those selected to be interviewed were chosen at random from a computerized list of residents from China, Korea and Taiwan. The list was provided by the USAC Administrative staff, who also granted permission to conduct the interviews in the USAC living areas.

The Iowa State University Apartment Community (USAC]) currently provides housing for 1,517 students of whom 782 are registered students from foreign countries. Of the 782 foreign residents, 131 are from China, 109 from Taiwan and 144 from Korea. The residents from the three countries constitute 25.3% of the total USAC population and 49.1% of the international population.

The personally administered survey was the primary data source. The survey considers the performance of the housing environment in relation to international transplants and their household activity patterns. The premise is that household activity patterns are based on learned cultural patterns, and that individuals moving from one housing environment to another would bring with them learned patterns from previous housing experiences. More significantly, it is expected that individuals tend to incorporate those household patterns learned and used in the country of origin, into the current housing situation.

Secondly, the expectation is that if there has been movement from the country, region or area of origin, the household activity patterns may have become diluted or mixed with those experienced
along the way. For example, movement from a rural to metro area may result in mixing traditional housing activities with more modern patterns, and the same case may also be made for those crossing international boundaries.

The operational framework for the study is based on the process known as Post Occupancy Evaluation or P.O.E. (Preiser 1988). Preiser provides this definition of P.O.E.: "an appraisal of the degree to which a designed setting satisfies and supports explicit and implicit human needs and values of those for whom a building is designed" (Preiser 1988, 3). In defining P.O.E. as a process Preiser states "Post Occupancy Evaluation is the process of evaluating buildings in a systematic and rigorous manner after they have been built and occupied for some time. POEs focus on building occupants and their needs..." (Preiser 1988, 13). The significance of P.O.E. to the methodology is that it provides a mechanism for evaluation of a built environment, which is itself reflective of a specific culture and way of life, in relation to the needs and values of those who occupy it. In the case of this study, the culture of those interviewed—students from China, Korea, Taiwan—the traditional culture is not reflected in the building or built environment in which the students reside.

By utilizing P.O.E. as a methodological framework, the focus becomes the "behavioral elements of building performance" (Preiser 1988, 17). The concern is with the "impact of a building upon the psychological and sociological well-being of the building's occupants" (Preiser 1988, 17). These elements provide a link with household
patterns, satisfaction with housing and adaptability for those living outside familiar cultural housing environments. In investigating building performance, Preiser refers to a performance evaluation research framework (Preiser 1988).

The framework links the building performance concept with actual methodology and procedures (Preiser 1988). It consist of three features: measurement technology, databases and performance criteria. This study utilizes the following features: interviews, questionnaires and observation. Given that neither a database nor performance standards have been established, the information gathered will serve as a starting point for establishing both a database and performance standards. In this regard, the findings will serve as a basis for future directives as well as feedback for USAC in planning responsive housing for cultural transplants.

The strategies have their bases in anthropological field methods. Access was gained overtly, and respondents were asked to participate and to respond in a manner that was culturally familiar for them. For example, if the individual was not able to respond to a question in English, or if he or she could not think of an English equivalent, then the language that was most familiar to that individual was used. An interpreter was not needed as the students were proficient in English and were able to provide explanations of such phrases. The location of the actual interview was chosen by the respondent. This diminished the cultural concerns the individual may have had regarding entry into the
home by an outsider. The interviewee also determined who would be present at the actual interview: husband, wife or entire family.

The USAC administrative staff was approached regarding the research and a permit was given that would allow interviews to be conducted on the USAC premises. After permission was given a computerized list of residents from China, Taiwan and Korea was provided by USAC. The listing contained the name of the person who had applied for the housing, home town and country, location, number of persons living in the unit, telephone number and student classification. If more than one resident was a registered student and living at the location, information on both individuals was shown. The selection of possible respondents was based primarily on address and country of origin. Only one person from any given unit was interviewed, usually the person who had made formal application for the unit. In the selection process, individuals were selected from each of the four housing areas.

USAC provided three separate lists, one for each focus group. Each list consisted of the four living areas and the addresses of the students. Each location was assigned a number, 1-x. The numbers of those to be interviewed were selected from a computer-generated random number table. If, for any reason, the selected resident could not be interviewed the address appearing immediately below the one selected was used, and so on. Once the respondents were selected, they were notified by telephone at the number provided on the list. They were told they had been chosen to participate in the study and a
prepared script was read to them (Appendix A). They were informed that they could take a few days to decide and were given a number at which they could contact the researcher. They were also informed that they could decide time, date and place of the interview. Those selected to be interviewed were also encouraged to discuss any concerns they might have with the interviewer. If necessary, a personal meeting was arranged with the interviewer prior to the interview.

Before the actual interview began, the respondent was given a copy of the prepared script that had been read over the telephone as well as a copy of the questions that would be asked during the interview. The respondent was asked to scan the questions to determine if there were questions that might be considered to be of a sensitive nature. The process provided an opportunity for the respondent to become familiar with the format and the flow of the questions. In addition, any problems with language were detected during the scanning. The individuals were also informed that they were free to answer questions they felt were invasive. They were also encouraged to ask for clarification on questions as necessary.

At the end of the interview, the respondents were asked for additional comments or suggestions they may have had regarding the interview process, the study, or comments regarding USAC.
The interview questions

The questions for the interview were based on the premise that satisfaction in the current housing environment would be influenced by past housing experiences and pattern of household activities. (Appendix B). These patterns and experiences were expected to be influenced by such cultural factors as decision making, social patterns, the functioning of the household, interactions with other people and size of the community the individual or household was accustomed to living in. The manner in which the housing services were delivered—such as housing policy and type of institution providing services—was also expected to be influenced by the same factors. The underlying premise is the consideration of the cultural context of the individual in the country of origin. It cannot be ignored that within cultures there may be greater diversity than between cultures. Therefore, it is important to note that individual responses cannot be assumed to be representative of the whole group. A collection of responses can be used as a general indicator of trends.

The questions

The purpose of the questions asked was to: 1) obtain a cross cultural view of housing services provided by USAC, 2) identify factors that influence satisfaction with housing services, including secondary
services, i.e., study environment, 3) evaluate how well the total housing environment influences the household activities and encourages adaptability and social interaction of international transplants.

Since the influence of past housing experience on current housing experience of cultural transplants is a focus of this research, this study is divided into four specific areas: 1) student demographics, 2) the students' previous housing patterns, 3) current student housing and 4) student social environment. An attempt will then be made to find relationships among all areas. The sections were designed to facilitate correlation of topics and specific questions within a given topic area. The summary questions serve as a starting point for qualitative analysis.

Section 1: The student

The questions in this section that relate to community size and where the student worked or attended school were designed to gain some general idea about the student's experience in living environments before coming to ISU. There was an initial assumption that students who come to ISU directly from a traditional family home, especially one in a small city or rural area, would have more difficulty in adjusting to campus housing than a student who had lived independently in a city apartment. This study attempted to explore the impact that previous experience had on resident satisfaction.

Secondly, it is important to know if the student had worked or attended another school prior to coming to ISU. It was assumed that if
students were fully employed prior to coming to ISU, then their adjustment to university life and housing would be different from that of those who had not been employed. Students who worked prior to arrival might be accustomed to a different life style, different cultural contexts of housing, and different household activity patterns. The differences might further influence satisfaction with the current housing experience.

Section 2: Previous housing pattern

This section asked questions regarding the students' housing pattern, movement, household characteristics and activities and experiences, prior to coming to USAC. The focus here was on the most recent housing experience. In some cases, the responses might not be based merely on experience in country of origin. It was expected that the questions regarding ownership and where the student lived would provide information on his/her perspective on student housing. The expectation was that an individual who had owned his/her own home would view housing services differently from a student who had lived in a dormitory or with parents.

The questions regarding frequency of room use were intended to provide information on the respondent's perceptions of the usefulness of the space from the respondent's cultural perspective. This information was expected to evaluate how satisfactory the space provided was to the respondent, as well as for the household.
Another important question in this section is, "Why did you decide to live in your previous home?" The question provides insight, from the cultural perspective and experience of the user, into the decision making process of housing selection and it attempts to evaluate elements, such as the family, that are culturally significant in deciding where one chooses to live and what aspects of a home make it culturally acceptable or non-acceptable.

