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WORKSHOP
AGENDA
COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Workshop Summary

The primary objective of the "Community Leaders and Affordable Housing Workshop" was to facilitate the sharing of research results from the S-194 Southern Region Housing Research Project, "Barriers and Incentives to Affordable Housing" with Extension Housing and Community Development Specialists. During the two-day session, research and Extension faculty worked collectively in developing recommendations for transferring research findings to appropriate audiences. The dissemination of research findings will ultimately benefit both housing professionals and housing consumers.

The program format facilitated the presentation of research procedures and relevant findings. Following the discussion of research findings, small-group discussion sessions were held. Each work session was chaired by a facilitator who directed participants' attention to specific questions related to workshop objectives. At least one member of the research team was a designated resource person in each work group. Each group pondered the following questions:

1. How can community action be garnered to help strengthen a weak housing delivery process in rural areas?

2. What role can Extension play in supporting community action related to affordable housing issues in the rural South?

3. What program materials are needed to support housing education programs, what audiences should be targeted, and what are potential implementation strategies that might be used?

This document presents the proceedings of the workshop and is divided into three major sections.

Section I details the research presentations made during the workshop and the ensuing discussions. It also includes a brief summary of each small-group session and recommendations for action.

Section II presents key findings from the research study and specific programming strategies, including target audiences for each major finding.

Section III gives the workshop format, participant list, and a full delineation of major research publications and presentations from the S-194 project.
OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH PROJECT

Dixon Hanna

The objective of this presentation was to provide the background and general methodology of the S-194 Research Project: Barriers and Incentives to Affordable Housing to assist in understanding the presentations that will follow. A more detailed version of the methodology developed and used by the research team is covered in Affordable Housing in the Rural South: Methodological Issues (Hanna, McManus, Beamish, and Goss, 1991).

The S-194 Research Committee met in Atlanta in 1984 to begin development of the research proposal that became the S-194 project. Research faculty from eight southern states participated (Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia). In 1986, South Carolina terminated its participation, leaving seven states.

Housing research conducted by the committee previous to the S-194 Project focused on low- to moderate-income housing issues, including (1) limitations to the attainment of quality housing in the rural South, (2) design and construction of prototypical energy-efficient houses, and (3) familial and societal barriers and incentives to energy-efficient housing alternatives. The immediately previous project (S-141) found a general lack of awareness of innovations in housing, especially the energy aspects of housing among consumers, as well as a lack of availability of innovations in the rural housing markets studied. To further paraphrase, the research documented a gap both in knowledge and in the delivery of housing innovations in rural housing markets.

Paralleling initial proposal development discussions of the S-194 research project was the implementation of new housing policy initiatives of the Reagan and Bush administrations. Most notable was a shift away from direct assistance for the production of housing for low- to moderate-income families to a more market-oriented approach using housing vouchers and existing housing stock. Recognizing the difficulty this shift would mean for the rural South, where in many instances there is not adequate stock available to respond to voucher assistance, the committee considered whether it should redirect its study of rural housing from household units to the community. This was discussed as a way both to understand better how innovations in housing are accepted/adopted and to determine what other factors affect decisions about housing in rural communities.

In the analysis of this option, the committee reviewed the state of the housing market in rural communities and concluded that several general challenges existed at the time.
1. There was a growing shortage of affordable resources for housing, including buildable land, access to alternative energy sources, and mortgage financing for alternative housing types.

2. The cost of constructing a traditional, single-family house was growing at a much faster rate than rural family income.

3. Most rural communities did not have the infrastructure of services (water and sewer) to support higher-density (apartment) developments.

4. Most rural communities lacked the technical expertise to successfully compete for private and federal resources. Therefore, the research committee concluded that the future of rural housing under these policy and economic conditions would fall to states and communities. To better understand how these knowledge gaps and market gaps could be overcome would require knowing more about housing in rural communities.

The committee postulated that future success in the delivery of adequate housing in rural communities employing innovative concepts would rest with the action of local community-elected leaders, actors in local housing markets (builders, realtors, etc.), and informed consumers. For example, it was hypothesized that local leaders would need to incorporate one of three probable actions: (1) a willingness to accept available housing programs to build or renovate units for low- and moderate-income families, (2) the establishment of requirements (or subsidies through tax breaks) to encourage energy-efficient construction, and/or (3) a willingness to allow the introduction of new technology in the form of building code or zoning reforms.

The Problem

Why do some rural communities adopt a more progressive approach toward providing or allowing alternative housing for low- to moderate-income families -- modular construction, subsidized apartments, etc.? Conversely, why do many rural communities stifle opportunities to secure housing for low- to moderate-income families by embracing regressive mobile/manufactured housing park ordinances, overly restrictive zoning requirements, moratoriums on utility expansions, and other restrictions?

Stated a little differently, the committee sought to determine what common traits or characteristics exist between communities with more diverse options in housing types, finance, and programs and "traditional" communities (those with fewer options). What specific mix of variables -- geographical, economic, social, political, historical, and others -- are at play in rural housing markets in these different communities? And which elements or variables act as "barriers" to achieving affordable housing, and which act as "incentives"?
The committee first initiated a thorough search of the literature on rural housing markets, barriers and incentives to affordable housing, and a series of related topics. To the committee’s dismay, very little useful literature was discovered on the issue or even on the appropriate methodology for conducting this type of social research on housing in rural communities. The literature provided neither a complete understanding of the process by which housing innovations are accepted in rural communities empirical evidence (case studies) of the impact of the total array of barriers and incentives on the adoption of innovative housing at the community level.

Initial Tasks

The committee developed several initial tasks or strategies to define more clearly the research in general and its specific objectives and to begin the task of assessing the availability of data with which to do the research. These strategies included:

- Setting parameters on research and developing specific research objectives.
- Developing a strategy for identifying the specific communities to be studied.
- Developing a strategy for documenting existing housing practices in these rural communities.
- Developing a strategy for collecting, coding, and collating data on housing in these rural communities.

Research Objectives

1. To assess the institutional and infrastructural barriers to community acceptance of innovations in housing design, construction, and financing.

2. To develop a conceptual model that delineates the interrelationships and interactions of the various barriers and incentives.

Community Definition

One of the initial tasks that was most difficult was "crafting" an operational definition by which communities were to be included in our study. The committee agreed to a conceptual definition that embraced all the social, economic, and political elements of a community, but the committee found that the availability of data in rural areas under the level of the county was a significant constraint to its ability to reach consensus on an operational definition, one that would successfully align the existing data with survey data to be collected.
The final operational definition for community was stated as follows:

An incorporated area of 2,500 to 10,000 population in 1980 in a non-Metropolitan Statistical Area county or an incorporated county seat town of 1,000 to 2,500 population in 1980 in a non-Metropolitan Statistical Area county without an incorporated area (town) of at least 2,500 population.

Further, the committee eliminated "atypical" communities that "fit" with the operational definition (i.e. college/university communities and recreational or "second home communities").

Community Selection

The committee initiated a listing and analysis of all the rural communities in the seven states that fit the operational definition, in most cases comparing the housing data available from both the 1970 and the 1980 Census. Concurrently, the committee developed a short "state-level questionnaire" to solicit from various state agencies and organizations involved in housing their knowledge about housing practices in these selected rural communities in their respective states. This "state survey" proved very disappointing even though it did lead to the production of a directory of state housing agencies and organizations for the seven states (Sweeney, Beamish, and Goss, 1987).

Since the state-level survey produced no useful results, the committee structured a short, descriptive survey termed the "housing practices survey" that went to a cross section of local officials involved with housing in each of the selected communities. This housing practices survey included 30 questions in four categories: alternative financing practices, housing programs, local regulations, and alternative housing types. The survey was mailed to six individuals working in or servicing each community in each state, including the county Cooperative Extension agent, the Farmers Home Administration supervisor, the regional planner, a realtor, a lender, and the mayor or city manager.

Results of the housing practices survey were analyzed and developed into an "index of diversity" by which each community could be "scored." These "community scores" were plotted on a graph using the 1980 population of the community as the other coordinate variable, producing a scatter plot. Four communities in each state to be studied in depth were selected in pairs from this scatter plot, such that one pair of "large" communities (both diverse and traditional) was selected as was one pair of "smaller" communities (both diverse and traditional). At the end of this phase, the research committee had defined 28 study communities across the seven states representing both diverse and traditional communities as well as large and small communities.
Community Documentation and Verification

The committee developed a series of documentation forms to use to collect and categorize or code data on housing in the 28 study communities. To accomplish several procedural requirements, the researchers in each state visited each of their proposed study communities to: (1) collect the required data, (2) interview the original "practices" respondents, (3) verify the results of the practices survey, and (4) start the documentation of the housing programs and unusual housing types referenced in the practices survey.

Community Leaders

One aspect of the documentation and verification process was the development of a list of community leaders in housing. The committee, supported by the literature search, recognized that the activity of key individuals or leaders in a community could have a significant impact on the diversity of the community. In order to include these individuals, the committee adjusted a standard community leader identification technique (Powers, 1985) as a mechanism to define "housing leaders" in each community. That interview and survey process was conducted by researchers in each state in each study community as a part of the verification process.

Questionnaires

The final step in the data gathering process for the committee involved the collection of attitudinal data from the three major components of the housing markets of each study community: households, intermediaries, and leaders. Intermediaries included builders, realtors, housing officials, and others involved in the local housing market. From the development of additional research sub-objectives, the committee drafted an eight-part, 133-statement questionnaire. The initial draft of the questionnaire was tested by researchers in each state. The committee approached the need to survey households in each study community by developing a sampling strategy for both the larger and the smaller communities. The sampling procedure involved the designation of every "nth" listing in the local telephone directory. The committee followed the Dillman Total Design Method of questionnaire administration (Dillman, 1978).

Likewise, the committee used the local telephone directory to select intermediaries -- professionals, agents, lending institutions, etc. -- involved in housing in their respective study communities. A version of the "household" questionnaire was developed for the survey instrument for intermediaries and leaders in each of the 28 study communities.

Initially, the committee selected a fifth community in North Carolina as the "pretest" community for the survey and procedure testing. The pilot survey process
enabled the committee to revise the questionnaire format and content for each of the questionnaires before attempting to mail out the thousands of questionnaires to households and intermediaries in the 28 study communities.

**Conclusion**

The conclusion of the massive data gathering effort by the researchers working in each state was the development of both a "state data set" and a "regional data set" that were the subject of numerous statistical efforts, looking at several key elements of housing at the community level in the rural South. All the presentations that follow use the regional data set as the source for their analysis and conclusions.

The second research objective was the blending of these facts, attitudes, and findings into a **conceptual model** of barriers and incentives to affordable housing in rural southern communities.
THE RESEARCH MODEL

Jacquelyn W. McCray

A causal model for examining the interplay between specific characteristics of a community and its housing stock was developed following an extensive review of the literature. Studies and concepts related to social structures at the community level, decision processes, and the role of community leaders in community actions provided the theoretical basis for the proposed model. Significant concepts from this review will be summarized.

Rogers (1972) conceptualized social systems as either traditional or modern. Traditional systems typically lack a favorable orientation to change, use less developed technology, enforce the status quo, and have little communication with outsiders or the ability to empathize with outsiders. Modern systems, in contrast, have a positive attitude toward change, developed technologies, more rational social relationships, and a more cosmopolitan perspective. In this project, the research team wanted to understand the relationship between a community’s social system and community decisions resulting in the presence/absence of minimally acceptable affordable housing.

In terms of the decision theory review, the concern was with decision theories related to housing. Most studies identified related to housing decisions at the family level; but a number appeared to have application to housing decisions at the community level as well.

Tallman’s structural-cultural theory (Klein and Hill, 1979) suggested that structural arrangements, cultural beliefs, interaction variables, and personality traits are related to the effectiveness of problem-solving strategies. Within this framework, values and attitudes of community leaders, housing consumers, and housing intermediaries were explored as potential barriers and/or incentives to the resolution of housing problems at the community level.

The central-satellite model proposed by Paolucci, Hall, and Axinn (1977) also appeared to be related to the research goals. In the model, the central choice is significant, but it is linked with several minor choices that are dependent on and related to the central choice.

This model has particular relevance to questions of housing affordability at the community level. The availability of decent, affordable housing often results from circumstances or situations outside the control of families forced to live in substandard units. Within the framework of the central-satellite model, when community leaders fail
to seek or use opportunities to support housing programs at the community level (central-satellite decision), housing consumers are limited in the opportunity to make related housing choices. Central-satellite decisions take many forms that encourage housing affordability, diversity, and quality in the community. Conversely, central decisions that decrease housing options to consumers often abound.

A number of studies related to community decision-making power and social action were identified. Four important notions regarding community leaders were noted: (a) social power is present and exercised in patterned ways in all social systems, including communities, (b) certain individuals play key roles in the exercise of community leadership, (c) only a very small percentage of community citizens become actively involved in the decision-making process, and (d) successful community action depends upon finding and involving key community leaders.

The desired research outcome was some indication of differences in social systems (i.e., community structures, decision making processes and participants, etc.) that result in differences in the availability of standard-quality affordable housing in rural communities. The major dependent variables (Housing Stock Characteristics) include measures of housing quality, housing affordability, and housing diversity.

Development of Components (Key Concepts) for Proposed Causal Model

The proposed causal model (figure 1) suggests that each model component has a direct impact on the housing stock of a community and that the interaction or combination of specific variables may create stronger influences than when variables act independently.

The first model component, demographic characteristics of community residents, considers household structure, age, race, and income characteristics of residents that are potentially related to the household’s ability to secure housing on the open market. According to Myers (1990), housing and population are intimately related. The population is broken down into household or family groups that are sheltered in housing units and different types of households living in different types of housing units. This is a very simple premise, but it clarifies the importance of demographics as a key concept in the proposed model.

The second key component, economic base of the community, considers the ability of rural communities to support community-based housing programs. According to Rainey and Rainey (1975), rural local governments have special financial difficulties because their support base is comprised of small towns and sparsely settled areas. Given the Economies of Scale principle, it is not surprising that community service costs to rural communities exceed those of more populated areas. The economic base component of the barriers and incentives to affordable housing model considers
economic resource parameters at the community level, including taxes, intergovernmental transfers, employment data, assessed value of real estate, and poverty statistics.

**Figure 1.0**

![Causal Model of Barriers and Incentives to Affordable Housing](image)

Values and attitudes of housing consumers, intermediaries, and leaders related to housing comprised the third key concept. Specific variables included measures of general innovativeness, housing values, perceived barriers and incentives to affordable housing, future demand for specific housing types, and general perceptions of respondents toward community services and programs. Two additional measures, perceptions of discrimination and receptivity to specific housing programs, were obtained from the housing intermediaries and community leaders.
The fourth key component, community services, regulations, programs, and financing, considered existing characteristics and/or resources available in or supported by the study community. Services specifically related to housing include water supply and waste disposal. However, other services including police and fire protection, as well as transportation, all contribute to the macro housing environment.

The number and type of community housing regulations provide a view of a community’s response to and/or actions toward housing development. While regulations are needed to protect the health and safety of occupants of housing, some under the control of state and local governments (such as outdated building codes, inappropriate subdivision regulations, exclusionary zoning controls, and excessive development impact fees) can needlessly drive up the cost of housing.

Finally, housing programs and financing options for housing at the community level were included as (1) a measure of the traditional vs. innovative structure of the community, and (2) indicators of existing housing resources available to households in the community.

The various independent variable sets (model components) were used in developing a series of multi-variate sub-models for each dependent variable (housing stock measures) under consideration (Figure 2).

Significant variables from all component sub-models were then combined into an overall model for each housing stock measure (housing diversity, housing quality, and housing affordability). Subsequent sections will detail procedures used in developing measures for the housing stock variables and provide a general overview of housing affordability, quality, and diversity throughout the region.

Regression models were developed that explained 60% of the variance in age of the housing stock, 84% in plumbing and crowding deficiencies, 60% in housing diversity, and 83% of the variance in housing affordability in the 28 non-Metropolitan Statistical Area communities studied in the seven southern states.