Section 3: Current housing

The questions in this section are based on questions asked in the previous section. The information to be obtained relates to how the previous housing experience influences the current housing situation. Its purpose was to determine whether experiences have an influence on satisfaction, adaptability and household activity patterns.

It was expected that questions regarding study patterns would elicit information on the contribution of factors beyond the living environment that might contribute satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the housing environment. The student was also asked to rate his/her level of satisfaction with the current living environment. Perhaps, this may be viewed as an attempt to summarize the attitudes of the students toward university housing.

Section 4: Social environment

The questions in this section ask the student about the social environment beyond his/her own living area and included the
neighborhood in which he/she lives. The questions allow for responses that are assessed quantitatively and qualitatively. The reasons for providing both types of response for some of the questions in this section are: 1) the nature of the questions are highly subjective 2) the social issues the students are faced with in one country may not exist in a form that is easily translatable in another, 3) students may not feel comfortable responding in a descriptive way and, 4) residents may not have first hand knowledge or experience with social issues in the area. However, the questions are an indicator of adaptability, or lack thereof, to a new social environment. This becomes especially evident when compared to a question about social environment in the previous housing environment.

The information obtained is very worthy of consideration, for it allows insights into how well USAC housing is performing, regarding social environment and relations with its foreign residents. This section attempts to evaluate whether individuals are being placed in uncomfortable or difficult social situations, and what impact this has on overall satisfaction.

Questions regarding familiarity with others in the surrounding areas provide information on the sphere of social contact for the international transplants. The objective is to determine if correlations exist between personal associations and level of satisfaction. A summary ranking question is provided at the end to help establish the level and type of differences among respondents in this area of social environment.
Section 5: Summary questions

The summary question section is designed to give respondents an opportunity to express themselves in a more spontaneous way and to provide the opportunity to make suggestions that could benefit USAC and the study. It was assumed that the responses might provide further information that could help in interpreting correlations that might surface later and tie together important facts that may have been overlooked. The section also serves as the beginning point for the qualitative portion of the analysis. All data in this section are related in narrative form, and the section serves as a summary that captures the essence of the individual questionnaire and/or interview.

Mapping

Four maps, one for each living area, were provided by the USAC staff. Each of the three countries, China, Taiwan and Korea, was assigned a color code and, using the computer list, the location of the units that had a resident from one of the three countries, was indicated on the appropriate map. The initial maps included all members of the populations being studied. Next, those who were selected for interviewing were indicated on the same maps.
Maps were used, also, in conjunction with the section of the questionnaire "Social Environment." The questions in this section pertained to proximity of the individual interviewed to individuals with whom he/she might have some degree of relationship. The mapping, based on the answer provided, visually indicated whether 1) the location was based on proximity to those who were culturally similar to the cultural transplant, 2) social networks extended beyond those areas that housed individuals that were culturally similar to the resident, 3) social networks included only the near environment.

Some of those interviewed were not comfortable indicating the location of those they had close ties to. However, they appeared to be most comfortable indicating the area they lived in, e.g., University Village. As a result some questionnaires had maps for the questions and some did not. The mixing of the two forms of response did not have a significant effect on the results.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS

The sample

The findings in the study are a result of personal in-depth interviews with 27 individual households, representing three groups; Chinese 8 (29.6 percent), Korean 8 (29.6 percent), and Taiwanese 11 (40.7 percent). In drawing the sample, every attempt was made to have representation from each group in each living area. However, lack of representation of any single group in any of the living areas is not an indication that students from that group do not reside in a particular area.

The study sample size represents 7 percent of the total population of the 384 students from the three groups living in the USAC complex. The sample size was designed to obtain personal and comprehensive responses from those interviewed. Further, the size allowed for observations and discussion with the respondents that would not have been possible with a larger sample. With only 7 percent of the total population represented, specific results cannot be definitive, but they may be indicative of the general trends.

Living patterns and family structure

The distribution of the sample was as follows: 33.3 percent lived in University Village, 29.6 percent in Hawthorn court, 25.9 percent in Pammel Court and 11.1 percent in Schilletter Village (see table1). Of
these individuals 44 percent indicated that Pammel Court was their first choice for living area, and 25.9 percent responded Hawthorn Court. Rent and proximity to campus were given as reasons for living in Pammel and Hawthorn Court. When asked why they chose to live where they were living, the responses included proximity to friends from their home country and to individuals they had attended university with in their home country, as well as to services, i.e., child care, Pammel grocery and transportation.

The first observation pertains to living patterns, that is, where the individual groups live and what their first preferences were for living area. For those from China, 50 percent lived in Pammel Court, 25 percent in Hawthorn Court, and 25 percent in University Village. Within this sample, no representative from China was living in Schilletter Village. Those from Korea were represented in all four areas, although University Village was the choice of 35 percent of those from Korea. The remaining areas were represented as follows: 25 percent lived in Pammel Court and 25 percent lived in Hawthorn Court. Only 1 individual interviewed lived in Schilletter Village. Of those from Taiwan, 36.3 percent lived in Hawthorn Court and 36.3 percent in University Village. One individual from Taiwan lived in Pammel Court and 3, or 27.2 percent, lived in Schilletter Village (see table 1).

Family structure of those in the sample included, with the exception of one person who was engaged, married students 51 percent had children living with them. Family size ranged from 1 to 4. The length of residence for the sample ranged from 5 months to 8
years, with the majority falling in the 2-3 year range at the time of the interview. An inference can be made from this finding that the family structure of the students responding is a nuclear family, based on lack of reference to other relatives living with the family. The families had, on average, one child.

In comparison, 55.6 percent reported having an original family structure consisting of mother, father, siblings, grandparents and sometimes in-laws. The family size ranged from 1 to 7. Those indicating that they came from a nuclear family arrangement, consisting of mother, father, and siblings, was 29.6 percent. For the majority of those interviewed, one of the first adjustments was in the support system. From the results, it seems that most of the students came from a system that relies heavily on family for support. Moving from a family focused support system to a self-reliant or "other" dependent system, can in some cases be a source of stress.

The time the respondents lived within their original family structure ranged from 1 year to 27 years. The question asked specifically for time at previous residences. It was not clear if this was in the original family setting; 14.8 percent indicated they had lived in their previous housing for 2 years. The next highest percentage range was 11.1 percent with 4 years of residency. It is important to note that 25.9 percent of those responding had attended school in the U.S. prior to coming to ISU. Therefore, some of the reported experiences may have been within the U.S. Significant differences between those who had attended school prior to ISU and those who did
not were not observed. Significant, perhaps, was the movement from smaller and medium size cities to metropolitan centers for the purposes of work or schooling. This also pointed to diverse housing experiences.

The environments in which the students had their housing experiences were also varied. For example, 51 percent had lived in apartments and 11.1 percent reported living with roommates in dormitories before coming to ISU, 48 percent reported living in metropolitan areas, 29.6 percent in regional centers and 22.2 percent in medium sized cities. The highest proportion had lived in housing that was provided for them; for 44.4 percent this was the case. About one fourth (25.9 percent) had owned their own home. In some instances the housing that was provided was owned by the company that employed the individual or was university housing if the person worked at or attended the university. In other cases, housing was provided by the family, or relatives had assisted in acquiring the housing. In still other cases, the individual interviewed lived with the larger family.

Previous and current housing situations

The issues of satisfaction, maximization, and adaptability of student cultural transplants are best addressed and investigated in a comparative manner, showing what was liked and disliked about their home in the country of origin (see table1). This information was compared with what is liked and disliked about their housing at USAC.
This approach allowed for a concrete point of reference, including previous homes in country of origin. This is significant, not only from the standpoint of the research, but also for the individual being interviewed. In research on housing of cultural transplants, it is important to obtain information on likes and dislikes for their original family setting so that some comparison can be made with their opinions of the new setting. Second, it is important to obtain information on the physical aspects and amenities of the original setting with which the individual is familiar, in order to compare similar aspects of the current situation.

Room use and the value placed on rooms were used as indicators of adaptability to a culturally different housing environment. Previous and current housing likes and dislikes and room uses were also compared. Two areas were mentioned specifically as being heavily used at home: the living room and the kitchen. There was a third category labeled "other". Some individuals were uncomfortable speaking openly about the bedroom or sleeping area or about the bathroom. Nevertheless, these two areas were typically found in both the previous and current living environments.

Other areas that will be analyzed include: 1) improvements that the respondents felt were needed in both previous and current housing situations (see tables 2-8) 2) aspects of the previous housing that they missed in the current housing and 3) socialization and association patterns. Association patterns were viewed as significant because they reflected the level of relationship with the housing environment.
The information obtained was analyzed by comparing responses to questions asked about past and about current housing situations. Categories of comparison were: 1) physical aspects, 2) infrastructure, 3) environment, and 4) structural aspects. These areas of comparison were used because they existed in both situations.

The four areas included specific features of the housing environment. Physical aspects included the following features: room configuration, aesthetics, and design. Infrastructure features are plumbing, heating, ventilation, water, lighting and services. The environment consist of both the external and internal surroundings and includes noise, air pollution, security and the social environment. Structural components focus on the structural integrity of the unit: roof, ceiling, steps, porch; verandah, balcony.

The specific aspects of housing referred to the respondents in the previous and current housing situations were grouped into eight areas: size of rooms, number of rooms, kitchen area, storage area, number of levels (upstairs and downstairs), amount of light, number of windows and noise. These categories were selected because they represented physical aspects of the housing environment that were experienced in both cultural environments. A Likert scale was used at the end of the sections to evaluate the overall satisfaction, as it pertained to that section. The scale of 1 to 5, with one being very low and five being very high, was used. The results were presented for individuals from each of the three countries, followed by a summary for the total sample.
China

For the students from China responding to the questions of what they liked about their previous homes (see table 2), 75 percent responded number of windows and 50 percent responded size of rooms and number of rooms. Two individuals, (12.5 percent of the Chinese student sample) responded "number of levels", and one responded "kitchen area" and "noise level". In responding to what they disliked about their previous home 62.5 percent of the students said they were dissatisfied with the kitchen area. Fifty percent responded that they did not like the storage area. Of those responding, 37.5 percent did not like size of rooms, number of levels, amount of light and noise level. Two individuals (25 percent) did not like the number of rooms.

When asked the same questions regarding their current housing (see table 2), 62.5 percent indicated they liked the number of rooms, 50 percent liked the kitchen area and 50 percent liked the storage area. The number of levels was satisfactory to 37.5 percent, or 3 individuals. Two students, or 25 percent of those responding from the sample, liked the amount of light, and an equal number liked the noise level. The number of windows was liked by only 1 person, 12.5 percent of those responding in the sample.

The feature of USAC units most disliked was number of rooms (37.5 percent). Two individuals (25 percent) were dissatisfied with size of rooms, kitchen area, and noise level (see table 2). The limited number of responses to the issue of dislikes may be explained through some of the verbal responses received, such as, "It's OK for students," "
We're only here to study," and "We do not think about these things, only study."

When asked to respond to the questions on room use/value in their previous housing environment, the students from China indicated that the room they used most was the living room. Yet of those who responded to which room(s) were important for day-to-day activities, 62.4 percent indicated "some other room". Only 25 percent responded living room and 12.5 percent responded kitchen. The area most used for social activities was the living room (37.5 percent) and some other room (37.5 percent).

When asked about room usage/value related to their current USAC housing, 87.5 percent responded the living room was the room used the most. The kitchen area had 12.5 percent of the responses. The room used the least was "some other room" with 75 percent of responses; 37.5 percent responded the kitchen. The room important for day-to-day activities was the living room (75 percent), with the kitchen and some other room, each, having 12.5 percent of the responses. All the 8 respondents said the living room was used for social activities.

Over one-third (37.5 percent) responded that the major improvements needed in their previous homes for these students were the physical aspects (see table 7). Some aspects that respondents commented on were the age of the building, the lack of air conditioning and the bathroom. For one student, the lack of space was a prime concern. The student had this comment "... the only way to escape was to go to a small town...where there is green space." For the other
categories, 25 percent responded that the infrastructure needed improvement, 12.5 percent responded the environment did and 12.5 percent indicated the structure was in need of improvement (see table 7).

When asked about improvements needed in their USAC housing 37.5 percent noted physical aspects, e.g., kitchen and windows. Improvements in environment were indicated by 37.5 percent (an example being noise coming from another unit). Infrastructure and structural elements needed improvements according to 25 percent. Some comments related to these two areas included: lack of exhaust fans in the kitchen, noise level and lack of ventilation. One student commented that the unit was "too old...everything needs to be fixed...things are not maintained well."

The students were asked, "What do you miss most from your previous home?" Fifty percent answered the neighborhood, family and people in the neighborhood; one person referred to the "shops" and other amenities located nearby or within the neighborhood. The students tend to mirror this traditional neighborhood support group in Pammel Court. Fifty percent of the Chinese respondents and 75 percent of the close friends or associates of the Chinese students whom they either visit or help regularly live in Pammel Court. One reason they give for these close associations was that these friends are from the same country, speak the same language, and share similar interests and the experience of parenting. The other areas where they had acquaintances were Hawthorn Court and University Village.
Those from Korea had some responses that were similar to those of the group from China (see table 3). In terms of the physical aspects they liked in their previous homes, 87.5 percent liked the number of rooms, 62.5 percent liked the number of windows and size of rooms, 50 percent approved of the amount of light, the noise level, the number of levels and the kitchen area. Only one or (12.5 percent) of those responding liked the storage area. With regard to dislikes, 62.5 percent were dissatisfied with the storage area, 50 percent disliked the noise level, and 37.5 percent were unhappy with the size of the rooms in the previous home. One individual, or 12.5 percent, expressed dissatisfaction with number of rooms, kitchen area, and number of windows. The percentages are based on a student respondent group of 8 students.

When asked to evaluate their current housing likes and dislikes, 62.5 percent liked the noise level and the number of levels, while 37.5 percent liked the number of rooms, the kitchen area, and the amount of light. Twenty-five percent were satisfied with the number of windows and storage space. Only one individual or 12.5 percent of those responding out of a sample of 8, liked the size of the rooms (see table 3).

Physical aspects of USAC that these students did not like included: size of the rooms (75 percent), kitchen area (62.5 percent), amount of light (50 percent), number of rooms and noise level (37.5 percent each). Two individuals or 25 percent disliked the number of
windows, and only one individual indicated a dislike for the number of levels, 12.5 percent (see table 3).

Korean students, when asked about their previous home said that the living room was the room they used the most (62.5 percent) while 37.5 percent said some other room (e.g., bedroom), and 12.5 percent said the kitchen. The room used the least was the kitchen, (50 percent), some other room (25 percent), and the living room (12.5 percent). For 37.5 percent the living room or some other room were important for day-to-day activities, and for 25 percent kitchen area was important. For social activities, the living room was used the most (62.5 percent). The kitchen area was next, with 25 percent of the responses.

Room use in the USAC units for these students resulted in the following patterns: The room used most and for social activities was the living room, with all 8 Korean students responding. The room used the least (87.5 percent) was some other room (e.g., bedroom). The room most important for day-to-day activities was the living room, (75 percent). In this group the kitchen was not mentioned in any of the usage categories. With respect to the room used least, in some instances a bedroom; some may have used it for storage. In some instances, the bedroom may have been converted to storage space. If a child was in the home, the bedroom was not used as much. Some responded that there were only two people in the home and there was no need to use the extra room. In some instances, the family was using another room, e.g., the living room, for sleeping space, as they did back home in Korea.
According to 62.5 percent of the Korean respondents (see table 7), the physical aspects of their previous housing were the aspects that needed improving the most. Specifically mentioned were enlargement of kitchen space, additional rooms, more privacy within the home, and more storage space. These responses were similar to those of the Chinese students. The other areas yielded the following percentages: 25 percent felt the environment needed improvement, and one person commented on the infrastructure, specifically plumbing (see table 7).

The students felt that the area that needed improvement most in USAC was the infrastructure; more specifically, heating, leaking floors and air conditioning. Physical aspects, for 37.5 percent of those responding, were another area of concern. Aspects commented on were the bathroom and space and ventilation, as was the case with the Chinese students. For most students, the aspect they most missed from their previous homes was the same aspect they perceived as needing improvement in USAC. In the case of the Korean students, infrastructure was the area most missed. For example, they mentioned heating, lighting, space, and bathrooms (plumbing) (see table 8).