Results confirm the contribution of all components of the proposed causal model to explained variance in the housing stock measures. Although variables from each model component contributed to explained variance, values and attitudes of housing intermediaries were more important in explaining variance across all housing stock measures (quality, diversity, and affordability) than were other groups of independent variables. For complete results of the regression modeling for each model component see McCray and Shelton (1992).
### Housing Stock Dependent Variables

**Affordability**
- Percentage of families with maximum allowable incomes to qualify for a home mortgage from each state's housing finance agency. (Case study)
- Percentage of families who pay more than 30% of income for rent. (Household questionnaire)

**Quality**
- Percentage of units built before 1959 (1980 census)
- Percentage of units with plumbing and crowding deficiencies (1980 census)

**Diversity**
- Percentage of non-single family units (1980 census)
- Housing type diversity score (Housing practices survey)

### Model Components and Independent Variables

**Demographics**
- Number of families (1980 census)
- Median family income (1980 census)
- Median age (1980 census)
- Percentage white (1980 census)
- Number of families below poverty (1980 census)

**Economic Base**
- Percentile range of school children below poverty (Case study)
- District expenditure per student (Case study)
- Total market value of real estate (Case study)
- Turnback funds per 100 population (Case study)

**Values/Attitudes**
- (Household and/or Intermediary/Leader Questionnaire)
- Household Perceptions of barriers and incentives -
  - Building regulations
  - Housing affordability
  - Lenders' attitudes
  - Land-use regulations
  - Housing production
  - Acceptance of housing alternatives

**Household disposition toward innovativeness** -
- Overall innovativeness
- Receptiveness to new housing ideas
- Work with things and ideas
- Innovative attitudes toward housing improvement

**Household ranking of housing values** -
- Family values
- Social values
- Personal values

**Household perceptions of** -
- Attitudes toward lenders
- Availability of affordable housing
- Community concern for housing
- Adequacy of housing programs
- Personal concern for housing
- Adequacy of community services

**Intermediary perceptions of barriers and incentives** -
- Building regulations
- Lenders' attitudes
- Housing production
- Housing affordability
- Housing availability
- Acceptance of housing types
- Natural environment
- Mobile homes

**Intermediary disposition toward innovativeness** -
- Receptiveness to new housing ideas
- Work with things and ideas
- Innovative attitude toward housing improvement

**Intermediary receptivity to support** -
- Programs for rental units
- Loan programs for housing
- Adequacy of community services
- Homeownership programs
- Housing programs from local budget
- Zoning to support housing

**Intermediary perception of demand for** -
- Single family housing
- Mobile homes
- Apartments/multi-family

**Intermediary perception of discrimination against** -
- Elderly, handicapped, single parents, etc.
- Racial and ethnic groups

**Housing Practices/Regulations/Community Services**
- Summary of housing practices (Housing practices survey)
- Housing finance score
- Housing regulations score
- Housing program score

**Community service scores (Case study)**
- Overall community service
- Water
- Garbage and sewage
- Shopping and transit
- Police and crime rate
- Fire
- Rescue service
- Medical service
- Education
- Community club/media
- Recreation

**Number of housing-related regulations (Regulations questionnaire)**
- Land use regulations
- Mobile home regulations
- Building regulations
- Permit procedures
- Total land-use regulations
- Total building regulations
- Total regulations
In summary, the proposed causal model is useful in identifying relationships and interactions among and between family and community variables and the housing stock of a community. As expected, some variables appear to be barriers to the availability of standards quality affordable housing, while others may function as incentives.

Housing affordability and quality are complex issues, but it is reasonable to consider that housing at the community level may be more affordable and of better quality if increased options in housing types and costs are available. Therefore, housing intermediaries/leaders and community residents need to be aware of the potential influence of values and attitudes on the housing stock of the community. An important educational goal is to increase the knowledge of these groups regarding attitudinal barriers and/or incentives to improved housing. It is noted that other factors (i.e., demographic and economic characteristics of the population and the community) are important as well and should be acknowledged and addressed. However, values and attitudes represent fertile grounds for expanding the role of communities in securing affordable housing for residents.
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Rosemary Carucci Goss

The need for affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households in both rural and urban areas of the United States continues to be a major concern in the 1990s. According to standards established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD, 1985), housing is considered affordable if it consumes no more than 30 percent of a household's income. Slightly more than one-fourth of all rural residents live in housing that is either substandard or a cost-burden to the residents (Schwartz, Ferlatuo, and Hoffman, 1988).

The extent to which housing is not affordable, one of the three housing stock dependent variables, was used to examine a model of housing affordability in rural communities. Housing cost data for 28 rural communities were collected as part of the S-194 Southern Region Housing Project, "Barriers and Incentives to Affordable Housing." From these data rental and ownership affordability ratios were developed. In most communities few respondents were actually experiencing rent burdens; however, a majority of respondents could qualify for homeownership assistance from their state housing finance agency. A probable reason for this major difference is the fact that the ratio for rental affordability used actual respondent rental costs. Many of these rental units were of poor or marginal quality and thus rented for relatively low sums. On the other hand, the ownership affordability ratio was computed using state finance agency guidelines for the highest incomes the state finance agencies would allow for low- to moderate-income residents. On the whole, this housing would almost certainly be superior to the existing rental housing used to compute the rental affordability ratio.

Separate stepwise regressions were performed using rental and ownership affordability ratios as a dependent variable. The variables, turnback funds per 100 persons (state tax funds returned to the community), household's attitudes toward building regulations, lender's attitudes, and apartment demand, were found to explain 83% of the variance in the ownership affordability model. Intermediaries’ and leaders’ perceptions of lenders’ attitudes and housing programs in the community were found to account for 48% of the variance in the renter affordability model.

From a practical point of view, these findings suggest that attitudes can influence housing affordability, and lenders’ attitudes are perceived to be a barrier. Throughout history, Southern rural lenders have had a reputation for being extremely conservative. As Southern rural communities work toward improved housing, perhaps one of the first places to begin is to work with community lenders.
HOUSING QUALITY

Julia O. Beamish

Housing quality was one of three dependent measures used to examine a model of housing affordability in rural communities. Often adequate or standard-quality housing is not available at costs that are affordable for low-income families. As many as one-fifth of low-income renters may suffer from both quality and affordability problems (Congressional Budget Office, 1988). Low-income households in the rural South still experience a higher incidence of problems with housing adequacy than do households in other regions. The housing conditions in the 28 Southern communities were examined to determine factors related to problems in housing quality. Both households and intermediaries in these communities indicated that the utilization of building codes and resident and official concern for housing quality were incentives to affordable housing. The availability of water and sewer was perceived as an incentive to housing by the households but as a barrier to the provision of affordable housing by the intermediaries.

In the housing affordability model, the dependent variables used to measure quality were taken from the 1980 census: percent of units built before 1959 and percent of units that lacked plumbing and were crowded. Most of the communities had a large portion of older housing stock, while there was a small proportion of units with both plumbing and crowding problems. Independent variables were identified from census data, interviews with community officials, and mailed surveys to community residents, housing leaders, and intermediaries. A series of stepwise regression procedures was performed with the various independent variable sets utilizing each dependent variable. In the final modeling, the variables median age, school children below poverty, and number of educational institutions accounted for 60% of the variance in the percent of units built before 1959 model. Proportion of white residents, households' perceived demand for mobile/manufactured housing, and percentile range of school children below poverty accounted for 84% of the variance in the percent of units lacking plumbing and crowded model.

While relationships to race, age, and poverty support previous research in the housing quality area, the role of financing and mobile/manufactured housing in the communities suggest other aspects of the problem that should be examined. Financing options have been limited in rural areas for a number of years, and the relationship between this limitation and housing quality should continue to be examined. Mobile/manufactured housing has increased dramatically in the last several decades and is a viable alternative in some rural communities. Explorations into the barriers that prevent mobile/manufactured housing from being a satisfactory solution for communities and residents should continue.
HOUSING DIVERSITY

Margaret Weber

Housing type diversity was examined as a component of an affordability model within rural communities. There are several factors that contribute to the diversity of housing options including regulations, finance, and practices available within communities to support the development of various housing types and forms. The range of diverse options is a major influence on the affordability and quality of housing units available to consumers. Therefore, the research team sought to examine diversity issues within communities in relation to demographic, economic, attitudinal, and housing characteristics. The data used to study housing diversity came from a mailed survey of housing intermediaries and community officials (housing practices survey) and the 1980 census of housing and population.