Of Korean students, social relationships and mutual visiting and assistance, seemed to be centered in Pammel Court for 45.4 percent of those responding. The reasons for these associations included: 1) the proximity to individuals from the same country as the respondents; 2) friends who they attended the same school and type of school in Korea; 3) same native language, 4) same department; and 5) same age and marital status. The last response, as explained to the interviewer,
means individuals who are of the same age and same marital status will associate. For example, a married woman will not necessarily associate or develop a strong relationship with a single woman, or a young man will not develop an equal relationship with an older man.

Taiwan

The number of windows and the amount of light were the two areas liked most by those students interviewed from Taiwan. Each of the two areas received 54.5 percent favorable responses. Size of rooms and number of rooms each received 45.4 percent favorable response. Approximately 27.2 percent liked the kitchen area and noise level (see table 4).

The storage area was an aspect that 54.5 percent of the respondents found inadequate in their previous home. The kitchen area and the noise level each were found acceptable by 45.4 percent of those responding to this question. Room size in the previous housing situation was disliked by 36.3 percent, while two individuals or 18.1 percent of the Taiwanese students did not like the number of levels. Only one individual was not satisfied with the number of windows in the previous home (see table 4).

When asked about their USAC housing, 54.5 percent found the storage area to be acceptable, while 36.3 percent liked the amount of light they had in their unit and 27.2 percent found the kitchen area satisfactory. Three areas, number of rooms, number of levels, number of windows, each had two favorable responses or 18.1 percent of the
sample of Taiwanese students. Only one individual liked the size of the rooms in the USAC unit (see table 4).

The noise level, kitchen area and size of rooms were not acceptable to a substantial portion of this group, (36.3 percent). Two individuals, or 18.1 percent, were not satisfied with the number of rooms or amount of light in the unit. And only one individual each, found the storage area and the number of windows to be unsatisfactory in their USAC units (see table 4).

The group from Taiwan indicated that the living room was used the most, (72.5 percent) and was important for day-to-day activities, (63.6 percent). Also, the living room was important for social activities, as indicated by all 11 students. The room used the least by 45.4 percent, was the kitchen, with 36.6 percent indicating that some other room (e.g., bedroom) was used the least. In noting those areas important for day-to-day activities; 63.6 percent named the living room 36.3 percent said the kitchen, and 27.2 percent said some other room.

Room usage in the current housing situation was as follows: The room used the most was the living room (36.3 percent), while some other room was used the most by 9.09 percent. The room used the least (36.3 percent) was some other room (e.g. bedroom), 36.3 percent while 54.4 percent indicated the living room was most important for day-to-day activities and was the room used most for social activities (72.2 percent).
Of the students from Taiwan, 81.8 percent felt the physical aspects of their previous homes needed improvement (see table 7). More specific responses included comments on size of the home, size of the rooms, bathroom, and size of windows. For their current housing in USAC, 63.6 percent felt physical aspects, as in the previous home, needed improvement (see table 7). Specific to USAC were storage, window size, space and room size (see table 8).

Infrastructure was also a concern in the USAC unit, according to 36.3% (see table 8). Those areas mentioned were lighting, ventilation, exhaust fans, air conditioning and insulation. The individual who mentioned air conditioning, a resident of University Village, commented that cooling was needed, especially on the second floor. Ventilation, a concern mentioned by Korean as well as Chinese students, as well, was referred to several times in reference to cross-ventilation, air circulation and the ability to vent smoke from cooking. The last concern pertained to the lack of, or inefficiency of, exhaust fans in the kitchen area.

When asked about things missed from their previous housing situation, aspects that related to infrastructure and physical elements were mentioned most frequently. For example, lighting, size, windows ventilation, and number of rooms were often mentioned. These responses follow the pattern of things the individual perceived as needing improvement in the current housing situation. There were some more personal aspects as well. One individual commented that he missed the Japanese type furniture that he had in his home. He went on
to comment that his USAC home would be better if he had been able to bring it with him. A female student said she missed her "miniatures" that were back home along with her music.

The relationship and socialization patterns for Taiwanese students tended to be slightly different from that of the Chinese and Korean students. Instead of Pammel Court being a focal point for social activity, 54.5 percent of those responding, indicated University Village was where most of their socialization occurred. Hawthorn Court was next with 45.5 percent responding. When asked about close relationships or associations, the location was, again, University Village. Reasons given for the close associations were religion, language, children, family relations, and coming from same country or city. Following the same pattern as the other two groups, the Taiwanese students tended to have close associations with those who lived in the area in which they lived. For these students this meant University Village and Hawthorn court.

Observations

Many of the interviews took place during the late spring, summer and early autumn. The interviews took place at various times of the day and night. The location of the interviews was left to the discretion of the person interviewed. The locations included homes, offices, laboratories, the library, and various places on campus. Typically, if the interviews were conducted in the home the whole
family participated. These interviews were more informal and personal than those conducted in an office setting.

Depending on the time of year the interviews were conducted, some issues were more prominent than others. For example, while at the home of a student living in Schilletter Village, the odor from the nearby pig farm was very prominent in the unit. The wife, who is home during the day, commented that if she opened the window the smell would not go away, but get worse. Because it was a warm day she wanted to open the window to let some air in but could not because of the smell. However, she liked living in Schilletter because of the light coming in the window, and she felt that was good for her family. It was bright and she felt it was very comforting.

Ventilation concerns extended to the exhaust provided for cooking. This issue was a particular concern for students living in all the USAC areas. For example, in University Village the location of the fan, it appeared, was not close to the stove. Although there is a window in the kitchen area, it does not seem to be effective in ridding the area of smoke and other factors associated with cooking. This seems to be particularly true for the type of high heat cooking the focus groups used. The respondents said that the odor from the cooking, due to the type of spices used, would linger for a long time. In Pammel Court there were no exhaust fans in the kitchen, only small windows located high above and away from the stove.

The households visited were very neat and organized. In a large number of cases the curtains were opened wide to allow sunlight in and
the windows were opened, when possible, to allow outside air in. The space available was used in an economic fashion. In many interviews the students expressed dissatisfaction with the size of the rooms and commented on the difficulty in maintaining the unit.

For example, in a unit in Hawthorn Court, the living room was the center for family activity. The children studied on a long coffee table that was positioned against one wall, nearest the window. The father, who was a student, had a small desk on an adjacent wall, and other items were dispersed around the remainder of the room. However, the center of the room was left clear and a mat covered it. In spite of the fact that a kitchen table was in the kitchen area, the family ate in the living room on a low table. The table would be moved in and out as the need dictated. The table in the kitchen served as a food preparation surface.

The bedrooms were very small and used not only as the sleeping area but also as storage space. In one instance in Schilletter Village, a student related that one bedroom was for study and the second for sleeping for the student; the living room was also converted to a sleeping area at night for the child and the other parent. In Hawthorn Court, due to lack of ventilation, absence of windows, light, and the small size, one of the bedrooms was converted to storage area while the children used the second; and the adults slept in the living room. Another major complaint was the bedroom wall did not go all the way to the ceiling.
One other observation that was made was the internal temperature of the units. Cooling the unit without air conditioning was difficult, particularly in Pammel Court and on the second floor of University Village. University Village, due to what appeared to be inadequate ventilation, was almost impossible to cool on the upper level. During the summer months it was not uncommon to have the household sleeping on the first level, according to the respondents. In the case of Pammel, household members spent a large portion of the day either outdoors or with the front door open. In the winter the reverse seemed to be the case.

In summarizing a few of the observations made, the areas of most concern and dissatisfaction were ventilation, light, number of windows, lack of exhaust in the kitchen area, and heating and cooling. The question of relationships between the areas and culture would be answered as follows: 1) number of windows, light and exhaust in the kitchen area could be considered a function of culture, based on verbal responses from the respondents, 2) ventilation and heating are perhaps more a function of personal preference than of culture 3) the extensive use of the living room as a multipurpose room is also a function of culture.

The responses and the observations made in this study point out the diverse points of view as they relate to housing experiences. Each response was unique not only to the group, but also to the individual responding. For example, in terms of impressions left on this researcher, the students from China appeared to be a bit more reserved
and cautious in their responses and willingness to participate. Once the interviews began discussions were a little less guarded, but reserved nonetheless. In contrast, the students from Taiwan were more open and in willing to participate, and their answers tended to be more candid than those of the Chinese students. Students from Korea were more traditional than were the Taiwanese and were something of a combination of the previous two groups. The students were candid and responsive, yet, reserved. Within each of these groups, however, individuals varied and various combinations occurred. The influence of length of time at USAC, status in country of origin, and life experiences are examples of influencing factors.

Summary

A profile of the student's surveyed show that the 33 percent of the respondents lived in University Village, (see table 1), even though it was not the first or second choice for living areas.

However, it may be concluded that it is at least reasonably affordable, and there is transportation to the campus and other services. The area itself, based on the data, has at least moderate representation from each of the three groups. Therefore, it is possible for the students to find someone to establish an association with, based on aspects mentioned, e.g., language, country... The close associates for the Chinese and Korean students seem to be in Pammel Court, even though they may live in University Village. The Taiwanese students, however, find their close friends within University Village.
The trend appears to be that close associations are found within the area where the student lives.

Most of the students were married and had at least one child, and had lived in the USAC system for an average of 2-3 years. The students had come from traditional family backgrounds, with an original family structure. The household composition could include, mother, father, siblings, grandparents and in-laws. The information reveals that, as a whole, the students are having to adjust to a nuclear family structure from the original family structure. What this implies is that the support system has been altered, and this could be a point of stress for the family and student. Based on the information provided, a number of the students have moved from smaller areas to metropolitan centers. They have been intra- as well as inter-cultural transplants, and have had the opportunities to mix living and household patterns and to adapt to new situations.

The results reported for the total sample of 27 individuals provides a more macro view, which may contribute information indicative of general trends. The aspects of previous housing the sample found most satisfactory were the number of windows, 62.9 percent; next was the number of rooms (59.2 percent) and size of rooms (51.8 percent). Those areas that were disliked were: 55.5 percent disliked the storage area, 44.4 percent found the noise level unsatisfactory and 40.7 percent did not like the kitchen space. When they compared previous homes with USAC, 44.4 percent liked the storage in USAC; the number of rooms, the kitchen area and the number
of levels were each liked by 37 percent. The amount of light and noise the level were each acceptable to 33.3 percent. The total response for aspects not liked in the current housing situation were: 44.4 percent disliked the size of the rooms with 40.7 percent dissatisfied with the kitchen area, and 33.3 percent found the noise level unacceptable.

The result of the total sample of 27 appears to follow the general trend reported for the three individual groups. The living room was the room used the most by 70.3 percent of the total population. Thirty-seven percent reported using some other room the most, and 7.4 percent of the total answered the kitchen. Following that trend 51.8 percent reported some other room (e.g., bedroom) as being used the least in their previous home, while 37 percent reported using the kitchen the least. Gender was not reported in the results, because in a large number of the cases the family was present for the interview. However, in those instances where only one individual was interviewed, it was typically a male. A fairly consistent response across the three groups is that males did not spend time in the kitchen in the country of origin.

In the previous home the room that was most important for day-to-day activities included the living room, (44.4 percent), some other room (40.7 percent), and the kitchen (25.9 percent). For social activities 81.4 percent indicated that they used the living room, 14.8 percent some other room and 7.4 percent the kitchen.

The results for the total sample revealed that the living room was the room used the most in their current USAC housing, (85.1 percent). However, 25.7 percent reported using some other room and 1
individual reported the kitchen as the room used the most. Some other room was reported by 62.9 percent to be the room used the least, and 18.5 percent indicated the kitchen. For day to day activities the living room was most important, (70.3 percent). And, of those responding 88.8 percent indicated that the living room was used for social activities.

The aspect that had the greatest impact on students and their ability to adapt was the total USAC housing environment (see tables 9-11). As stated earlier, this category included noise level, air pollution, security and social environment. The second area with significant impact was infrastructure and physical aspects (see tables 9-11). In many ways USAC becomes a microcosm of the larger society. It becomes reflective of the cultural values, norms, institutions, and goals, not only of the larger culture, but also of, the special population it serves. Once inside the housing structure, the individual and the household are confronted with those aspects that affect day-to-day life: how one eats, sleeps, entertains, and interacts with individual household members. The manner in which the interior is arranged or configured determines how and in which order and in what manner the interactions will take place.

The students interviewed have had their socialization and enculturation grounded in housing experiences that are different from the environment they now find themselves living in. In spite of mobility the foundation for a home or what makes a home, has been laid, and satisfaction and the ability to adapt or respond to a new
setting are based in part on individual responsiveness and in part on the flexibility of the new housing environment.

Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to investigate housing satisfaction among and the ability to adapt of student international transplants. The approach was to compare the students' previous housing experience with their current housing situation. By doing so, perhaps a connection could be made with specific elements; from the previous home that would improve satisfaction here. The next issue explored how the students adapted to the setting or the setting to their specific needs.

The above approach and questions were based on the premise that household activity patterns are based on learned cultural patterns, and that individuals, moving from one housing environment to another would bring patterns from previous housing experiences. More specifically, it was expected that individuals would incorporate those cultural household patterns into the new housing environment.

The results indicated that the students were reasonably satisfied with USAC housing, despite differences in cultural and housing backgrounds. The students indicated they were able to maintain their cultural identity due to the number of students from the same country. Also, since the population at USAC consists of students, there is a sense of identification with the community as a whole. Ironically, this aspect seems to have had a negative influence on some. In many
cases the students commented that they missed the neighborhood in their previous homes, i.e., the people, relatives and shops. In the current housing environment some feel because there are so many different nationalities present, it is difficult to make friends and have a sense of community. In the words of one student, "too many different people, too many different languages, too many different cultures...make it hard...". The conclusion that may be drawn from this information is that the need to identify as members of a community and the ability to connect with individual members of that community are important to the student transplant.

The results did indicate that the physical aspects, more specifically the interior physical aspects, infrastructure, utilities, and services, did have a definite impact on the day to day activities and adaptability within the USAC housing environment (see tables 9-11). For example, some students did not utilize one bedroom for sleeping space; in some instances it was used for storage or study. In still other cases, the living room was used as a multi-purpose area. In terms of utilities, students indicated, for example, dissatisfaction with the plumbing, ventilation, lack of exhaust fans in the kitchen and insulation. And when compared with aspects missed from their previous home environment, the above mentioned, were the things they missed most. And these issues varied group to group and where they happened to live within the USAC. The conclusion here, it is important for the student to be able to manipulate some aspect of the interior, i.e., space, of the new housing environment in such a way as to
accommodate the particular needs of the household or individual, recognizing that some aspects, such as utilities, are fixed.

The student cultural transplant seemed to adapt the new housing environment, within limits, in accordance with the needs of his/her household. The greatest limit to this ability was the interior of the home, perhaps the most important part of a housing environment. The interior is the part in which our daily lives are played out. The students appear to have coped with the social environment through the presence of other students from the same country or background, and through a sense of belonging to a student community.
Table 1. Respondent distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>PAMMEL CT</th>
<th>HAWTHORN CT</th>
<th>U.V.</th>
<th>S.V.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>50% (4)</td>
<td>25% (2)</td>
<td>25% (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREA</td>
<td>25% (2)</td>
<td>25% (2)</td>
<td>35% (3)</td>
<td>13% (1)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIWAN</td>
<td>9.1% (1)</td>
<td>36% (4)</td>
<td>36% (4)</td>
<td>18% (2)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26% (7)</td>
<td>29% (8)</td>
<td>33% (9)</td>
<td>11% (3)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total represents the sample size of 27.

The areas are the four living areas that make up USAC.

The percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent percentage and number of students interviewed from each of the three countries in the four living areas.