Two dependent variables were employed to measure housing diversity at the community level: 1) the percentage of non-single housing units -- calculated as a portion of the total housing units -- and 2) housing type diversity score for each community based on a housing-type subscale from the housing practices survey. Utilizing a hypothesized modeling process, the independent variables were identified and categorized as: demographic, economic base, values/attitudes of households, values/attitudes of intermediaries and leaders, and housing practices/regulations/community services. Pearson product moment correlations were calculated for each subset of variables and then entered into a stepwise regression procedure. In the final modeling, over 48.5% of the variance was explained in the model that used the percentage of non-single housing as a dependent variable. Only three variables were significant: apartment demand/intermediaries and leaders, shopping and transportation, and educational institutions. Independent variables, adequacy of services/households, receptiveness to loans/intermediaries and leaders, and apartment demand/intermediaries and leaders, contributed to 60.3% of the variance in the housing type diversity model. These measures indicate that values and attitudes held by both the households and community leaders and intermediaries are a large determinant in the types of housing available in a community.
ROLE OF INTERMEDIARIES AND LEADERS

Gladys Shelton

Housing intermediaries and community leaders play key roles in community decision-making often affecting the quantity and quality of existing housing. Characteristics, attitudes, and perceptions of those in relevant positions help define community decisionmaking and actions related to successful delivery of adequate and affordable housing in rural communities. Results of the S-194 study indicate some significant characteristics of the intermediaries/leaders in responding to the survey.

Intermediaries/leaders in small rural communities in the southern region of the United States were found to be employed, experienced in housing, well-educated, married, white males with above-median annual household incomes. Both their knowledge and their involvement with housing types, projects, and programs in their communities were primarily limited to those activities involving traditional housing. Intermediaries/leaders rated regular single-family houses as the housing type to be in greatest demand for the next five years in the communities they serviced.

Also, regular, single-family houses were perceived by the intermediaries/leaders as one type of housing for which there would be a substantial demand in the future. Mobile/manufactured homes, a viable alternative to the more expensive, regular, single-family home, was not highly regarded. Neither did intermediaries/leaders support activities for land use control modifications that would specifically affect the placement of mobile/manufactured housing.

The support for continued funding of housing programs given by these intermediaries/leaders was directed toward programs that benefitted the community in general or homeowners in particular. Few intermediaries/leaders supported programs related to rental assistance for low-income households. Additionally, these intermediaries/leaders were inclined to express greater support for more traditional programs than for those requiring newer types of local funding or action for the provision of housing.

It appears that better representation from all segments of the population in important decision-making positions would improve the receptivity of intermediaries/leaders to the provision of affordable housing for all segments of the population. The limited knowledge of the intermediaries/leaders about newer types of housing that emerged with the onset of the 1970s energy crisis would imply that exposure to recent developments in the housing construction field might improve the variety of housing offered in the community. The low rating given to
mobile/manufactured housing and land use controls for mobile/manufactured housing suggests that exposure to recent advances in safety and aesthetic concerns of mobile/manufactured housing is needed.

It would appear that unless intermediaries/leaders gain a better understanding of the ramifications of poor housing on the quality of life for the entire community, housing provisions for limited-income households will continue to lag behind other community efforts. Change is necessary in rural communities, and efforts to involve the intermediaries/leaders in these changes should be encouraged.
PROGRAMMING FRAMEWORK
Jacquelyn W. McCray

This programming framework (McCray and Willis, 1991) was developed for inclusion in the ES/USDA Reaching Limited Resource Audience Task Force Report. It is presented here as one way to explore program strategies for addressing affordable housing issues.

REACHING LIMITED RESOURCE AUDIENCES
Programming Framework

The framework views households as the central core of four concentric circles. The inner circle and the two outermost circles represent factors that have an impact on the availability and use of household and community resources. In this instance, the issue is housing. Access to specific resources needed is determined by characteristics of households and individuals; but in like manner, resource availability is also influenced by specific services within the community (represented by level
three). Finally, social, economic, and other characteristics of a community influence the level and quality of services available as noted in level 4.

In this mode, the framework has relevance to the task of translating research findings into outreach programs. Limiting factors at the household and community levels may influence the availability of affordable housing in rural communities; this suggests the need to explore possible educational programs that may benefit communities in addressing limiting factors at various levels of the matrix.

LEVEL 1. Household and Individual Level

General limiting factors: Income, education, minority status, knowledge and utilization of available services and resources, skills and abilities, and lack of positive view of the future.

Educational programs: Skills development (money management, energy conservation etc).

Knowledge expansion (available housing programs, including finance and how to access).

Other skills and abilities, i.e., simple home repair, furniture refinishing, etc.

LEVEL 2. Community Resource Needs Related to Housing

Adequate supply of decent housing with:
- Option in design and structural type
- Alternative tenure options
- Range of prices to parallel income distribution
- Support facilities and services

Level 3. Community Services and Support Systems

General limiting factors: Lack of community support systems and limited and/or inefficient services, inadequate supply of decent, affordable housing, lack of employment opportunities, and limited and inefficient distribution of social benefits to needy residents.

Resource needs to support affordable housing:
- Utilization of available housing programs
- Water and sewerage systems
- Streets and roads
- Transportation networks
- Financing options
- Effective regulations and enforcement
Level 4. Community Characteristics

General limiting factors: Traditional versus modern or innovative perspective of community; lack of vision and direction by community leaders and residents; high unemployment; low median and per capita incomes; limited resource base (taxes, turnback funds, etc.) and attitudes toward cultural and ethnic plurality.

Extension Home Economics programs have generally targeted the household and individual levels of the framework, while Community Development programs have addressed community services and characteristics (though not specifically related to the provision of affordable housing). The premise for the workshop is that each level of the framework should be attacked simultaneously and consistently to maximize the educational impact of extension housing efforts. Leadership development programs provide excellent opportunities to inform new and emerging community leaders of the benefits that innovative and creative thoughts and actions can have on a community. If creativity and innovativeness can be enhanced by educational experiences, then programs in this area may be warranted.

The intention is not to suggest specific types of educational programs that might flow from the research effort but rather to provide one way of viewing relationships between a community, its housing and its citizenry. The charge for the symposium will be to develop recommendations for educational programs and future research that can enhance the availability of affordable housing in rural communities. SYNERGY will be the word. This workshop is probably a first in combining the collective talents of Extension educators from housing and community development with the technical background of housing researchers to address the problems of affordable housing in southern rural communities.
LITERATURE CITED


LITERATURE CITED, continued


GROUP I - COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Facilitators: Linda Gardner and Eddie Wynn
Resource/Recorder: Julia Beamish

The purpose of the session was to discuss ways in which community involvement can be implemented to address barriers and incentives to affordable housing. The group identified various agencies available in the states represented and discussed programs sponsored by these agencies. These included state housing authorities, Farmers Home Administration, Community Reinvestment Act, Federal Reserve, Resolution Trust Corporation, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Elderly/Handicapped Access Groups, and legislative conferences. Discussants had been involved in preparing or contributing to comprehensive housing affordability strategy reports for their states, in housing counseling, advocacy groups, and leadership training as well as in publications related to the first-time homebuyer.

Developing strategies for working with agencies and programs was also discussed. Key personnel need to be identified and contacted personally. These may be state-level personnel, or they may be more regional or local. Several different barriers were discussed. Several problems related to the acceptance of mobile/manufactured housing were identified, including terminology, lenders' attitudes, zoning, perceptions of impact studies on real estate values, tax status, aesthetic and design considerations, and management of mobile/manufactured home parks. Educational programs related to these topics could be developed to enhance the acceptability of mobile/manufactured home alternatives. Further discussions were related to lenders' attitudes related to low-income housing, the overall problem of who really owns "slum" housing, and why it continues to exist. Finally, housing as an economic development strategy for rural communities was discussed. As small towns seek to be competitive in attracting and maintaining industry, they need to look at the supply of affordable, quality housing and the role that this can play as an incentive to economic growth.
GROUP II - ROLE OF EXTENSION

Facilitators: Glenda Herman and Mike Lambur
Resource/Recorder: Rosemary Carucci Goss

The purpose of this session was to discuss ways in which Extension could use the findings of this research to address barriers and incentives to affordable housing. The discussion centered around the need for more opportunities to have idea interchange between research and Extension faculty. The Southern Extension and Research Information Exchange Group was recognized as one good vehicle. Another suggestion was sharing at annual conferences of the American Association of Housing Educators.