The total number of students interviewed from the countries indicated.
### Table 2. China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>PREVIOUS HOUSING</th>
<th>CURRENT HOUSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIKED</td>
<td>DISLIKED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF RMS</td>
<td>50.0% (4) 37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.0% (2) 25.0% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF RMS</td>
<td>50.0% (4) 25.0% (2)</td>
<td>62.5% (5) 12.5% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITCHEN</td>
<td>12.5% (1) 62.5% (5)</td>
<td>50.0% (4) 25.0% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORAGE</td>
<td>- 50.0% (4)</td>
<td>50.0% (4) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF LEVS</td>
<td>25.0% (2) 37.5% (3)</td>
<td>37.5% (3) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT OF LITE</td>
<td>- 37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.0% (2) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF WIN</td>
<td>75.0% (6) 12.5% (1)</td>
<td>12.5% (1) 37.5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td>12.5% (1) 37.5% (3)</td>
<td>25.0% (2) 25.0% (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of rms = size of room  
Num of rms = number of rooms  
Kitchen = size of kitchen and functionality of kitchen  
Storage = existance of storage, size of storage and existence of storage  
Num of levs = number of levels, including multi-level building and number of floors within a single unit.  
Amt of lite = amount of lighting within the unit.  
Num of win = number of windows within single unit  
Noise = noise level within single unit, between units and exterior environment.  
Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent percentage and number of students responding to the question.  
- = no responds.  
Previous housing refers to housing in country of origin.  
Current housing refers to housing in USAC.
Table 3. Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>PREVIOUS HOUSING</th>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT HOUSING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIKED</td>
<td>DISLIKED</td>
<td>LIKED</td>
<td>DISLIKED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF RMS</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>75.0% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF RMS</td>
<td>87.5% (7)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITCHEN</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORAGE</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF LEVS</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT OF LITE</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF WIN</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of rms=size of room
Num of rms=number of rooms
Kitchen=size of kitchen and functionality of kitchen
Storage=existance of storage, size of storage and existence of storage
Num of levs=number of levels, including multi-level building and number of floors within a single unit.
Amt of lite=amount of lighting within the unit.
Num of win=number of windows within single unit
Noise=noise level within single unit, between units and exterior environment.
Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent percentage and number of students responding to the question.
-=no responds.
Previous housing refers to housing in country of origin
Current housing refers to housing in USAC.
Table 4. Taiwan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>PREVIOUS HOUSING</th>
<th>CURRENT HOUSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIKED</td>
<td>DISLIKED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF RMS</td>
<td>45.4% (5)</td>
<td>36.3% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF RMS</td>
<td>45.4% (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITCHEN</td>
<td>27.2% (3)</td>
<td>45.4% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORAGE</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>54.5% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF LEVS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.0% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT OF LITE</td>
<td>54.5% (6)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF WIN</td>
<td>54.5% (6)</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td>27.0% (3)</td>
<td>45.4% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of rms=size of room
Num of rms=number of rooms
Kitchen=size of kitchen and functionality of kitchen
Storage=existence of storage, size of storage and existence of storage
Num of levs=number of levels, including multi-level building and number of floors within a single unit.
Amt of lite=amount of lighting within the unit.
Num of win=number of windows within single unit
Noise=noise level within single unit, between units and exterior environment.
Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent percentage and number of students responding to the question.
-=no responds.
Previous housing refers to housing in country of origin.
Current housing refers to housing in USAC.
Table 5. **All groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>PREVIOUS HOUSING</th>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT HOUSING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIKED</td>
<td>DISLIKED</td>
<td>LIKED</td>
<td>DISLIKED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF RMS</td>
<td>51.8% (14)</td>
<td>37.0% (10)</td>
<td>14.8% (4)</td>
<td>44.4% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF RMS</td>
<td>59.0% (16)</td>
<td>11.0% (3)</td>
<td>37.0% (10)</td>
<td>22.0% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITCHEN</td>
<td>29.6% (8)</td>
<td>40.7% (11)</td>
<td>37.0% (10)</td>
<td>40.7% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORAGE</td>
<td>7.0% (7)</td>
<td>55.5% (15)</td>
<td>44.4% (12)</td>
<td>18.5% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF LEVS</td>
<td>22.0% (6)</td>
<td>25.9% (7)</td>
<td>37.0% (10)</td>
<td>4.0% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT OF LITE</td>
<td>37.0% (10)</td>
<td>11.0% (3)</td>
<td>33.0% (9)</td>
<td>22.0% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM OF WIN</td>
<td>63.0% (1)</td>
<td>11.0% (3)</td>
<td>18.5% (5)</td>
<td>22.0% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td>29.6% (8)</td>
<td>44.4% (12)</td>
<td>33.0% (9)</td>
<td>33.0% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of rms=size of room  
Num of rms=number of rooms  
Kitchen=size of kitchen and functionality of kitchen  
Storage=existence of storage, size of storage and existence of storage  
Num of levs=number of levels, including multi-level building and number of floors within a single unit.  
Amt of lite=amount of lighting within the unit.  
Num of win=number of windows within single unit  
Noise=noise level within single unit, between units and exterior environment.  
Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent percentage and number of students responding to the question.  
-=no responds.  
Responses of all groups and total percentages and numbers for the sample of 27, responding to questions for each factor.  
Previous housing refers to housing in country of origin.  
Current housing refers to housing in USAC.
### Table 6. Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>INTERIOR</th>
<th>INFRASTRUC</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>EXTERIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREVIOUS</td>
<td>62.9%(17)</td>
<td>14.8%(4)</td>
<td>14.8%(4)</td>
<td>3.7%(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>48.1%(13)</td>
<td>40.7%(11)</td>
<td>25.9%(7)</td>
<td>18.5%(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

refers to responses from the total sample for previous and current living area.
refers to improvements to previous housing.
refers to improvements to current USAC housing.
Interior=refers to the interior of a single unit.
Infrastructure=plumbing, heating and cooling, insulation, ventilation.
Environment=social environment, noise, pollution, interaction with management.
Exterior=superstructure, aesthetics.
Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent students responding to the question.
Table 7. Improvements previous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>INTERIOR</th>
<th>INFRASTRUC</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>EXTERIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>37.5%(3)</td>
<td>25.0%(2)</td>
<td>12.5%(1)</td>
<td>12.5%(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREA</td>
<td>62.5%(5)</td>
<td>12.5%(1)</td>
<td>25.0%(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIWAN</td>
<td>81.8%(9)</td>
<td>9.0%(1)</td>
<td>9.0%(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

refers to responses from the total sample for previous and current living area.
refers to improvements to previous housing.
refers to improvements to current USAC housing.
Interior=refers to the interior of a single unit.
Infrastructure=plumbing, heating and cooling, insulation, ventilation.
Environment=social environment, noise, pollution, interaction with management.
Exterior=superstructure, aesthetics.
Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent students responding to the question.
Table 8. Improvements current

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>INTERIOR</th>
<th>INFRASTRUC</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>EXTERIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>37.5%(3)</td>
<td>25.0%(2)</td>
<td>25.0%(2)</td>
<td>25.0%(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREA</td>
<td>37.5%(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.5%(1)</td>
<td>12.5%(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIWAN</td>
<td>63.9%(7)</td>
<td>36.3%(4)</td>
<td>18.0%(2)</td>
<td>18.0%(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

refers to responses from the total sample for previous and current living area.
refers to improvements to previous housing.
refers to improvements to current USAC housing.
Interior=refers to the interior of a single unit.
Infrastructure=plumbing, heating and cooling, insulation, ventilation.
Environment=social environment, noise, pollution, interaction with management.
Exterior=superstructure, aesthetics.
Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent students responding to the question.
Table 9. China summary questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>INTERIOR</th>
<th>INFRASTRUC</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>EXTRN STRUC</th>
<th>% RESPOND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMFORT</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>87.5% (7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOMFORT</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (25)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY EASY</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDER DAY</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL EASY</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDER SOC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>30.0% (7)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISS</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT MISS</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comfort=factors that make housing comfortable
Uncomfort=factors that make housing uncomfortable
Day easy=factors that make daily activities easy to carry out
Hinder day=factors that hinder day to day activities
Social easy=factors that make social interaction easy
Hinder soc=factors that hinder social interaction
Miss=factors that are missed from previous housing environment
Not miss= factors that are not missed from previous housing environment
Comments=additional comments from student
% Respond=percentage of responses that refered to the corresponding factor
Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent those students responding to the questions. And whose responds include any of the four factors.
Note, note in some of the responses more than one factor was mentioned therefore, the percentages may be higher.
### Table 10. Korea summary questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>INTERIOR</th>
<th>INFRASTRUC</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>EXTRN STRUC</th>
<th>% RESPOND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMFORT</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0% (6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOMFORT</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY EASY</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDER DAY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.0% (4)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL EASY</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDER SOC</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISS</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>37.5% (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT MISS</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>25.0% (2)</td>
<td>62.5% (5)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>12.5% (1)</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comfort=factors that make housing comfortable
Uncomfort=factors that make housing uncomfortable
Day easy=factors that make daily activities easy to carry out
Hinder day=factors that hinder day to day activities
Social easy=factors that make social interaction easy
Hinder soc=factors that hinder social interaction
Miss=factors that are missed from previous housing environment
Not miss= factors that are not missed from previous housing environment
Comments=additional comments from student

% Respond=percentage of responses that referred to the corresponding factor

Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent those students responding to the questions. And whose responses include any of the four factors.

Note, in some of the responses more than one factor was mentioned therefore, the percentages may be higher.
Table 11. Taiwan summary questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>INTERIOR</th>
<th>INFRASTRUC</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>EXTRN STRUC</th>
<th>% RESPOND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMFORT</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>63.6% (7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCOMFORT</td>
<td>27.2% (3)</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>45.4% (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY EASY</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>36.3% (4)</td>
<td>27.2% (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDER DAY</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>36.3% (4)</td>
<td>18.1% (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL EASY</td>
<td>27.2% (3)</td>
<td>18.1% (2)</td>
<td>45.4% (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDER SOC</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.7% (9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISS</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>27.2% (3)</td>
<td>45.4% (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT MISS</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.4% (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>9.0% (1)</td>
<td>45.4% (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comfort=factors that make housing comfortable
Uncomfort=factors that make housing uncomfortable
Day easy=factors that make daily activities easy to carry out
Hinder day=factors that hinder day to day activities
Social easy=factors that make social interaction easy
Hinder soc=factors that hinder social interaction
Miss=factors that are missed from previous housing environment
Not miss= factors that are not missed from previous housing environment
Comments=additional comments from student
% Respond=percentage of responses that referred to the corresponding factor
Percentages and numbers, in parenthesis, represent those students responding to the questions. And whose respondents include any of the four factors.
Note, in some of the responses more than one factor was mentioned therefore, the percentages may be higher.
CHAPTER 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The need to respond to the housing needs of a changing population in the USAC system forms the basis for these recommendations. Based on the history of USAC and the responses of the students who participated in the study, USAC is doing an excellent job in addressing the needs of the student population it serves. Paramount to this recommendation is the benefit not only to the student transplant but also to the USAC community at large. Second, these recommendations should in no way serve as a catalyst to the separation or clustering of any specific group or groups of individuals or households.

Students indicated a moderate level of satisfaction with USAC on a Likert scale of 1-5, with 1 being lowest and 5 highest. Further, decisions to live in the housing were based on considerations of economics, proximity to campus and services. It also appeared that the issues of housing were not foremost in the mind of some of the respondents. The main focus was on education and perhaps living in university housing was considered an extension of and a support to the educational process. Therefore, careful consideration should be given by the administration and housing staff to the perceptions of students of the connection between housing and education, and the impact the connection has on housing satisfaction for student transplants. If this connection is not addressed, not only will satisfaction be lowered but also the impact on the education process and student performance will be affected in a negative way.
A large number of respondents, 51 percent of those interviewed, were married and had children living with them. This fact indicates the need for 1) considerations for family and children, in terms of services and location of services and 2) the needs of a spouse or significant other who may or may not speak English. Since this spouse often finds herself or himself at home most of the time, her/his sense of belonging and involvement in the student housing community is very important. Perhaps, by being aware of the family situation, staff would become more helpful in times of need, e.g., repairs, emergencies. USAC has in place many services that are responsive to the needs of the family. For example, Pammel grocery, carries a variety of foods from many countries, and Pammel day care, offers day care services for pre-school children in the community. The children in the pre-school not only have exposure to children who may have similar backgrounds, but also have exposure to those with different backgrounds. This is also an excellent way for families to meet. Other services include the laundry rooms located in University Village and Pammel Court and study and computer rooms.

A large number of the students interviewed, 55.6 percent, were from traditional backgrounds and family structures. The indication here would be that the family plays a very significant role in the lives of these individuals. The family serves as a strong support system. This fact reinforces the need for inclusion of the non-student spouse and family in planning for the housing. One way in which these individuals can be involved would be through the resident manager or area manager.
The area manager could act as a liaison between the non-student spouse and family by making sure they are aware of activities, periodically checking on maintenance needs, and informing them of groups on campus that would put them in touch with others in similar circumstances.

As indicated by the interviews and observations, the households were very organized and neat. This organization was important to the families. They liked natural lighting and a sense of openness. These were factors the families had little control over, and they seemed to be aspects that generated the most dissatisfaction.

Recommendations fall into two categories: 1) physical and 2) environmental including social, internal and external.

**Physical recommendations**

* Flexible units that would allow for the partitioning of space without reducing size of the units. The living room was generally noted as the most used room. This should, therefore, be as large as possible. A bedroom was not used very much. Hence, they could be traded off for enlarged living room. The bathroom and one bedroom could be left as separate rooms.

* An increase in storage space, for large items, and closet space, for smaller items.

* Based on the responses, windows were a big issue. Not only the size, but also the number, was an issue. The students said that in their
previous home environments, they liked to let the light from the outside in; this would also aid in improving ventilation. They would have liked more windows and ventilation in their USAC unit.

* Based on the cooking style and general dissatisfaction with the exhaust system, emphasis should be placed on placement and efficiency of exhaust fans in the kitchen area.

* Students also wanted more privacy. Hence it is recommended that future units should be a garden-type home, or townhouse type.

* The student should have the ability to customize the interior; for example, the ability to paint the walls.

Infrastructure

* There were a number of concerns raised about heating and cooling. Hence it is recommended that the units have improved heating and cooling. Perhaps central air conditioning should be explored.

* Improved insulation, which would aid heating and cooling.

* Improved sound proofing.

* The units should be within reasonably close proximity to campus and services.

Location was high on the list of those interviewed. Again, many chose Pammel Court or Hawthorn Village because of their proximity to campus and other services. The distance is walkable or bikeable without too much inconvenience even in bad weather. However, in
University and Schilletter Villages, the bus or a car was seen as necessary in inclement weather.

A prime location for the units would be in the area of Pammel Court; where units are being phased out. This would make land available.

**Environment**

In this respect assisting the student in the transition from one housing environment, specifically cultural, to another can be helpful. One way to accomplish this is by making contact with the potential resident as personal as possible. A brief questionnaire to establish contact, with staff, and between the individual and others from the same country or school, could be used so that when the student arrives he/she comes into an environment that is somewhat familiar.

**Summary**

In considering the recommendations, the following factors are identified as focal points: 1) economic feasibility, 2) location, and 3) the ability of the units to meet the needs of the population being served. The units should be evaluated in a manner that would allow for an exchange of communication. In doing so, the changes that may be needed can be monitored in a consistent and on-going manner.
The first point, economic feasibility, is essential not only from the perspective of the university but also, from the economic perspective of the student. It would appear from the sample that the students are able or willing to pay rents, or willing to pay rents, within the ranges of Pammel Court, Hawthorn Court, and University Village. Consideration should also be given to: 1) the cost to the university, and 2) the level of maintenance, which should be low for both the university and the student.

Location should be as close to campus and other services as possible. For example, the area near Pammel Court and Hawthorn Court are within walking and biking distance of campus and other services. In addition, this area is conveniently located to bus services. Location is also a key factor in enhancing a sense of community, not only for the student, but also for the families of the students.

The ability of USAC to meet the needs of the population it serves will hinge on its ability to draw on lessons learned from the past, reflecting on strengths and weaknesses and, lastly, anticipating future changes. One way of facilitating such a process would involve the use of focal groups. The groups would be composed of student residents from culturally diverse backgrounds and USAC staff. Input from the participants would aid in the facilitation of positive change for both residents and staff, thus opening a line of communication. Focus groups are an example of a low-cost means of enhancing positive, and eliminating negative, elements in the housing environment.
The recommendations can be classified in two very broad categories: 1) short term, low cost, and immediate and 2) long term, higher cost and further consideration. The implementation of the recommendations should be based on a rational problem solving process. (Patton and Sawicki, pp.2, 1986). The model defines the process steps as first defining the problem, evaluation criteria, alternatives, evaluation of alternatives.... (pp. 2).