Specifically, participants in this session suggested that the conference proceedings contain one- to two-page summaries of key findings of the regional research project. These findings should include target groups and a suggested action plan.

In each state, researchers need to work with the Extension specialist to examine the findings for that state and to determine how the findings might be used in Extension programming.

The question of how to market housing programs was explored. Extension housing specialists and researchers were encouraged to develop linkages with departments of housing and community development and state finance agencies. Family Community Leadership programs are another way to market programs.
GROUP I - RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, RESOURCE MATERIALS, AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Facilitators: Kathleen Parrott and Savannah Day
Resource/Recorder: Anne Sweaney

Workshop participants discussed and proposed various recommendations for program development and implementation. The outcome of this discussion was the development of specific items and strategic actions that workshop participants are encouraged to implement as a result of the session.

Workshop participants should return to their respective states and identify specific housing-related programs and policies. Interstate networks should be established to better utilize the expertise available throughout the region, and collaboration and resource sharing should be encouraged.

Efforts should be made to foster information and expertise sharing across program lines as well. Extension agents can serve as facilitators for housing programs and other community resource-building activities. Audiences can be expanded to include community leaders with agents serving as catalysts for connecting various groups to one another.

All housing production grants should include an educational component. Farmers Home Administration, Housing and Urban Development, and Local Housing Authorities can be informed about the expertise available, via research and Extension faculty, to assist in developing educational components of specific grants and programs.

Extension specialists should consider the use of alternative program delivery models such as the Master Gardener and the Expanded Food and Nutrition Educational Programs for use in programs related to housing affordability and counseling.

Finally, the group suggested that regional programming priorities should be developed and that individual state priorities should be shared. The workshop participants all recognized the need for regional efforts in the areas of housing and were committed to maintaining better communications among the states.
GROUP II - RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, RESOURCE MATERIALS, AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Facilitators: Dixon Hanna and Eleanor Walls
Resource/Recorder: Sarah Drummond Kirby

Discussion centered on the inclusion of housing affordability issues in current housing educational programs. It is often difficult to address affordability issues alone. The group recommended that affordability issues be added to other topics that are identified in housing programs instead of addressing the issue as a separate program thrust. For example, if housing for the elderly population has been identified as a major area of work, one component of the educational programming could target the housing affordability problems of the elderly. In this way, the issue can be addressed, and county staff and clientele will identify with the importance of the issue.

The group also recommended that the Cooperative Extension Service link with those agencies, individuals, and organizations that have an influence on the type of housing available in the community. Those targeted include community leaders, planners, housing providers, lenders, realtors, and agencies that work with individuals experiencing housing affordability problems. There has been a decline in housing for low- to moderate-income households in communities, and only those who are housing providers can make a real impact. Developing community coalitions to address housing concerns should be considered. It was also suggested that Extension specialists make themselves available to sit on local and state housing boards in an attempt to influence the housing issues and concerns that are addressed.

Solutions to the problems associated with housing affordability issues require community action. It is important to involve the people in the community. Additionally, the potential of housing as an economic development tool is not often recognized by communities.

The group asked for more information from researchers concerning the affordability issues in their state. This information can assist Extension faculty when working with community and state leaders on housing affordability issues.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

Margaret J. Weber

The discussion of recommendations for action centered around the research-Extension interface in relation to 1) needs, 2) use of information/actions, and 3) accomplishments. The group felt that the greatest need was to inform Extension and Experiment Station Directors of the accomplishments to date of this first joint research/Extension housing workshop in the region. The importance of this initial workshop, "Community Leadership and Affordable Housing," is evidenced by the financial support provided by the Southern Rural Development Center. These collaborative efforts should be encouraged and supported by both research and Extension programs.

This workshop and the ongoing follow-up activities are real-life solutions to the problem of translating research findings into a format useable by Extension faculty in disseminating findings to housing industry professionals and lay clientele. We strongly request the support of Extension and Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and Academic Deans in continuing this process of meeting the federally mandated mission of providing research-based educational programs to citizens. This is particularly critical in the nine southern states where there are no housing research faculty (South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Tennessee and Kentucky).

Other recommendation areas are summarized below:

Needs

1. Research findings such as those presented at this workshop should be incorporated into educational programs and community action.

2. Programs should be designed to close the knowledge gap for the consumer and build awareness of housing needs and potential community response.

3. There is a need to create an awareness of voids in the knowledge base. It was emphasized that consumers are often unaware of 1) what they need to know in order to take sound actions, 2) what knowledge is available, and 3) how to incorporate basic information into the housing-decision process.
4. Linkages need to be created among the many community agencies and groups working with housing-related programs, i.e., an investigation of housing counseling needs in relation to economic constraints should be of interest to lenders.

5. The context of housing should be more broadly defined to incorporate process and product. This expanded perspective of housing should enhance the understanding of housing issues by community residents and leaders.

6. Regional Extension publications are needed to address specific housing issues common to all southern states. Such issues include housing finance, policy, affordability, quality, and others. Educational materials can take a variety of forms, including video tapes and slide sets with supporting educational materials.

**Use of Information/Actions**

1. Housing research and Extension faculty should have a broader knowledge of key individuals involved in housing in their state and community.

2. Research results and findings should be shared with these key housing individuals. This exploration of solutions to housing problems could result in expanded community action research and housing programs.

3. A sharing of findings between Extension and research faculty within each state and within the region would result in the development of more research-based housing programs.

4. Interdisciplinary program efforts are needed to strengthen housing research and program development approaches.

5. Linkages between Extension and research can be strengthened through professional organizations such as Southern Region Plan Exchange Group, the American Association of Housing Educators and the American Home Economics Association. Well-designed symposia at annual meetings were suggested.
Workshop Accomplishments

1. Research findings were of interest to Extension personnel. Applications to program development were identified and specific programming strategies were discussed.

2. Research and Extension faculty across the region established linkages and participated in open dialogue regarding housing problems and procedures for addressing those problems within the framework of the land-grant system.

3. The workshop provided opportunities for creative thought to help focus and clarify research programs and begin the development of Extension programming based on results of the S-194 project.

4. Successful housing programs were shared among participants, providing valuable information that will be useful in program development and implementation in other states and communities.

5. And finally, Extension faculty left with a better insight into constraints to the provision of affordable standard-quality housing at the community level.
KEY FINDINGS
AFFORDABILITY-QUALITY INTERFACE

Rosemary Goss and Julia Beamish

Statement: Housing was affordable for most renter respondents (costing less than 30% of income per month). However, a majority of the total sample had household incomes that qualified for homeownership assistance based on state finance agency guidelines. Most respondent's housing met minimum levels of quality. Almost all had complete plumbing, and almost two-thirds lived in units built after 1959. Census data indicated that communities experienced higher rates of quality deficits than were reported by survey respondents.

Background/explanation: Recent analysis of American Housing Survey data has indicated more severe problems with affordability and quality in Southern rural areas than were found within this sample. Some possible reasons for this finding might include: 1) poverty households without telephones were not included, 2) sample came from small towns with water/sewer systems that provided improved plumbing conditions, 3) many homeowners owned their homes without a mortgage, and 4) housing costs and household income in Southern rural communities are lower than in most other parts of the United States.

First-time homeowners in Southern rural areas have an opportunity to attain ownership through state finance agency loans since income guidelines are often based on state averages that place small-town residents at an advantage.

Communities seemed to have supported water/sewer systems as a way of improving housing quality. This concern with water/sewer has been effective in reducing plumbing problems in the small towns studied. Likewise, a concerted effort to utilize state finance agency loans might improve the availability of moderate-cost housing in small communities.

Target Audience: Community leaders, lenders, realtors, builders, and first-time homebuyers.

Strategies: Use of extension network to inform target audiences of the availability of state finance agency programs.

Expected Impacts: Extension educators can help policy makers understand the meaning of both housing quality and affordability and that quality needs to be a component of affordability. In addition, Extension programming can have a positive impact on the awareness of state finance agency programs for both consumers and intermediaries.
HOUSING DEMAND: APARTMENT/TOWNHOUSE

Rosemary Carucci Goss

Statement: Demand for apartments/townhouses in rural areas is likely to be less than that for mobile/manufactured housing even though households and intermediaries in this study ranked multifamily housing demand second behind single-family housing. This suggests that there may be more demand for multifamily housing in rural areas than is currently perceived.

Background/explanation: Multifamily housing growth accounted for only 9% of growth between 1970 and 1980. At the same time single-family housing starts increased by 19%, and mobile home growth increased by 89%. Yet when asked about housing demand in the next five years, both lenders and households ranked multifamily housing demand second behind that of single-family housing. Both households and intermediaries responded that attitudes toward multifamily housing tended to be an incentive. Yet there was little growth in multifamily housing production in the previous decade. When combined with other findings of the S-194 project regarding attitudes toward mobile/manufactured housing, it is apparent that mobile/manufactured housing has been more popular than multifamily housing even though intermediaries do not predict as much future demand for these units as they do multifamily housing. Perhaps this is because intermediaries would actually prefer multifamily to mobile/manufactured housing because of the negative image mobile/manufactured units continue to have despite the efforts of the industry efforts to improve the product and its image.

These contrasting findings raise several questions. Have developers been reluctant to build multifamily housing for fear that it would not be accepted in rural areas? Do mobile/manufactured units provide the affordable alternative to single-family housing in rural areas that multifamily housing provides in urban areas? The findings of this study indicate that there might be more of a demand for multifamily housing in rural areas than might have been expected.

Target Audience: Housing intermediaries, Extension educators, developers, and community officials.

Strategies: Housing intermediaries and community leaders need to examine the true demand for multifamily housing in rural areas. Information describing housing alternatives needs to be targeted toward consumers, particularly young families.

Expected Impacts: Developers and community officials would find this information useful when examining housing demand and enacting public policies that impact upon multifamily and mobile home starts.
ASSESSING COMMUNITY HOUSING NEEDS

Anne Sweaney

**Statement:** Community housing needs are difficult to assess due to the lack of a comprehensive and consistent data base.

**Background/explanation:** A critical factor in identifying the housing needs in the study communities was the lack of a consistent data base providing a detailed description of the present housing stock. A case study documentation form was developed to aid in this data collection. However, each of the 28 communities was unique in the availability and accuracy of housing data. The needs identified by the households and the intermediaries were of the ex-post facto nature and gave only a snap shot view of the community needs at that point in time. Current secondary data sources such as census data are severely lacking, especially in these rural areas. Presently the requirement for developing Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategies (CHAS) by states and entitlement communities has reinforced the need for more comprehensive data. One of the basic components of the CHAS document is the community housing needs assessment. Frankly, these data do not exist, and communities are recognizing the need for such documentation.

**Target Audience:** Community officials, community service agencies, consumers, planners, non-profit housing associations, local housing authorities, state housing agencies, and commercial and real estate professionals.

**Strategies:** Educational programs that inform community leaders and others of strategies for assessing community housing needs could empower rural communities to seek available funding to support housing development.

**Expected Impacts:** Accurate and defensible assessments of community housing needs contribute directly to the amount of state and federal funding coming into the community. Citizen support of housing efforts is more likely to develop if community residents and leaders have a lucid view of the community’s housing situation.
AVAILABILITY OF WATER AND SEWER

Julia Beamish

**Statement:** Households in the small rural communities studied indicated that the availability of water and sewer was adequate and an incentive to housing in their community, while intermediaries indicated that it was adequate but a slight barrier.

**Background/explanation:** Concern about the availability of plumbing in rural homes has been prevalent in housing policy since the 1940s when over 70% of rural housing lacked complete plumbing. The 1980 census indicated that only 2.2% of all units lacked complete plumbing, but the majority of units that did have this deficit were in rural areas and small communities. During this period of improved plumbing conditions, many small communities have installed public water and sewer systems. This has allowed residents to more efficiently utilize indoor water supplies and toilets. Over 99% of the respondents in the S-194 study had complete plumbing. All of the study communities had public water, and only one did not have a public sewer system. Most of these systems were funded by the communities. The households and intermediaries rated the water systems higher in adequacy than the sewer systems. Households indicated that the provision of water and sewer had been an incentive to housing in their community (Mean=3.68), while intermediaries indicated that the water and sewer systems had been a slight barrier (Mean=2.92). These responses indicate that the provision of water and sewer systems has been successful in these small towns and the systems are appreciated by residents. Intermediaries are probably responding to the community's needs for expansion. They may feel that these systems will need to extend to outlying areas if their community is to grow and encourage industrial and housing development. Yet this has an additional cost to the households that face annexation.

**Target Audience:** Community officials and regional planners.

**Strategies:** Information can be used by Extension staff working with the target audiences as they examine the water and sewer needs for growth and the provision of quality of life in their affected communities. Additional concerns about solid waste disposal and the costs involved in this process should also be examined.

**Expected Impacts:** The water and waste disposal needs of rural areas are a community development concern. Communities cannot grow effectively until these needs are addressed. Those communities not serviced by community systems still face problems that must be addressed by other types of systems.
COMMUNITY SERVICES

Gladys G. Shelton

**Statement:** Housing intermediaries and leaders rated services in rural communities higher than the residents in the communities.

**Background/explanation:** Community services, such as police and fire protection, water and sewage treatment, roads, hospitals, libraries, etc., are integral to community well-being and quality of life. Small rural towns often experience deficits in service quality or level, creating dissatisfaction with small-town life. Recently there has been an increasing trend for local governments to coordinate management of all functions affecting housing and to link direct housing initiatives with the entire municipal structure: taxes, capital budget, operating budget, and municipal services. As small communities are struggling to provide expected services, questions related to the level of provision and the adequacy of services become critical.

Research results indicate the following regarding ten categories of community services. (1) Households in general rated schools, public water services, and libraries as highly adequate and recreation facilities, hospitals, and shopping areas as less than adequate. (2) Housing intermediaries and leaders also rated recreation facilities, hospitals and shopping areas as less than adequate. Overall, however, these housing actors rated community services higher than the residents in the communities. (3) Services were perceived as more adequate in communities with higher housing diversity and populations by both households and housing intermediaries and leaders.

**Target Audience:** Consumers, community officials, and housing intermediaries.

**Strategies:** To increase opportunities for citizen involvement in community policy decision-making via public hearings, and other public input formats to allow participation in the prioritization and provision of services.

**Expected Impacts:** Greater involvement on the part of local citizens and the sharing of information by local officials should serve to identify and reduce perceptual differences in the adequacy and provision of services.
CONSUMER KNOWLEDGE AND ACCEPTANCE

Julia Beamish

Statement: Households and intermediaries/leaders perceived that consumers’ knowledge of alternative housing and their willingness to accept alternatives, such as solar or earth-sheltered housing, were barriers to affordable housing in these communities.

Background/explanation: Housing alternatives may offer consumers a choice of living arrangements that are more affordable or more energy efficient and less costly to operate. Affordable options include mobile/manufactured housing and multi-family housing; energy-efficient alternatives include designs such as passive and active solar and earth-sheltered housing.

Households and intermediaries were asked if these various options existed in their communities. Both groups were consistent in reporting the presence of mobile/manufactured housing and apartments. The presence of solar housing was reported by one-third of the households and 40-50% of the intermediaries. Earth-sheltered housing was reported as present in the community by 25% of the households and one-third of the intermediaries. For both the solar and earth-sheltered options, 40-46% of the households did not know if these options existed.

Both households and intermediaries perceived that consumers did not know about housing alternatives and that this was a barrier. The intermediaries were more negative in their perception of this lack of knowledge. Consumers were also perceived by both groups as less willing to accept alternatives. The implication is that if consumers were more knowledgeable about alternatives they might be more accepting of them. Intermediaries in particular may perceive that since consumers are not accepting of alternatives, there is no need to develop or provide these options although they may be more affordable or less costly to operate.

Target Audience: Consumers, community officials, and housing intermediaries.

Strategies: Written materials that describe housing alternatives continue to be needed by both groups.