The first suggestion for implementation is to draw on the strengths of existing policy and conditions at USAC. The use of focus groups, made up of residents and perhaps staff, involve no cost, except in terms of time [which is valuable to all involved]. Second, these groups allow for interaction of staff and residents. The groups are able to provide definition of the problems that exist based on personal experiences and perspectives. The residents are the most positive resources USAC has, as they are diverse and are reasonably satisfied with the services offered.

In terms of physical aspects USAC has a policy that allows for customization of units, specifically in Pammel Court. It is recommended that this policy be extended to other living areas. By doing so, individuals would have a sense of control and sense of personalizing the interior of the home. Issues such as type of customizing, paint and etc. would be taken up between staff and residents via focus groups.

These recommendations, again, are low cost, and can be carried out immediately. One additional issue that is important to the
implementation of these recommendations is the interaction of staff with residents, especially those from outside of the country. This may be accomplished through sensitivity training. The staff has worked with diverse groups of students and this asset should be drawn upon.

The more long term and costly recommendations include the use of flex-units. These recommendations involve intense study and research on cost effectiveness, what constitutes low maintenance, availability of land, and projections into student population and alternatives such as privatization of the housing. These recommendations are not assuming that universal design can be obtained, but does draw on the existing strengths and experiences of USAC and considers how they may be expanded to address the housing needs of the diverse student population that it serves.
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APPENDIX A. STATEMENT READ TO THE RESPONDENTS

You have been invited to participate in a research project for my Master's thesis. The purpose of my study is to determine the influence of previous housing experiences on current housing satisfaction.

I would like to emphasize that your participation is entirely voluntary, and that if, after I explain the procedures to you, you feel that you do not want to participate, I will end the process. I hope you will decide to participate, as your answers will make a significant contribution to our knowledge about housing needs of students at ISU.

All of the information you provide will be completely confidential, at no time will your names be mentioned. The interview will take about one hour to complete.

You are asked to give a response for each question included in the interview. Information regarding your age, sex, etc. will enable me to compare the perceptions of different groups. It is not possible to connect your answer with you as an individual, so please answer the questions as accurately and honestly as possible. The validity of the research depends on the honesty of your response.

The decision to participate in this interview is left to you. Further, at any time during the interview you may feel free to discontinue participation.
The student
1. Address
2. Classification? (undergraduate, graduate, other)
3. Where are you from? (city, country).
4. How large is the city where you are from?
5. Are you married?
6. Do you have children?
7. How many people live here with you?
8. How many months have you lived here?
9. Where did you attend school before coming to Iowa State? (location, size of town and school, type of institution.).
10. Did you come directly from school or did you work?
11. If you worked what was the size of the city or town where you worked?

Previous housing pattern
12. Before coming to Iowa State where did you live;
   a. dormitory
   b. family home
   c. apartment
   d. single family home
13. Regarding your previous housing, did you;
   a. rent
   b. own
   c. housing provided
14. In the home you lived in how many people lived with you?
15. What was their relationship to you?
16. Would you describe the house you lived in before coming to ISU?
17. What did you like about the previous house? For example;
   a. size of room(s)
   b. number of rooms
   c. kitchen area
   d. storage space
   e. number of levels
   f. amount of lighting
   g. number of windows
   h. noise level
18. What did you not like about your previous house? For example;
   a. size of room (s)
   b. number of rooms
   c. kitchen area
   d. storage space
   e. number of levels
   f. amount of lighting
   g. number of windows
   h. noise level

19. What room (s) were used the most? For example;
   a. living room
   b. kitchen
   c. other (please specify)

20. What room (s) were used the least? For example;
   a. living room
   b. kitchen
   c. other (please specify)

21. What room (s) were most important for day-to-day activities?
   For example;
   a. living room
   b. kitchen
   c. other (please specify)

22. What room (s) were most important for social activities?
   For example;
   a. living room
   b. kitchen
   c. other (please specify)

23. Why did you decide to live in your previous house?
   a. space
   b. location
   c. family
   d. no choice
   e. other (please specify)

24. What was the most outstanding feature of your previous house?

25. What part needed improvement?

26. How long had you lived in your previous home before coming to ISU?
27. On a scale of 1-5, with 1 being lowest, indicate you level of satisfaction with your previous housing

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. What part of your previous home do you miss in your current location?

29. What part of your previous home do you not miss in your current location?

**Current housing**

30. How did you find out about USAC?
   a. friend
   b. housing department
   c. other (please specify)

31. Why did you decide to live in USAC?
   a. friend
   b. assigned
   c. transferred
   e. other

32. What do you like about your current home? For example;
   a. size of room(s)
   b. number of room
   c. kitchen area
   d. storage area
   e. number of levels
   f. amount of lighting
   g. number of windows
   h. noise level
   i. other

33. What do you dislike about your current home? For example;
   a. size of room(s)
   b. number of rooms
   c. kitchen area
   d. storage area
   e. number of levels
   f. amount of lighting
   g. number of windows
   h. noise level
   i. other
34. What room (s) do you use the most? for example;
   a. kitchen
   b. living room
   c. other

35. What room (s) do you use the least? For example;
   a. kitchen
   b. living room
   c. other

36. What room (s) do you use the most for day-to-day activities?
37. What room (s) do you use the most for social activities?

38. Where do you study most of the time?
   a. home
   b. library
   c. office
   d. other (please specify)

39. Where do you prefer to study;
   a. home
   b. library
   c. office
   d. other (please specify)

40. If you study in your home on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being lowest, rate the level or adequacy for the following;
   a. noise
   b. lighting
   c. ventilation
   d. other factors

41. If you study at home on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being lowest, rate your level of satisfaction with your home as a study environment.

   1 2 3 4 5

42. What aspects of your current housing need improvement?
43. In general do you feel the noise level in your current home is acceptable?
44. In general do you feel ventilation is adequate in your apartment?
45. What is the one major difference in your previous home and your current home? For example, space, location, size....
46. What was your first choice for a living location this year?
Social environment
Please rate the following questions on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest.

47. Do you feel residents in your building or area show respect for others?
48. Do you feel residents are accepting of people from other countries?
49. Do you feel residents are accepting of American minorities?
50. Are there opportunities for your to interact with community members who maybe culturally, ethnically and racially different from yourself?
51. Do you feel comfortable enough in this environment to carry on with your way of life. For example, cultural, religious, ritual, festivals,...activities.

The next set of questions in this section apply to both our previous and current housing area or neighborhood. For this set of questions there maps of the four USAC housing areas. A sketch of your previous housing area or near neighborhood will be needed. The sketch should show what you considered your living area or neighborhood to be.

52. On the map and the sketch would you please draw a line or arrow indicating the type of relationship you have or had with the people in your area or neighborhood. The relationships are listed below

a. recognize them on the street, but have only a greeting acquaintance.
b. stop and talk with them outside regularly (one adult).
c. stop and talk with them outside regularly (all adults).
d. mutual aid and/or common activities (involving one adult)
e. mutual visiting and entertaining in each other houses, for example dinner, parties, festivals, celebrations,...

53. Would you say your previous neighborhood was;
a. more homogenous than current area.
b. more heterogenous than current area.
c. about the same.
d. not sure.
54. Do you consider our current housing situation as;
   a. long term.
   b. short term.
   c. not sure at this time.

55. Concerning the people that you have a very good or close relations with. What things do you have in common? For example, children, interest or hobbies, from the same city, attend the same school, family relations,...

56. On the map would you indicat where these people live?

57. In general, are you satisfied with the area or neighborhood where you currently live?

58. How does your current area compare with your previous area, on scale of 1-5 with 1 being lowest.

Summary questions
59. In regards to your current housing situation, what aspects make you feel comfortable or part of the community?
60. What aspects make you feel uncomfortable with or not part of the community?
61. What aspects of your home make your day-to-day activities go easily?
62. What aspects hinder your day-to-day activities?
63. What factors make socialization easy?
64. What factors make socialization difficult?
65. What things do you not have in your overall housing environment that existed in your previous environment, that you miss the most?
66. You miss the least?
67. Would you please comment on any additonal factors that have either positively or negatively, influenced your housing experience at USAC.
68. Comments or suggestions.