Expected Impacts: Information should help consumers analyze the alternatives and make comparisons related to life cycle costs, lifestyle factors, design, and local regulations.
ECONOMIC INDICATORS AND HOUSING QUALITY/AFFORDABILITY

Jacquelyn W. McCray

Statement: Community economic indicators contributed to explained variance in owner-affordability ratio and housing quality in the 28 study communities.

Background/explanation: The economic indicators (percent change in number employed, poverty level indicator, school district expenditures per student, turnback funds per 100 population, appraised market value of real estate and percent unemployed) combined to explain 54% of the variance in the owner affordability ratio across the 28 communities; however, only poverty level indicator and turnback funds per 100 were significant. More favorable housing affordability ratios are found in communities with higher percentages of school children below the poverty level and in communities receiving higher dollar amounts of turnback funds per 100 population.

Poverty level was also significant in the housing quality measure (percent of units with plumbing/crowding deficiencies). For the plumbing/crowding measure of housing quality, 64% of the variance in community scores was explained by four economic variables (poverty level, district expenditures, turnback funds, and appraised market value).

These relationships are important in understanding housing issues facing local communities. The influence of income on housing quality is obvious. Families use available resources to purchase goods and services, including housing, within their economic means. People live in low-quality housing when they cannot afford to pay for standard units and when subsidies are not available. Affordable housing as currently used in the industry typically refers to unit cost and does not reflect the quality of the unit. In reality, poor-quality housing is affordable, but not adequate. Issues of housing quality and affordability must be considered jointly.

Target Audience: Legislators, community leaders, and local and state agencies.

Strategies: Inform target audience of interrelatedness of housing issues and the economic structure of rural communities. Develop educational programs that suggest strategies for enhancing economic resources for families and communities.

Expected Impacts: Community leaders will become aware that economic variables contribute to the quality and affordability of housing, and that family income and community resources must be considered in any policy initiative designed to improve the housing stock of a community.
HOUSING STOCK

Rosemary Carucci Goss

**Statement:** Both intermediaries and households perceived the availability of rental housing for large families and the supply of vacant housing units as a barrier to obtaining affordable housing. If this perception is true, can housing vouchers meet low-income housing demand in rural communities?

**Background/explanation:** Since the 1980s, federal low-income housing policies have been based on the belief that housing vouchers can provide housing through the private market more efficiently and less expensively than production subsidies. However, there must be vacant housing available for low-income families to rent with their housing vouchers, and vacant housing is often of substandard quality. In areas where standard-quality vacant housing is available, vouchers have been found to be an efficient way of dealing with low-income housing problems.

Research results indicated a lack of vacant housing and a lack of housing for large families. Quality vacant housing of both types is needed if the voucher program is to work well.

**Target Audience:** Housing policy makers

**Strategies:** Housing professionals must take every opportunity to share policy-related information with federal and state policy makers so they can understand and incorporate housing market dynamics into housing policy decisions and program implementation strategies.

**Expected Impacts:** Housing policy can be impacted when policy makers are informed of these results, indicating that housing vouchers are not always the best alternative to solve the affordable housing problem.
Statement: The housing knowledge and involvement of housing intermediaries and leaders was limited to traditional housing types.

Background/explanation: Housing intermediaries and leaders were experienced in housing and had considerable knowledge and involvement with traditional housing, i.e., conventionally built houses, mobile/manufactured homes, and multi-family housing units. However, few respondents had any knowledge of or involvement with the newer types of housing that emerged with the onset of the 1970s energy crisis. This suggests that newer housing types had not "arrived" in rural areas to any great extent. Also, since low support was reported for manufactured homes, it might appear that housing actors are more concerned with the types of housing currently available in the community than with the provision of adequate and affordable housing. The acceptance of mobile/manufactured housing in many communities has produced highly controversial debates and court cases, although the mobile/manufactured housing industry has made considerable progress with safety and aesthetic concerns. It will be very important to keep housing intermediaries and community leaders updated regarding advances, through either the efforts of industry or other special educational programs to enhance knowledge and acceptance on newer housing options in rural communities.

Target Audiences: Lending agency officials, contractors, architects, Extension housing specialists, planning and zoning officials, local elected officials, non-profit housing associations, state housing authorities.

Strategies: Workshops, publications, videos, slide sets, and other media presentations should be developed to inform target audiences of the positive characteristics and potential of newer housing types.

Expected Impacts: Exposure to recent developments in housing construction and design might enhance the acceptability of newer housing forms and improve the variety of housing types available in rural communities.
DIVERSITY ABSENT IN INTERMEDIARIES/LEADERS

Gladys Shelton

Statement: Demographic characteristics of the intermediaries/leaders in the study reflected inadequate representation of population segments in community housing decisions.

Background/explanation: The housing intermediaries/leaders were primarily well-educated, white males. Thus, the participation of minorities, i.e., Blacks, Hispanics, American Indians, and females, in community decisions regarding housing was limited. Also, only 7% of the intermediaries/leaders were 65 years or older. Ironically, it is these same minorities that most often occupy a disproportionate share of poor housing and suffer from housing discrimination or affordability problems.

Target Audiences: Minority leaders and organizations, lending officials, local government officials, regional planning and development district officials or Councils of Governments, and policy makers at all levels.

Strategies: Special efforts should be made to involve a broad-based spectrum of the population base in the decision-making processes. Information related to this deficiency in representation could be addressed in various ways. Workshops, organizational newsletters, and press releases would make the general public aware of the absence of diversity in the composition of decision-making bodies.

Expected Impacts: Better representation from all segments of the population in decision-making positions could enhance the availability of affordable housing for all segments of the population.
INTERMEDIARIES/LEADERS SHOW LITTLE SUPPORT FOR RENTAL ASSISTANCE

Gladys Shelton

Statement: Housing actors did not report substantial support for rental assistance programs for low-income households.

Background/explanation: In the past, the federal government has been the major provider of housing programs for this group. Recently, legislative actions have given new responsibilities for housing programs to rural communities. In order to make effective decisions, housing intermediaries/leaders need to understand the ramifications of poor housing on the well-being of the citizens and to make a commitment to this need. One response to this problem can be incentives for developers to plan for increased numbers of low-income set-aside units in subsidized projects. Housing intermediaries/leaders tend to respond best to financial incentives. Such incentives as well as recognition of the social welfare responsibility of communities is needed to encourage the development of rental assistance programs in rural communities.

Target Audience: Housing intermediaries/leaders, legislators, lobbyists, and community development officials and associations.

Strategies: Educational programs to inform target audiences of needed changes in legislation and regulations; increase sensitivity to specific needs of economically disadvantaged residents; enlist support of non-profit community organizations and corporations, and encourage media coverage of the problem.

Expected Impacts: Increased involvement in rental assistance programs by local governments and non-profit housing developers (i.e., churches and Community Development Corporations) may be realized if educational programs sensitize community residents and leaders to the housing needs of low- and moderate-income families.
LOW SUPPORT FOR LOCAL FUNDING OF HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Gladys Shelton

**Statement:** Local funding of housing activities rated very low among the various strategies intermediaries/leaders would support to improve housing in rural communities.

**Background/explanation:** The personal receptiveness and support of housing intermediaries/leaders to initiatives that require local funding of housing activities for the specific purpose of providing affordable housing was low. Generally, housing intermediaries/leaders were the most supportive of code enforcement activities and rehabilitation efforts in declining neighborhoods.

**Target Audiences:** Local elected officials, lending agencies, and community improvement organizations.

**Strategies:** Provide educational programs for intermediaries/leaders addressing the above groups concerning the need for additional support for affordable housing programs and the overall community benefits to be derived. Introducing successful initiatives used in similarly situated communities might be one way to achieve this end.

**Expected Impacts:** Greater awareness of the need for local support of housing activities and ultimately more local support of housing initiatives.
METHODOLOGY

Julia Beamish and Rosemary Goss

Statement: In the study of communities, survey methodology may need to be augmented by secondary sources, interviews, and site visits to the community. While providing a richness to the data, variations in reporting of secondary source information may exist across communities, creating difficulties in analysis and interpretation of data.

Background/explanation: The methodology for this study was multidimensional, consisting of four major segments. First, communities were selected based on a theoretical framework of traditional and modern social systems as they might be applied to housing diversity in rural communities. The selection process for the four communities in each state was based on a combination of census data and data obtained from surveys, indicating level of housing diversity among the communities. Verification was made through site visits and interviews with housing intermediaries. The second step was the collection of case study data to document the housing situation in each study community. Various secondary sources were examined to obtain data, and interviews were conducted with several intermediaries in each community.

The third and fourth steps were conducted simultaneously. Households and housing intermediaries in each community were surveyed to determine perceptions of housing resources and needs within the study communities.

The regionality of the study presented some difficulties with data collection procedures. The problems of each community were often unique, and the procedures for operations within the towns were often the result of this uniqueness. This became apparent as various types of information were sought. Everything from telephone directories to tax records seemed to be different, even within states.

Target Audience: Extension specialists, researchers, and other state-level agency personnel working with community problems from a state perspective.

Strategies: Use some common data sources, i.e. census, so that there is some consistency in the data for all communities. The use of a variety of data sources may be appropriate for several communities in one state, but it may not be appropriate for regional analysis.

Expected Impact: The specific methodology used in this research study may be appropriate for conducting housing and other needs assessments at the local level.
MOBILE/MANUFACTURED HOUSING

Julia Beamish

Statement: Mobile/manufactured housing accounted for the largest growth in the housing stock of the S-194 rural study communities between 1970 and 1980. While some intermediaries reported activities that supported mobile/manufactured housing development, there was consensus among the intermediaries and households that the attitudes of lenders and community officials toward mobile homes were barriers to affordable housing in their communities.

Background/explanation: The number of mobile/manufactured housing placed in the S-194 study communities increased by 89% between 1970 and 1980. Among eligible communities in the seven states, the increase was as high as 132%. A large portion of respondents to the Housing Practices survey indicated that planned mobile home developments existed in their community (42%); however, the quality of these developments was not clearly identified from the survey. The households indicated that attitudes of lenders and community officials toward mobile homes was a barrier to affordable housing. Intermediaries also indicated that these attitudes were a barrier. Few intermediaries indicated that they were involved in the placement of individual mobile/manufactured housing or in the development of mobile home communities or subdivisions. Over 80% of the intermediaries perceived "some" to "great" demand for mobile/manufactured units in their communities in the future, and 66% perceived "some" to "great" demand for planned mobile/manufactured home communities. However, 50% of the intermediaries were not supportive of the elimination or reduction of restrictive zoning affecting the placement of manufactured housing.

The findings from the S-194 study in relation to mobile/manufactured housing indicate confusion about mobile homes by households and intermediaries. The policies that have been in place related to mobile/manufactured housing have not supported affordable housing. Respondents acknowledge a demand for mobile/manufactured housing in the future but, on the other hand, indicate that changing land use policies to encourage mobile home development is not desired. The overall problems associated with mobile homes, from both a consumer and a community perspective, need to be examined more closely to clarify policy directions related to mobile/manufactured housing.

Target Audience: Community officials and lenders and the manufactured housing industry.
Strategies: Visual and written materials depicting successful mobile home developments that are attractive and well maintained to increase the awareness of mobile home options.

Expected Impact: The development of model management strategies for mobile home parks might increase the effectiveness of this affordable housing option. Informing consumers of maintenance and upkeep strategies might enhance the quality and long-term investment of their mobile homes and make them more acceptable to lenders and community officials.
STATE SURVEY

Julia Beamish

Statement: Officials in state-level agencies were aware of activities related to housing programs they administered in the small rural communities of their state. However, they did not know the general housing situation in these communities nor were they aware of activities unrelated to their particular programs.

Background/explanation: The initial process of identifying diverse communities for the S-194 study involved surveying state officials about the small towns that were eligible for the study. Researchers in each state identified state-level agencies that were involved in housing programming and included lenders, regulators, producers, consumer-information groups, sellers, appraisers, and professional associations. The number identified ranged from 19 in Oklahoma to 59 in Alabama and Georgia (mean = 49). The number of communities eligible in each state ranged from 38 in Virginia to 74 in Georgia (mean = 56). The mean response rate was 56%. Sixty-seven percent of the responses were "don't know." Letters and follow-up conversations with respondents indicated that they did not know enough about the activities of the communities within the state to respond if they were innovative (diverse) or traditional in the housing activities that were identified. Because of their inability to identify activities of communities, a further study was conducted among local officials that was successful in classifying communities. Specific questions about housing financing, policies, programs, and housing types were asked of individuals working in the local communities to determine whether or not the community was traditional or innovative.

Target Audience: Personnel in various state agencies.

Strategies: Specific activities related to the housing conditions in small rural communities should be presented to this audience. Analysis of census data and reports on programming that is occurring in small communities should be included. Specialists and researchers should team up with research agencies in their state to develop this analysis and work with Extension agents and regional planners in the reporting process. Information could be shared through conferences and through computer networking.

Expected Impact: If state leaders and personnel in state agencies were better informed about all aspects of housing throughout the state, they might be better able to see the interface of housing policies and how programs could be better implemented.
VALUES AND ATTITUDES

Jacquelyn W. McCray

Statement: Values and attitudes of housing intermediaries/leaders and consumers are important determinants of the quality, affordability, and diversity of a community's housing stock.

Background/explanation: A causal model of barriers and incentives to affordable housing was designed to test the combined effect of demographic characteristics; economic resources; values and attitudes of community leaders, housing intermediaries, and housing consumers; and community services, housing regulations, housing programs, and financing options, on three housing stock dependent variables (quality, affordability, and diversity). Results of the analyses confirm that all components of the model were important to at least one of the housing stock measures; but that the values and attitudes component was more important across all housing variables than were the other components.

Households' perceptions of building regulations and their perceptions of lender attitudes were both important in the owner-affordability model. The perceptions of intermediaries and leaders regarding lenders' attitudes was related to the affordability of renter units in the communities, while their perceptions of the availability of affordable housing was associated with the percent multifamily and mobile/manufactured units in the communities. Intermediary and leader receptivity to loan programs to support affordable housing was also associated with the number of housing options available.

Target Audience: Community leaders, housing consumers, realtors, developers, lenders, and public officials.

Strategies: These audiences need to be informed of the potential influence of values and attitudes on the housing stock of a community. An important education goal is to increase the knowledge of these groups regarding attitudinal barriers and/or incentives to improved housing.

Expected Impacts: Community residents and housing intermediaries/leaders may become more accepting of various housing alternatives if they are informed of the potentially negative influences that specific actions and behaviors have on housing development and community growth.
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WORKSHOP AGENDA
SRDC WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
REGIONAL PUBLICATIONS LIST
WORKSHOP AGENDA

Wednesday, October 2

P.M.
12:00
Workshop Objectives ................................ Gladys Shelton
Overview of Research Project .......................... Dixon Hanna
The Research Model ..................................... Jacquelyn McCray
Housing Affordability ................................. Rosemary Goss
Housing Quality ......................................... Julia Beamish
Housing Diversity ....................................... Margaret Weber
Summary of Relevant Findings ......................... Savannah Day

3:15
BREAK

Role of Intermediaries and Community Leaders .... Gladys Shelton
Collaborating with Related Agencies and Organizations ... Anne Sweeney
Programming Framework ............................ Jacquelyn McCray

Thursday, October 3

Work Session I

A.M.
8:30
Group I - Community Involvement
Facilitators: Linda Gardner and Eddie Wynn
Resource/Recorder: Julia Beamish

Group II - Role of Extension
Facilitators: Glenda Herman and Mike Lambur
Resource/Recorder: Rosemary Goss

10:15
BREAK

10:45
General Discussion ................................. Margaret Weber, Facilitator

11:45
LUNCH

Work Session II

P.M.
12:45
Group I - Recommendations for Program Development,
Resource Materials, and Implementation Strategies
Facilitators: Kathleen Parrott and Savannah Day
Resource/Recorder: Anne Sweeney

Group II - Recommendations for Program Development,
Resource Materials, and Implementation Strategies
Facilitators: Dixon Hanna and Eleanor Walls
Resource/Recorder: Sarah Drummond Kirby

2:00
Adoption of Recommendations for Action .... Margaret Weber, Facilitator

3:00
ADJOURN
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